



**The City of West Jordan
City Council Meeting
September 08, 2026**

8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor
West Jordan, UT 84088

PARTICIPATE IN MEETING



VIEW THE MEETING



Welcome to City Council meeting!

While the Council encourages in-person attendance, you may attend virtually by using the links in the top right corner:

- To provide public comment, click **“Participate in Meeting”** (registration required)
- To observe the meeting, click **“View the Meeting”**

West Jordan Public Meeting Rules

To view meeting materials for any agenda item, click the item title to expand it, then select the view icon to access attachments, or visit <https://westjordan.primegov.com/public/portal>

City Council Meeting 7:00 PM

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Special Recognition

- a. Badge Pinning for West Jordan Fire Department
- b. Recognizing Beto Conejo Artist of the Water Tank Mural at 9000 South

4. Council & Mayor Reports

- a. City Council Reports
- b. Mayor’s Report
- c. City Administrator’s Report

5. Public Comment

6. Public Hearings

- a. Resolution No. 26-041 Authorizing the Mayor to Sign the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program Certifications and Assurances

7. Business Items

- a. Ordinance No. 26-45 Amending Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6 Prohibited Parking

- b. Ordinance No. 26-24 Enacting Title 7, Chapter 6 Electric Bicycles
- c. Ordinance No. 26-46 Enacting Title 7, Chapter 2, Section 3 Negligently Colliding

8. Council Office Report

9. Consent Items

- a. Approve Meeting Minutes
 - August 25, 2026 – Committee of the Whole Meeting
 - August 25, 2026 – Regular City Council Meeting

10. Adjourn

Upcoming Meetings

- Tuesday, September 22, 2026 – Committee of the Whole (4:00p) – Regular City Council (7:00p)
- Tuesday, October 13, 2026 – Committee of the Whole (4:00p) – Regular City Council (7:00p)
- Tuesday, October 27, 2026 – Committee of the Whole (4:00p) – Regular City Council (7:00p)

Certificate of Posting

I certify that the foregoing agenda was posted at the principal office of the public body, on the Utah Public Notice website <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/>, on West Jordan City's website <https://westjordan.primegov.com/public/portal>, and notification was sent to the Salt Lake Tribune and Valley Journal.

Posted and dated September 3, 2026 Cindy M. Quick, MMC, Council Office Clerk

Request For Council Action

Action: Need Council to Take Action

Meeting Date Requested : 09/08/2026

Presenter: Gary Gox, Operations Coordinator

Deadline of item :

Applicant:

Department Sponsor: Police Department

Agenda Type: Public Hearings

Presentation Time: 10 Minutes

(Council may elect to provide more or less time)

1. Agenda Subject

Resolution No. 26-041 Authorizing the Mayor to Sign the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program Certifications and Assurances

2. Executive Summary

The City of West Jordan applied for grant funding to address a current issue in the city. We face persistent community concerns regarding speeding and unsafe roadway conditions, yet current validation methods—such as speed trailers, pneumatic tubes, and short-term counters—require extensive deployment time and manual analysis. This reactive, hardware-dependent approach strains officer resources, delays enforcement, and limits the agency’s ability to proactively identify and address the most dangerous locations. Additionally, the absence of continuous, jurisdiction-wide data makes it challenging to justify enforcement strategies, staffing decisions, and capital investments with objective evidence. Traffic-related injuries and fatalities impose significant human and financial burdens, underscoring the need for a more modern, data-driven system to improve roadway safety.

The Police Department, in collaboration with our West Jordan Public Works and Engineering, proposed adopting Urban SDK, a cloud-based traffic intelligence platform that delivers continuous, 24/7 insights using anonymized connected-vehicle data. Urban SDK enables near-instant complaint validation, systemic hotspot identification, pre/post intervention analysis, and seamless integration with GIS and existing records systems. This real-time intelligence empowers the agency to transition from reactive complaint response.

The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) has approved the application submitted by the City of West Jordan for an award under the funding opportunity entitled 2025 BJA FY25 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program – Local Formula. The approved award amount is \$51,578.

Expected outcomes include a reduction in serious injury and fatal crashes on treated corridors, significant increases in enforcement productivity, and rapid complaint resolution—often debunking 80 percent of perceived speeding concerns within minutes. Agencies using similar approaches have observed measurable speed reductions of 6–10 mph in targeted areas and an improvement in citation efficiency. Eliminating repetitive hardware deployments and manual data processing will also free officer time for higher-value public safety operations.

Beyond enforcement, the platform's cross-department utility supports collaboration among Police, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning, enabling shared investments and broader applications such as infrastructure planning and grant development.

We seek the City Council's approval for Mayor Burton to sign the award agreement, accepting the \$51,578 grant funding to implement the Urban SDK platform.

3. Time Sensitivity / Urgency

Urgency

4. Fiscal Note

\$51,578

5. Planning Commission Recommendation

N/A

6. Staff Analysis

Staff recommends Council authorize the Mayor sign the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program Certifications and Assurances, accepting \$51,578, allowing the use of Urban SDK, a traffic intelligence platform and associated hardware and equipment.

7. Mayor Recommendation

8. Council Staff Analysis

The Council is being asked to authorize the Mayor to sign the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program Certifications and Assurances which is a required form from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of Justice Programs that is required by local government applicants before receiving the funds from the grant program.

The Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Grant Program is the DOJ's primary formula grant for state and local criminal justice funding which can be used for personnel, equipment, training, and technical assistance tied to law enforcement and criminal justice activities.

9. Possible Council Action

The Council may choose to take one of the following actions:

1. Approve the Resolution as written and proposed OR with stated amendments;
2. Not Approve the Resolution;
3. Refer the item back to Council Staff or Administrative Staff.

10. Attachments

Resolution No. 26-041

Attachment A – Pre-Acceptance Award Package

Attachment B – JAG Assurances_2026

Attachment C – Public Hearing Notice

The City of West Jordan, Utah
A Municipal Corporation

Resolution No. 26-041

A Resolution Authorizing the Mayor's Signature on the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Program Certification and Assurances

Whereas, the West Jordan City Council has reviewed the attached Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Program Certifications and Assurances Form; and

Whereas, the City Council desires the Mayor to execute the aforementioned Certification and Assurances Form; and

Whereas, a public hearing was held before the City Council on September 8, 2026; and

Whereas, the Mayor is authorized to execute the attached Certification and Assurances Form pursuant to Utah State and West Jordan City Code.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of West Jordan, Utah:

Section 1. The Mayor is authorized to execute the attached Certification and Assurances Form after the City Attorney's office approved as to legal sufficiency.

Section 2. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage. (UCA § 10-3-719)

Adopted by the City Council of the City of West Jordan, Utah, this 8th day of September 2026.

City of West Jordan

Jessica Wignall
Council Chair

Attest:

Cindy M. Quick, MMC
Council Office Clerk

Voting by the City Council

Chair Jessica Wignall
Vice Chair Kent Shelton
Council Member Bob Bedore
Council Member Annette Harris
Council Member Zach Jacob
Council Member Chad Lamb
Council Member Kayleen Whitelock

"Yes"

"No"

☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐



Department of Justice (DOJ)

Office of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Assistance

Washington, D.C. 20531

Name and Address of Recipient:	CITY OF WEST JORDAN 8000 S REDWOOD RD		
City, State and Zip:	WEST JORDAN, UT 84088		
Recipient UEI:	FJLSQMAMNKC4		
Project Title: Urban SDK geospatial AI platform for traffic calming and accident reduction implementation.	Award Number: 15PBJA-25-GG-03260-JAGX		
Solicitation Title: BJA FY25 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program – Local Formula			
Federal Award Amount: \$51,578.00		Federal Award Date: 7/31/26	
Awarding Agency:	Office of Justice Programs Bureau of Justice Assistance		
Award Type:	Initial		
Funding Instrument Type:	Grant		
Opportunity Category: M			
Assistance Listing: 16.738 - Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program			
Project Period Start Date: 10/1/24		Project Period End Date: 9/30/28	
Budget Period Start Date: 10/1/24		Budget Period End Date: 9/30/28	
Project Description: The City of West Jordan faces persistent community concerns regarding speeding and unsafe roadway conditions, yet current validation methods—such as speed trailers, pneumatic tubes, and short-term counters—require extensive deployment time and manual analysis. This reactive, hardware-dependent approach strains officer resources, delays enforcement, and limits the agency's ability to proactively identify and address the most dangerous locations. Additionally, the absence of continuous, jurisdiction-wide data makes it challenging to justify enforcement strategies, staffing decisions, and capital investments with objective evidence. Traffic-related injuries and fatalities impose significant human and financial burdens, underscoring the need for a more modern, data-driven system to improve roadway safety. The City of West Jordan proposes adopting Urban SDK, a cloud-based traffic intelligence platform that delivers continuous, real-time data on traffic patterns and safety. Expected outcomes include a reduction in serious injury and fatal crashes on treated corridors, significant increases in enforcement efficiency, and improved data-driven decision-making. Beyond enforcement, the platform's cross-department utility supports collaboration among Police, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning. Urban SDK offers West Jordan Police Department a scalable, cost-effective solution to enhance roadway safety, improve			
Award Letter July 31, 2026			

Dear Dirk Burton,

On behalf of the Attorney General, it is my pleasure to inform you the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) has approved the application submitted by CITY OF WEST JORDAN for an award under the funding opportunity entitled 2025 BJA FY25 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program – Local Formula. The approved award amount is \$51,578.

Review the Award Instrument below carefully and familiarize yourself with all conditions and requirements before accepting your award. The Award Instrument includes the Award Offer (Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions) and Award Acceptance. For COPS Office and OVW funding the Award Offer also includes any Other Award Documents.

Please note that award requirements include not only the conditions and limitations set forth in the Award Offer, but also compliance with assurances and certifications that relate to conduct during the period of performance for the award. These requirements encompass financial, administrative, and programmatic matters, as well as other important matters (e.g., specific restrictions on use of funds). Therefore, all key staff should receive the award conditions, the assurances and certifications, and the application as approved by OJP, so that they understand the award requirements. Information on all pertinent award requirements also must be provided to any subrecipient of the award.

Should you accept the award and then fail to comply with an award requirement, DOJ will pursue appropriate remedies for non-compliance, which may include termination of the award and/or a requirement to repay award funds.

Prior to accepting the award, your Entity Administrator must assign a Financial Manager, Grant Award Administrator, and Authorized Representative(s) in the Justice Grants System (JustGrants). The Entity Administrator will need to ensure the assigned Authorized Representative(s) is current and has the legal authority to accept awards and bind the entity to the award terms and conditions. To accept the award, the Authorized Representative(s) must accept all parts of the Award Offer in the Justice Grants System (JustGrants), including by executing the required declaration and certification, within 45 days from the award date.

To access your funds, you will need to enroll in the Automated Standard Application for Payments (ASAP) system, if you haven't already completed the enrollment process in ASAP. The Entity Administrator should have already received an email from ASAP to initiate this process.

Congratulations, and we look forward to working with you.

Maureen A. Henneberg
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

Office for Civil Rights Notice for All Recipients

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) enforces federal civil rights laws and other provisions that prohibit discrimination by recipients of federal financial assistance from OJP, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), and the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW).

Several civil rights laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, require recipients of federal financial assistance (recipients) to give assurances that they will comply with those laws. Taken together, these and other civil rights laws prohibit recipients from discriminating in the provision of services and employment because of race, color, national origin, religion, disability, and sex or from discriminating in the provision of services on the bases of age.

Some recipients of DOJ financial assistance have additional obligations to comply with other applicable nondiscrimination provisions like the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of religion in addition to race, color, national origin, and sex. Recipients may also have related requirements regarding the development and implementation of equal employment opportunity programs.

OCR provides technical assistance, training, and other resources to help recipients comply with civil rights obligations. Further, OCR administratively enforces civil rights laws and nondiscrimination provisions by investigating DOJ recipients that are the subject of discrimination complaints. In addition, OCR conducts compliance reviews of DOJ recipients based on regulatory criteria. These investigations and compliance reviews permit OCR to evaluate whether DOJ recipients are providing services to the public and engaging in employment practices in a nondiscriminatory

manner.

For more information about OCR, your civil rights and nondiscrimination responsibilities, how to notify your employees or beneficiaries of their civil rights protections and responsibilities and how to file a complaint, as well as technical assistance, training, and other resources, please visit www.ojp.gov/program/civil-rights-office/outreach. If you would like OCR to assist you in fulfilling your civil rights or nondiscrimination responsibilities, please contact us at askOCR@oip.usdoj.gov or www.ojp.gov/program/civil-rights-office/about#ocr-contacts.

Memorandum Regarding NEPA

NEPA Letter Type

OJP - Ongoing NEPA Compliance Incorporated into Further Developmental Stages

NEPA Letter

All BJA awards are subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other related federal laws (including the National Historic Preservation Act), if applicable. Award recipients (and subrecipients, as applicable) must support BJA's compliance with NEPA by providing details about their project, its location, and any resources that might be affected. BJA complies with NEPA (and other related federal laws) for an award-funded activity by evaluating the environmental impacts of the activity in one of three levels of analysis: a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX), an Environmental Assessment (EA), or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). See

<https://bjaojp.gov/funding/nepa-guidance> for additional information regarding NEPA implementation.

Carefully review the conditions on this award for information about any requirements specific to NEPA compliance for this award.

After completion of any required environmental analysis, throughout the term of this award the recipient must inform BJA of (1) any change(s) that it is considering making to the previously assessed activity that may be relevant to environmental impact; or (2) any proposed new activities or changed circumstances that may require assessment as to environmental impact, such as new activities that involve the use of chemicals or involve construction or major renovation. The recipient may not implement a proposed change or new activity until BJA, with the assistance of the recipient, has determined whether the proposed change or new activity (or changed circumstances) will require additional review under NEPA. Approval for implementation will not be unreasonably withheld as long as any requested modification(s) is consistent with eligible program purposes and found acceptable under an approved environmental impact review process.

Questions about NEPA compliance may be directed to your grant manager.

NEPA Coordinator

First Name	Middle Name	Last Name
Chris	no value	Casto

Award Information

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

Recipient Information

Recipient Name

UEI FJLSQMAMNKC4	
Street 1 8000 S REDWOOD RD	Street 2
City WEST JORDAN	State/U.S. Territory Utah
Zip/Postal Code 84088	Country United States
County/Parish	Province
Award Details	
Federal Award Date 7/31/26	Award Type Initial
Award Number 15PBJA-25-GG-03260-JAGX	Supplement Number 00
Federal Award Amount \$51,578.00	Funding Instrument Type Grant
Assistance Listing Number 16.738	Assistance Listings Program Title Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program
Statutory Authority Pub. L. No. 90-351, Title I, Part E, subpart 1 (codified at 34 U.S.C. 10151-10158); see also 28 U.S.C. 530C(a)	
[] I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.	
Project Information	
This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.	
Solicitation Title 2025 BJA FY25 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program – Local Formula	Awarding Agency OJP
Application Number GRANT14618763	Program Office BJA

Grant Manager Name

Michael Austin

Phone Number

202-598-5292

E-mail Address

Michael.Austin3@usdoj.gov

Project Title

Urban SDK geospatial AI platform for traffic calming and accident reduction implementation.

Performance Period Start**Date**

10/01/2024

Performance Period End Date

09/30/2028

Budget Period Start Date

10/01/2024

Budget Period End Date

09/30/2028

Project Description

The City of West Jordan faces persistent community concerns regarding speeding and unsafe road conditions.

The City of West Jordan proposes adopting Urban SDK, a cloud-based traffic intelligence platform.

Expected outcomes include a reduction in serious injury and fatal crashes on treated corridors, safety improvements, and enhanced data-driven decision-making.

Beyond enforcement, the platform's cross-department utility supports collaboration among Police, Public Works, and Planning departments.

Urban SDK offers West Jordan Police Department a scalable, cost-effective solution to enhance road safety and reduce traffic incidents.

☐ I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.

Financial Information

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

☐ I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.

Award Conditions

This award is offered subject to the conditions or limitations set forth in the Award Information, Project Information, Financial Information, and Award Conditions.

Condition 1

Compliance with general appropriations-law restrictions on the use of federal funds (FY 2025)

The recipient, and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier, must comply with all applicable restrictions on the use of federal funds set out in federal appropriations statutes. Pertinent restrictions that may be set out in applicable appropriations acts are indicated at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/FY25AppropriationsRestrictions.htm>, and are incorporated by reference here.

Should a question arise as to whether a particular use of federal funds by a recipient (or a subrecipient) would or might fall within the scope of an appropriations-law restriction, the recipient is to contact OJP for guidance, and may not proceed without the express prior written approval of OJP.

Condition 2

Compliance with DOJ regulations pertaining to civil rights and nondiscrimination - 28 C.F.R. Part 38

The recipient, and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier, must comply with all applicable requirements of 28 C.F.R. Part 38.

Among other things, 28 C.F.R. Part 38 states that recipients may not use direct Federal financial assistance from the Department of Justice to support or engage in any explicitly religious activities except when consistent with the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and any other applicable requirements. An organization receiving Federal financial assistance also may not, in providing services funded by the Department of Justice or in outreach activities related to such services, discriminate against a program beneficiary or prospective program beneficiary on the basis of religion, a religious belief, a refusal to hold a religious belief, or refusal to attend or participate in a religious practice. Part 38 also sets out rules and requirements that pertain to recipient and subrecipient ("subgrantee") organizations that engage in or conduct explicitly religious activities, as well as rules and requirements that pertain to recipients and subrecipients that are faith-based or religious organizations. In addition, Part 38 states that a faith-based organization that participates in a Department of Justice funded program retains its independence from the Government and may continue to carry out its mission consistent with religious freedom and conscience protections in Federal law.

Recipients and subrecipients that provide social services under this award must give written notice to beneficiaries and prospective beneficiaries prior to the provision of services (if practicable) which shall include language substantially similar to the language in 28 CFR Part 38, Appendix C, sections (1) through (4). A sample written notice may be found at <https://www.ojp.gov/program/civil-rights-office/partnerships-faith-based-and-other-neighborhood-organizations>.

In certain instances, a faith-based or religious organization may be able to take religion into account when making hiring decisions, provided it satisfies certain requirements. For more information, see "Nondiscrimination provisions and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act," accessible at <https://www.ojp.gov/funding/explore/legaloverview2025/civilrightsrequirements>.

Condition 3

Requirements pertaining to prohibited conduct related to trafficking in persons (including reporting requirements and OJP authority to terminate award)

The recipient, and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier, must comply with all applicable requirements (including requirements to report allegations) pertaining to prohibited conduct related to the trafficking of persons, whether on the part of recipients, subrecipients ("subgrantees"), or individuals defined (for purposes of this condition) as "employees" of the recipient or of any subrecipient.

The details of the recipient's obligations related to prohibited conduct related to trafficking in persons are posted on the OJP web site at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/ProhibitedConduct-Trafficking.htm> (Award condition: Prohibited conduct by recipients and subrecipients related to trafficking in persons (including reporting requirements and OJP authority to terminate award)), and are incorporated by reference here.

Condition 4

All subawards ("subgrants") must have specific federal authorization

The recipient, and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier, must comply with all applicable requirements for authorization of any subaward. This condition applies to agreements that -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- OJP considers a "subaward" (and therefore does not consider a procurement "contract").

The details of the requirement for authorization of any subaward are posted on the OJP website at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SubawardAuthorization.htm> (Award condition: All subawards ("subgrants") must have specific federal authorization), and are incorporated by reference here.

Condition 5

Specific post-award approval required to use a noncompetitive approach in any procurement contract that would exceed the Simplified Acquisition Threshold

The recipient, and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier, must comply with all applicable requirements to obtain specific advance approval to use a noncompetitive approach in any procurement contract that would exceed the Simplified Acquisition Threshold, as set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR). See the definition of simplified acquisition threshold in the FAR at 48 CFR part 2, subpart 2.1. This condition applies to agreements that -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- OJP considers a procurement "contract" (and therefore does not consider a subaward).

The details of the requirement for advance approval to use a noncompetitive approach in a procurement contract under an OJP award are posted on the OJP website at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/NoncompetitiveProcurement.htm> (Award condition: Specific post-award approval required to use a noncompetitive approach in a procurement contract (if contract would exceed Simplified Acquisition Threshold)), and are incorporated by reference here.

Condition 6

Federal Civil Rights and Nondiscrimination Laws (certification)

The recipient agrees that its compliance with all applicable Federal civil rights and nondiscrimination laws is material to the government's decision to make this award and any payment thereunder, including for purposes of the False Claims Act (31 U.S.C. 3729-3730 and 3801-3812), and, by accepting this award, certifies that it does not operate any programs (including any such programs having components relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion) that violate any applicable Federal civil rights or nondiscrimination laws.

Condition 7

Requirements of the award; remedies for non-compliance or for materially false statements

The conditions of this award are material requirements of the award. Compliance with any assurances or certifications submitted by or on behalf of the recipient that relate to conduct during the period of performance also is a material requirement of this award.

Limited Exceptions. In certain special circumstances, the U.S. Department of Justice ("DOJ") may determine that a legal notice regarding award requirements is necessary or that it will not enforce, or enforce only in part, one or more requirements otherwise applicable to the award. Any such notice or exception regarding enforcement, including any such notice or exception made during the period of performance, is (or will be during the period of performance) set out through the Office of Justice Programs ("OJP") webpage entitled "Legal Notices: Special circumstances as to particular award conditions" (ojp.gov/funding/Explore/LegalNotices-AwardReqs.htm), and incorporated by reference into the award.

By signing and accepting this award on behalf of the recipient, the authorized recipient official accepts all material requirements of the award, and specifically adopts, as if personally executed by the authorized recipient official, all assurances or certifications submitted by or on behalf of the recipient that relate to conduct during the period of performance.

Failure to comply with one or more award requirements -- whether a condition set out in full below, a condition incorporated by reference below, or an assurance or certification related to conduct during the award period -- may result in OJP taking appropriate action with respect to the recipient and the award. Among other things, the OJP may withhold award funds, disallow costs, or suspend or terminate the award. DOJ, including OJP, also may take other legal action as appropriate.

Any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement to the federal government related to this award (or concealment or omission of a material fact) may be the subject of criminal prosecution (including under 18 U.S.C. 1001 and/or 1621, and/or 34 U.S.C. 10271-10273), and also may lead to imposition of civil penalties and administrative remedies for false claims or otherwise (including under 31 U.S.C. 3729-3730 and 3801-3812).

Should any provision of a requirement of this award be held to be invalid or unenforceable by its terms, that provision shall first be applied with a limited construction so as to give it the maximum effect permitted by law. Should it be held, instead, that the provision is utterly invalid or -unenforceable, such provision shall be deemed severable from this award.

Condition 8

Effect of failure to address audit issues

The recipient understands and agrees that the DOJ awarding agency (OJP or OVW, as appropriate) may withhold award funds, or may impose other related requirements, if (as determined by the DOJ awarding agency) the recipient does not satisfactorily and promptly address outstanding issues from audits required by the Part 200 Uniform Requirements (or by the terms of this award), or other outstanding issues that arise in connection with audits, investigations, or reviews of DOJ awards.

Condition 9

Applicability of Part 200 Uniform Requirements

The Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements in 2 C.F.R. Part 200, as adopted and supplemented by DOJ in 2 C.F.R. Part 2800 (together, the "Part 200 Uniform Requirements"), including, without limitation, the provisions regarding termination in 2 C.F.R. 200.340, apply to this award from OJP.

For more information and resources on the Part 200 Uniform Requirements as they relate to OJP awards and subawards ("subgrants"), see the OJP website at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Part200UniformRequirements.htm>.

Record retention and access: Records pertinent to the award that the recipient (and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier) must retain -- typically for a period of 3 years from the date of submission of the final expenditure report (SF 425), unless a different retention period applies -- and to which the recipient (and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier) must provide access, include performance measurement information, in addition to the financial records, supporting documents, statistical records, and other pertinent records indicated at 2 C.F.R. 200.334.

In the event that an award-related question arises from documents or other materials prepared or distributed by OJP that may appear to conflict with, or differ in some way from, the provisions of the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, the recipient is to contact OJP promptly for clarification.

Condition 10

Reporting potential fraud, waste, and abuse, and similar misconduct

The recipient, and any subrecipients ("subgrantees") at any tier, must promptly refer to the DOJ Office of the Inspector General (OIG) any credible evidence that a principal, employee, agent, subrecipient, contractor, subcontractor, or other person has, in connection with funds under this award-- (1) submitted a claim that violates the False Claims Act; or (2) committed a criminal or civil violation of laws pertaining to fraud, conflict of interest, bribery, gratuity, or similar misconduct.

Potential fraud, waste, abuse, or misconduct involving or relating to funds under this award should be reported to the OIG by--(1) online submission accessible via the OIG webpage at <https://oig.justice.gov/hotline/contact-grants.htm> (select "Submit Report Online"); (2) mail directed to: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, Investigations Division, ATTN: Fraud Detection Office, 950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20530; and/or (3) by facsimile directed to the DOJ OIG Investigations Division (Attn: Grantee Reporting) at (202) 616-9881 (fax).

Additional information is available from the DOJ OIG website at <https://oig.justice.gov/hotline>.

Condition 11

Requirements related to "de minimis" indirect cost rate

A recipient that is eligible under the Part 200 Uniform Requirements and other applicable law to use the "de minimis" indirect cost rate described in 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f), and that elects to use the "de minimis" indirect cost rate, must advise OJP in writing of both its eligibility and its election, and must comply with all associated requirements in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements. The "de minimis" rate may be applied only to modified total direct costs (MTDC) as defined by the Part 200 Uniform Requirements.

Condition 12

Compliance with applicable rules regarding approval, planning, and reporting of conferences, meetings, trainings, and

other events

The recipient, and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier, must comply with all applicable laws, regulations, policies, and official DOJ guidance (including specific cost limits, prior approval and reporting requirements, where applicable) governing the use of federal funds for expenses related to conferences (as that term is defined by DOJ), including the provision of food and/or beverages at such conferences, and costs of attendance at such conferences.

Information on the pertinent DOJ definition of conferences and the rules applicable to this award appears in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide (currently, as section 3.10 of "Postaward Requirements" in the "DOJ Grants Financial Guide").

Condition 13

Requirement for data on performance and effectiveness under the award

The recipient must collect and maintain data that measure the performance and effectiveness of work under this award. The data must be provided to OJP in the manner (including within the timeframes) specified by OJP in the program solicitation or other applicable written guidance. Data collection supports compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, and other applicable laws.

Condition 14

Compliance with DOJ Grants Financial Guide

References to the DOJ Grants Financial Guide are to the DOJ Grants Financial Guide as posted on the OJP website (currently, the "DOJ Grants Financial Guide" available at <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm>), including any updated version that may be posted during the period of performance. The recipient agrees to comply with the DOJ Grants Financial Guide.

Condition 15

Compliance with DOJ regulations pertaining to civil rights and nondiscrimination - 28 C.F.R. Part 42

The recipient, and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier, must comply with all applicable requirements of 28 C.F.R. Part 42, specifically including 28 C.F.R. § 42.106(d), 28 C.F.R. § 42.405(c), and 28 C.F.R. § 42.505(f), which contain notice requirements that covered recipients must follow regarding the dissemination of information regarding federal nondiscrimination requirements.

Condition 16

Determination of suitability to interact with participating minors

SCOPE. This condition applies to this award if it is indicated -- in the application for the award (as approved by DOJ)(or in the application for any subaward, at any tier), the DOJ funding announcement (solicitation), or an associated federal statute -- that a purpose of some or all of the activities to be carried out under the award (whether by the recipient, or a subrecipient at any tier) is to benefit a set of individuals under 18 years of age.

The recipient, and any subrecipient at any tier, must make determinations of suitability before certain individuals may interact with participating minors. This requirement applies regardless of an individual's employment status.

The details of this requirement are posted on the OJP web site at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/Interact-Minors.htm> (Award condition: Determination of suitability required, in advance, for certain individuals who may interact with participating minors), and are incorporated by reference here.

Condition 17

Requirement to disclose whether recipient is designated "high risk" by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ

If the recipient is designated "high risk" by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ, currently or at any time during the course of the period of performance under this award, the recipient must disclose that fact and certain related information to OJP by email at OJP.ComplianceReporting@ojp.usdoj.gov. For purposes of this disclosure, high risk includes any status under which a federal awarding agency provides additional oversight due to the recipient's past performance, or other programmatic or financial concerns with the recipient. The recipient's disclosure must include the

following: 1. The federal awarding agency that currently designates the recipient high risk, 2. The date the recipient was designated high risk, 3. The high-risk point of contact at that federal awarding agency (name, phone number, and email address), and 4. The reasons for the high-risk status, as set out by the federal awarding agency.

Condition 18

Employment eligibility verification for hiring under the award

1. The recipient (and any subrecipient at any tier) must--

A. Ensure that, as part of the hiring process for any position within the United States that is or will be funded (in whole or in part) with award funds, the recipient (or any subrecipient) properly verifies the employment eligibility of the individual who is being hired, consistent with the provisions of 8 U.S.C. 1324a(a)(1).

B. Notify all persons associated with the recipient (or any subrecipient) who are or will be involved in activities under this award of both--

(1) this award requirement for verification of employment eligibility, and

(2) the associated provisions in 8 U.S.C. 1324a(a)(1) that, generally speaking, make it unlawful, in the United States, to hire (or recruit for employment) certain aliens.

C. Provide training (to the extent necessary) to those persons required by this condition to be notified of the award requirement for employment eligibility verification and of the associated provisions of 8 U.S.C. 1324a(a)(1).

D. As part of the recordkeeping for the award (including pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements), maintain records of all employment eligibility verifications pertinent to compliance with this award condition in accordance with Form I-9 record retention requirements, as well as records of all pertinent notifications and trainings.

2. Monitoring

The recipient's monitoring responsibilities include monitoring of subrecipient compliance with this condition.

3. Allowable costs

To the extent that such costs are not reimbursed under any other federal program, award funds may be obligated for the reasonable, necessary, and allocable costs (if any) of actions designed to ensure compliance with this condition.

4. Rules of construction

A. Staff involved in the hiring process

For purposes of this condition, persons "who are or will be involved in activities under this award" specifically includes (without limitation) any and all recipient (or any subrecipient) officials or other staff who are or will be involved in the hiring process with respect to a position that is or will be funded (in whole or in part) with award funds.

B. Employment eligibility confirmation with E-Verify

For purposes of satisfying the requirement of this condition regarding verification of employment eligibility, the recipient (or any subrecipient) may choose to participate in, and use, E-Verify (www.e-verify.gov), provided an appropriate person authorized to act on behalf of the recipient (or subrecipient) uses E-Verify (and follows the proper E-Verify procedures, including in the event of a "Tentative Nonconfirmation" or a "Final Nonconfirmation") to confirm employment eligibility for each hiring for a position in the United States that is or will be funded (in whole or in part) with award funds.

C. "United States" specifically includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

D. Nothing in this condition shall be understood to authorize or require any recipient, any subrecipient at any tier, or any person or other entity, to violate any federal law, including any applicable civil rights or nondiscrimination law.

E. Nothing in this condition, including in paragraph 4.B., shall be understood to relieve any recipient, any subrecipient at any tier, or any person or other entity, of any obligation otherwise imposed by law, including 8 U.S.C. 1324a(a)(1).

Questions about E-Verify should be directed to DHS. For more information about E-Verify visit the E-Verify website (<https://www.e-verify.gov/>) or email E-Verify at E-Verify@dhs.gov. E-Verify employer agents can email E-Verify at E-VerifyEmployerAgent@dhs.gov.

Questions about the meaning or scope of this condition should be directed to OJP, before award acceptance.

Condition 19

Encouragement of policies to ban text messaging while driving

Pursuant to Executive Order 13513, "Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging While Driving," 74 Fed. Reg. 51225 (October 1, 2009), DOJ encourages recipients and subrecipients ("subgrantees") to adopt and enforce policies banning employees from text messaging while driving any vehicle during the course of performing work funded by this award, and to establish workplace safety policies and conduct education, awareness, and other outreach to decrease crashes caused by distracted drivers.

Condition 20

Reclassification of various statutory provisions to a new Title 34 of the United States Code

On September 1, 2017, various statutory provisions previously codified elsewhere in the U.S. Code were editorially reclassified (that is, moved and renumbered) to a new Title 34, entitled "Crime Control and Law Enforcement." The reclassification encompassed a number of statutory provisions pertinent to OJP awards (that is, OJP grants and cooperative agreements), including many provisions previously codified in Title 42 of the U.S. Code.

Effective as of September 1, 2017, any reference in this award document to a statutory provision that has been reclassified to the new Title 34 of the U.S. Code is to be read as a reference to that statutory provision as reclassified to Title 34. This rule of construction specifically includes references set out in award conditions, references set out in material incorporated by reference through award conditions, and references set out in other award requirements.

Condition 21

Restrictions and certifications regarding non-disclosure agreements and related matters

No recipient or subrecipient ("subgrantee") under this award, or entity that receives a procurement contract or subcontract with any funds under this award, may require any employee or contractor to sign an internal confidentiality agreement or statement that prohibits or otherwise restricts, or purports to prohibit or restrict, the reporting (in accordance with law) of waste, fraud, or abuse to an investigative or law enforcement representative of a federal department or agency authorized to receive such information.

The foregoing is not intended, and shall not be understood by the agency making this award, to contravene requirements applicable to Standard Form 312 (which relates to classified information), Form 4414 (which relates to sensitive compartmented information), or any other form issued by a federal department or agency governing the nondisclosure of classified information.

1. In accepting this award, the recipient--

a. represents that it neither requires nor has required internal confidentiality agreements or statements from employees or contractors that currently prohibit or otherwise currently restrict (or purport to prohibit or restrict) employees or contractors from reporting waste, fraud, or abuse as described above; and

b. certifies that, if it learns or is notified that it is or has been requiring its employees or contractors to execute agreements or statements that prohibit or otherwise restrict (or purport to prohibit or restrict), reporting of waste, fraud, or abuse as described above, it will immediately stop any further obligations of award funds, will provide prompt written notification to the federal agency making this award, and will resume (or permit resumption of) such obligations only if expressly authorized to do so by that agency.

2. If the recipient does or is authorized under this award to make subawards ("subgrants"), procurement contracts, or both--

a. it represents that--

(1) it has determined that no other entity that the recipient's application proposes may or will receive award funds (whether through a subaward ("subgrant"), procurement contract, or subcontract under a procurement contract) either requires or has required internal confidentiality agreements or statements from employees or contractors that currently prohibit or otherwise currently restrict (or purport to prohibit or restrict) employees or contractors from reporting waste, fraud, or abuse as described above; and

(2) it has made appropriate inquiry, or otherwise has an adequate factual basis, to support this representation; and

b. it certifies that, if it learns or is notified that any subrecipient, contractor, or subcontractor entity that receives funds under this award is or has been requiring its employees or contractors to execute agreements or statements that prohibit or otherwise restrict (or purport to prohibit or restrict), reporting of waste, fraud, or abuse as described above, it will immediately stop any further obligations of award funds to or by that entity, will provide prompt written notification to the federal agency making this award, and will resume (or permit resumption of) such obligations only if expressly authorized to do so by that agency.

Condition 22

OJP Training Guiding Principles

Any training or training materials that the recipient -- or any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier -- develops or delivers with OJP award funds must adhere to the OJP Training Guiding Principles for Grantees and Subgrantees, available at <https://www.ojp.gov/funding/implement/training-guiding-principles-grantees-and-subgrantees>.

Condition 23

Requirement to report potentially duplicative funding

If the recipient currently has other active awards of federal funds, or if the recipient receives any other award of federal funds during the period of performance for this award, the recipient promptly must determine whether funds from any of those other federal awards have been, are being, or are to be used (in whole or in part) for one or more of the identical cost items for which funds are provided under this award. If so, the recipient must promptly notify the DOJ awarding agency (OJP or OVW, as appropriate) in writing of the potential duplication, and, if so requested by the DOJ awarding agency, must seek a budget-modification or change-of-project-scope Grant Award Modification (GAM) to eliminate any inappropriate duplication of funding.

Condition 24

Required training for Grant Award Administrator and Financial Manager

The Grant Award Administrator and all Financial Managers for this award must have successfully completed an "OJP financial management and grant administration training" by 120 days after the date of the recipient's acceptance of the award. Successful completion of such a training on or after January 1, 2022, will satisfy this condition.

In the event that either the Grant Award Administrator or a Financial Manager for this award changes during the period of performance, the new Grant Award Administrator or Financial Manager must have successfully completed an "OJP financial management and grant administration training" by 120 calendar days after the date the Entity Administrator enters updated Grant Award Administrator or Financial Manager information in JustGrants. Successful completion of such a training on or after January 1, 2022, will satisfy this condition.

A list of OJP trainings that OJP will consider "OJP financial management and grant administration training" for purposes of this condition is available at <https://onlinegfmt.training.ojp.gov/>. All trainings that satisfy this condition include a session on grant fraud prevention and detection.

The recipient should anticipate that OJP will immediately withhold ("freeze") award funds if the recipient fails to comply with this condition. The recipient's failure to comply also may lead OJP to impose additional appropriate conditions on this award.

Condition 25

Compliance with 41 U.S.C. 4712 (including prohibitions on reprisal; notice to employees)

The recipient (and any subrecipient at any tier) must comply with, and is subject to, all applicable provisions of 41 U.S.C. 4712, including all applicable provisions that prohibit, under specified circumstances, discrimination against an employee as reprisal for the employee's disclosure of information related to gross mismanagement of a federal grant, a gross waste of federal funds, an abuse of authority relating to a federal grant, a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety, or a violation of law, rule, or regulation related to a federal grant.

The recipient also must inform its employees, in writing (and in the predominant native language of the workforce), of employee rights and remedies under 41 U.S.C. 4712.

Should a question arise as to the applicability of the provisions of 41 U.S.C. 4712 to this award, the recipient is to contact the DOJ awarding agency (OJP or OVW, as appropriate) for guidance.

Condition 26

Potential imposition of additional requirements

The recipient agrees to comply with any additional requirements that may be imposed by the DOJ awarding agency (OJP or OVW, as appropriate) during the period of performance for this award, if the recipient is designated as "high-risk" for purposes of the DOJ high-risk grantee list.

Condition 27

Requirement to report actual or imminent breach of personally identifiable information (PII)

The recipient (and any "subrecipient" at any tier) must have written procedures in place to respond in the event of an actual or imminent "breach" (OMB M-17-12) if it (or a subrecipient) -- (1) creates, collects, uses, processes, stores, maintains, disseminates, discloses, or disposes of "Personally Identifiable Information (PII)" (2 CFR 200.1) within the scope of an OJP grant-funded program or activity, or (2) uses or operates a "Federal information system" (OMB Circular A-130). The recipient's breach procedures must include a requirement to report actual or imminent breach of PII to an OJP Program Manager no later than 24 hours after an occurrence of an actual breach, or the detection of an imminent breach.

Condition 28

Requirements related to System for Award Management and Universal Identifier Requirements

The recipient must comply with applicable requirements regarding the System for Award Management (SAM), currently accessible at <https://www.sam.gov/>. This includes applicable requirements regarding registration with SAM, as well as maintaining the currency of information in SAM.

The recipient also must comply with applicable restrictions on subawards ("subgrants") to first-tier subrecipients (first-tier "subgrantees"), including restrictions on subawards to entities that do not acquire and provide (to the recipient) the unique entity identifier required for SAM registration.

The details of the recipient's obligations related to SAM and to unique entity identifiers are posted on the OJP web site at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SAM.htm> (Award condition: System for Award Management (SAM) and Universal Identifier Requirements), and are incorporated by reference here.

This condition does not apply to an award to an individual who received the award as a natural person (i.e., unrelated to any business or non-profit organization that he or she may own or operate in his or her name).

Condition 29

Restrictions on "lobbying"

In general, as a matter of federal law, federal funds awarded by OJP may not be used by the recipient, or any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier, either directly or indirectly, to support or oppose the enactment, repeal,

modification, or adoption of any law, regulation, or policy, at any level of government. See 18 U.S.C. 1913. (There may be exceptions if an applicable federal statute specifically authorizes certain activities that otherwise would be barred by law.)

Another federal law generally prohibits federal funds awarded by OJP from being used by the recipient, or any subrecipient at any tier, to pay any person to influence (or attempt to influence) a federal agency, a Member of Congress, or Congress (or an official or employee of any of them) with respect to the awarding of a federal grant or cooperative agreement, subgrant, contract, subcontract, or loan, or with respect to actions such as renewing, extending, or modifying any such award. See 31 U.S.C. 1352. Certain exceptions to this law apply, including an exception that applies to Indian tribes and tribal organizations.

Should any question arise as to whether a particular use of federal funds by a recipient (or subrecipient) would or might fall within the scope of these prohibitions, the recipient is to contact OJP for guidance, and may not proceed without the express prior written approval of OJP.

Condition 30

Compliance with DOJ regulations pertaining to civil rights and nondiscrimination - 28 C.F.R. Part 54

The recipient, and any subrecipient ("subgrantee") at any tier, must comply with all applicable requirements of 28 C.F.R. Part 54, which relates to nondiscrimination on the basis of sex in certain "education programs."

Among other items, 28 C.F.R. § 54.140 contains notice requirements that covered recipients must follow regarding the dissemination of information regarding federal nondiscrimination requirements.

Condition 31

The recipient understands that, in accepting this award, the Authorized Representative declares and certifies, among other things, that he or she possesses the requisite legal authority to accept the award on behalf of the recipient entity and, in so doing, accepts (or adopts) all material requirements that relate to conduct throughout the period of performance under this award. The recipient further understands, and agrees, that it will not assign anyone to the role of Authorized Representative during the period of performance under the award without first ensuring that the individual has the requisite legal authority.

Condition 32

Verification and updating of recipient contact information

The recipient must verify its Grant Award Administrator, Financial Manager, and Authorized Representative contact information in JustGrants, including telephone number and e-mail address. If any information is incorrect or has changed, the award recipient's Entity Administrator must make changes to contact information through DIAMD. Instructions on how to update contact information in JustGrants can be found at <https://justicegrants.usdoj.gov/training/training-entity-management>.

Condition 33

FFATA reporting: Subawards and executive compensation

The recipient must comply with applicable requirements to report first-tier subawards ("subgrants") of \$30,000 or more and, in certain circumstances, to report the names and total compensation of the five most highly compensated executives of the recipient and first-tier subrecipients (first-tier "subgrantees") of award funds. The details of recipient obligations, which derive from the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA), are set forth in 2 C.F.R. part 170, Appendix A ("Award Term") and are incorporated by reference here.

This condition, including its reporting requirement, does not apply to-- (1) an award of less than \$30,000, or (2) an award made to an individual who received the award as a natural person (i.e., unrelated to any business or non-profit organization that he or she may own or operate in his or her name).

Note: In early March 2025, the reporting system that had been used for subaward reporting, the FFATA (Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act) Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) was retired and functionality moved to SAM.gov. For more information, including steps on how to connect your FSRS account to SAM.gov, visit <https://sam.gov/fsrs>.

Condition 34

The recipient agrees to comply with OJP grant monitoring guidelines, protocols, and procedures, and to cooperate with BJA and OCFO on all grant monitoring requests, including requests related to desk reviews, enhanced programmatic desk reviews, and/or site visits. The recipient agrees to provide to BJA and OCFO all documentation necessary to complete monitoring tasks, including documentation related to any subawards made under this award. Further, the recipient agrees to abide by reasonable deadlines set by BJA and OCFO for providing the requested documents. Failure to cooperate with BJA's/OCFO's grant monitoring activities may result in sanctions affecting the recipient's DOJ awards, including, but not limited to: withholdings and/or other restrictions on the recipient's access to grant funds; referral to the Office of the Inspector General for audit review; designation of the recipient as a DOJ High Risk grantee; or termination of an award(s).

Condition 35

Any publication (e.g., curricula, training materials, publications, reports, videos, or any other written, web-based, or audio-visual, or other materials) funded in whole or in part under this award, (with the exception of press releases, websites, and mobile applications), shall contain the following statement: "This project was supported by Grant No. <Award_Number> awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice."

Any website or mobile application that is funded in whole or in part under this award must include the following statement where most practicable: "This website [or application] was supported by Grant No. <Award_Number> awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Neither the U.S. Department of Justice nor any of its components operate, control, are responsible for, or necessarily endorse, this website [or application] (including, without limitation, its content, technical infrastructure, and policies, and any services or tools provided)." The full text of the foregoing statement must be clearly visible. The statement may also be included through a link, entitled "Notice of Federal Funding and Federal Disclaimer," to the full text of the statement.

Upon specific request by BJA, the recipient must submit to BJA for review and approval (or, for recipients or subrecipients that are institutions of higher education, review and comment) any publication or product developed under this award at least 30 working days prior to the targeted dissemination date.

The current edition of the DOJ Grants Financial Guide provides additional guidance on allowable printing and publication activities.

Condition 36

Confidentiality of data

The recipient (and any subrecipient at any tier) must comply with all confidentiality requirements of 34 U.S.C. 10231 and 28 C.F.R. Part 22 that are applicable to collection, use, and revelation of data or information. The recipient further agrees, as a condition of award approval, to submit a Privacy Certificate that is in accord with requirements of 28 C.F.R. Part 22 and, in particular, 28 C.F.R. 22.23 for any applicable project.

Condition 37

The recipient agrees to cooperate with any assessments, national evaluation efforts, or information or data collection requests, including, but not limited to, the provision of any information required for the assessment or evaluation of any activities within this project.

Condition 38

Protection of human research subjects

The recipient (and any subrecipient at any tier) must comply with the requirements of 28 C.F.R. Part 46 and all OJP policies and procedures regarding the protection of human research subjects, including obtainment of Institutional Review Board approval, if appropriate, and subject informed consent.

Condition 39

Compliance with 28 C.F.R. Part 23

With respect to any information technology system funded or supported by funds under this award, the recipient (and

any subrecipient at any tier) must comply with 28 C.F.R. Part 23, Criminal Intelligence Systems Operating Policies, if OJP determines this regulation to be applicable. Should OJP determine 28 C.F.R. Part 23 to be applicable, OJP may, at its discretion, perform audits of the system, as per the regulation. Should any violation of 28 C.F.R. Part 23 occur, the recipient may be fined as per 34 U.S.C. 10231(c)-(d). The recipient may not satisfy such a fine with federal funds.

Condition 40

Justice Information Sharing

Information sharing projects funded under this award must comply with DOJ's Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) guidelines. The recipient (and any subrecipient at any tier) must conform to the Global Standards Package (GSP) and all constituent elements, where applicable, as described at: <https://bja.ojp.gov/program/it/gsp-grant-condition>. The recipient (and any subrecipient at any tier) must document planned approaches to information sharing and describe compliance with the GSP and appropriate privacy policy that protects shared information, or provide detailed justification for why an alternative approach is recommended.

Condition 41

Avoidance of duplication of networks

To avoid duplicating existing networks or IT systems in any initiatives funded by BJA for law enforcement information sharing systems that involve interstate connectivity between jurisdictions, such systems shall employ, to the extent possible, existing networks as the communication backbone to achieve interstate connectivity, unless the recipient can demonstrate to the satisfaction of BJA that this requirement would not be cost effective or would impair the functionality of an existing or proposed IT system.

Condition 42

Law enforcement task forces - required training

Within 120 days of award acceptance, each current member of a law enforcement task force funded with award funds who is a task force commander, agency executive, task force officer, or other task force member of equivalent rank, must complete required online task force training. Additionally, all future task force members must complete this training once during the period of performance for this award, or once every four years if multiple OJP awards include this requirement.

The required training is available free of charge online through the BJA-funded Center for Task Force Integrity and Leadership (www.ctfli.org). The training addresses task force effectiveness, as well as other key issues including privacy and civil liberties/rights, task force performance measurement, personnel selection, and task force oversight and accountability. If award funds are used to support a task force, the recipient must compile and maintain a task force personnel roster, along with course completion certificates.

Additional information regarding the training is available through BJA's web site and the Center for Task Force Integrity and Leadership (www.ctfli.org).

Condition 43

Compliance with National Environmental Policy Act and related statutes

Upon request, the recipient (and any subrecipient at any tier) must assist BJA in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the National Historic Preservation Act, and other related federal environmental requirements in the use of these award funds, either directly by the recipient or by a subrecipient. Accordingly, the recipient agrees to determine if any of the following activities will be funded by the grant prior to obligating funds for any of these purposes. If it is determined that any of the following activities will be funded by the award, the recipient agrees to contact BJA, and follow instructions regarding NEPA compliance.

The activities covered by this condition are:

- a. New construction;
- b. Minor renovation or remodeling of a property located in an environmentally or historically sensitive area, including properties located within a 100-year flood plain, a wetland, or habitat for endangered species, or a property listed on or

eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

c. A renovation, lease, or any proposed use of a building or facility that will either (a) result in a change in its basic prior use or (b) significantly change its size;

d. Implementation of a new program involving the use of chemicals other than chemicals that are (a) purchased as an incidental component of a funded activity and (b) traditionally used, for example, in office, household, recreational, or education environments;

e. Implementation of a program relating to clandestine methamphetamine laboratory operations, including the identification, seizure, or closure of clandestine methamphetamine laboratories; and

f. Any extraordinary or unusual project with potential to have a significant environmental impact.

The recipient understands and agrees that complying with NEPA may require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment and/or an Environmental Impact Statement, as directed by BJA.

Condition 44

The recipient shall ensure that each DNA analysis conducted under this award will be performed either (1) by accredited government-owned laboratories, or (2) through an accredited fee-for-service vendor. The accreditation must be by an accrediting body that is a signatory to an internationally recognized arrangement and that offers accreditation to forensic science conformity assessment bodies using an accreditation standard that is recognized by that internationally recognized arrangement. Any laboratory conducting STR, Y-STR, or mitochondrial DNA testing undergo external audits not less than once every 2 years that demonstrate compliance with the DNA Quality Assurance Standards established by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

If award funds are used for DNA testing of evidentiary materials, recipients shall ensure that any resulting eligible DNA profiles must be uploaded to the Combined DNA Index System ("CODIS," the DNA database operated by the FBI) by a government DNA laboratory with access to CODIS, and, where applicable, uploaded to the National DNA Index System (NDIS). Award funds may be used for forensic genetic genealogy in accordance with United States Department of Justice Interim Policy Forensic Genealogical DNA Analysis and Searching and program requirements. With the exception of Forensic Genetic Genealogy, no profiles generated under this award may be entered or uploaded into any non-governmental DNA database without prior express written approval from BJA. Award funds may not be used for the purchase of DNA equipment and supplies unless the resulting DNA profiles may be accepted for entry into CODIS. Booking agencies should work with their state CODIS agency to ensure all requirements are met for participation in Rapid DNA (see National Rapid DNA Booking Operational Procedures Manual).

The recipient shall ensure that each DNA analysis conducted and each DNA profile generated under this award, and each stored DNA sample that results from this award, are maintained in accordance with any applicable federal privacy requirements and restrictions on disclosure.

Condition 45

Recipients utilizing award funds for forensic genealogy testing must adhere to the United States Department of Justice Interim Policy Forensic Genealogical DNA Analysis and Searching (<https://www.justice.gov/olp/page/file/1204386/download>), and must collect and report the metrics identified in Section IX of that document to BJA.

Condition 46

Establishment of trust fund

If award funds are being drawn down in advance, the recipient (or a subrecipient, with respect to a subaward) is required to establish a trust fund account. Recipients (and subrecipients) must maintain advance payments of federal awards in interest-bearing accounts, unless regulatory exclusions apply (2 C.F.R. 200.305(b)(11)). The trust fund, including any interest, may not be used to pay debts or expenses incurred by other activities beyond the scope of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program. The recipient also agrees to obligate the award funds in the trust fund (including any interest earned) during the period of performance for the award and expend within 90 days thereafter. Any unobligated or unexpended funds, including interest earned, must be returned to OJP at the time of closeout.

Condition 47

As of the first day of the period of performance for the award, the recipient may choose to incur project costs using non-federal funds, but any such project costs are incurred at the recipient's risk until, at a minimum-- (1) the recipient

makes a valid acceptance of the award, and (2) all applicable withholding conditions are removed by OJP (via an Award Condition Modification (ACM)). (A withholding condition is a condition in the award document that precludes the recipient from expending or drawing down all or a portion of the award funds until the condition is removed.)

Except to the extent (if any) that an award condition expressly precludes reimbursement of project costs incurred "at-risk," if and when the recipient makes a valid acceptance of this award and OJP removes each applicable withholding condition through an Award Condition Modification (ACM), the recipient is authorized to obligate (federal) award funds to reimburse itself for project costs incurred "at-risk" earlier during the period of performance (such as project costs incurred prior to award acceptance or prior to removal of an applicable withholding condition), provided that those project costs otherwise are allowable costs under the award.

Condition 48

Submission of eligible records relevant to the National Instant Background Check System

Consonant with federal statutes that pertain to firearms and background checks -- including 18 U.S.C. 922 and 34 U.S.C. ch. 409 -- if the recipient (or any subrecipient at any tier) uses this award to fund (in whole or in part) a specific project or program (such as a law enforcement, prosecution, or court program) that results in any court dispositions, information, or other records that are "eligible records" (under federal or State law) relevant to the National Instant Background Check System (NICS), or that has as one of its purposes the establishment or improvement of records systems that contain any court dispositions, information, or other records that are "eligible records" (under federal or State law) relevant to the NICS, the recipient (or subrecipient, if applicable) must ensure that all such court dispositions, information, or other records that are "eligible records" (under federal or State law) relevant to the NICS are promptly made available to the NICS or to the "State" repository/database that is electronically available to (and accessed by) the NICS, and -- when appropriate -- promptly must update, correct, modify, or remove such NICS-relevant "eligible records".

In the event of minor and transitory non-compliance, the recipient may submit evidence to demonstrate diligent monitoring of compliance with this condition (including subrecipient compliance). DOJ will give great weight to any such evidence in any express written determination regarding this condition.

Condition 49

Compliance with trauma kit standards

If the recipient uses funds under this award to purchase trauma kits or trauma kit components, the recipient must ensure that the trauma kits purchased meet the performance standards established consistent with 34 U.S.C. § 10202(d), as such standards are in effect at the time of purchase.

Condition 50

Initial period of performance; requests for extension.

The recipient understands that for award amounts of less than \$25,000 under JAG, the initial period of performance of the award will be less than four years. The recipient further understands that any requests for an extension of the period of performance for an award of less than \$25,000 will be approved automatically for up to a total period of performance of four years, pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 10152(f) and in accordance with the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) associated with this award.

Any request for an extension of the period of performance beyond a four-year award period will require approval, and the approval (if any) will be at the discretion of OJP.

Condition 51

Noninterference (with award funds and within the funded "program or activity") with federal law enforcement: No public disclosure of certain law-enforcement-sensitive information

SCOPE. This condition applies throughout the entire award period of performance. Its provisions must be among those included in any subaward (at any tier).

1. No use of funds to interfere: No public disclosure of federal law-enforcement information in order to conceal, harbor, or shield.

Consistent with the purposes and objectives of federal law enforcement statutes and federal criminal law (including 8 U.S.C. 1324 and 18 U.S.C. chs. 1, 49, 227), no State or local government entity, agency, or official (including a

government-contracted correctional facility) may use funds under this award to make any public disclosure of any federal law-enforcement information in a direct or indirect attempt to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection any fugitive from justice under 18 U.S.C. ch. 49, or any alien who has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of 8 U.S.C. ch. 12—without regard to whether such disclosure would constitute (or could form a predicate for) a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1071 or 1072 or of 8 U.S.C. 1324(a).

2. Noninterference: No public disclosure of federal law-enforcement information in order to conceal, harbor, or shield within the funded "program or activity."

With respect to the "program or activity" funded in whole or part under this award (including any such program or activity of any subrecipient at any tier), and consistent with federal law as cited in para. 1 of this condition, no State or local government entity, agency, or official (including a government-contracted correctional facility) within the funded program or activity may make any public disclosure of any federal law-enforcement information in a direct or indirect attempt to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection any fugitive from justice under 18 U.S.C. ch. 49, or any alien who has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of 8 U.S.C. ch. 12—without regard to whether such disclosure would constitute (or could form a predicate for) a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1071 or 1072 or of 8 U.S.C. 1324(a).

3. Monitoring. The recipient's monitoring responsibilities include monitoring of subrecipient compliance with this condition.

4. Allowable costs. To the extent that such costs are not reimbursed under any other federal program, award funds may be obligated for the reasonable, necessary, and allocable costs (if any) of actions (e.g., training) designed to ensure compliance with this condition.

5. Rules of construction.

A. For purposes of this condition—

(1) the term "alien" means what it means under section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (see 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(3));

(2) the term "federal law-enforcement information" means law-enforcement-sensitive information communicated or made available, by the federal government, to a State or local government entity, agency, or official, through any means, including, without limitation—

(a) through any database,

(b) in connection with any law enforcement partnership or task-force,

(c) in connection with any request for law enforcement assistance or -cooperation, or

(d) through any deconfliction (or courtesy) notice of planned, imminent, commencing, continuing, or impending federal law enforcement activity;

(3) the term "law-enforcement-sensitive information" means records or information compiled for any law-enforcement purpose; and

(4) the term "public disclosure" means any communication or release other than one—

(a) within the recipient, or

(b) to any subrecipient (at any tier) that is a government entity.

B. This condition shall be enforceable to the extent that it does not otherwise contravene any express requirement of any federal law, or of any judicial ruling, governing or applicable to the award.

C. The "Rules of Construction" set out in the "Noninterference (with award funds and within the funded "program or activity") with federal law enforcement: information-communication restrictions; ongoing compliance" award condition are incorporated by reference as though set forth here in full.

Condition 52

Noninterference (with award funds and within the funded "program or activity") with federal law enforcement: information-communication restrictions

SCOPE. This condition applies throughout the entire award period of performance. Its provisions must be among those included in any subaward (at any tier).

1. Throughout the entire award period of performance, no State or local government entity, -agency, or -official may use funds under this award (including under any subaward, at any tier) to prohibit or in any way restrict—

(1) any government entity or -official from sending or receiving information regarding citizenship or immigration status to or from DHS; or

(2) a government entity or agency from sending, requesting or receiving, or exchanging information regarding immigration status to, from, or with DHS, or from maintaining such information.

Any prohibition (or restriction) that violates this condition is an "information-communication restriction" under this award.

2. With respect to the "program or activity" funded in whole or part under this award (including any such program or activity of any subrecipient at any tier), throughout the entire award period of performance, no State or local government entity, agency, or official may implement an "information-communication restriction."

3. The recipient's monitoring responsibilities include monitoring of subrecipient compliance with the requirements of

this condition.

4. Allowable costs. Compliance with these requirements is an authorized and priority purpose of this award. To the extent that such costs are not reimbursed under any other federal program, award funds may be obligated for the reasonable, necessary, and allocable costs (if any) that the recipient, or any subrecipient at any tier that is a State or local government incurs to implement this condition.

5. Rules of Construction.

A. For purposes of this condition:

(1) "State" and "local government" include any agency or other entity thereof, but not any public institution of higher education or Indian tribe.

(2) "Program or activity" means what it means under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (see 42 U.S.C. 2000d-4a).

(3) "Immigration status" means what it means under 8 U.S.C. 1373 and 8 U.S.C. 1644; and terms that are defined in 8 U.S.C. 1101 mean what they mean under that section 1101, except that "State" also includes American Samoa.

(4) "DHS" means the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

B. Nothing in this condition shall be understood to authorize or require any recipient, any subrecipient at any tier, any State or local government, or any other entity (or individual) to violate any federal law, including any applicable civil rights or nondiscrimination law.

C. This condition shall be enforceable to the extent that it does not otherwise contravene any express requirement of any federal law, or of any judicial ruling, governing or applicable to the award.

Condition 53

Noninterference (with award funds and within the funded "program or activity") with federal law enforcement: Notice of scheduled release

SCOPE. This condition applies throughout the entire award period of performance. Its provisions must be among those included in any subaward at any tier.

1. No use of funds to interfere with "removal" process: Notice of scheduled release date and time.

Consonant with federal law enforcement statutes—including 8 U.S.C. 1231 (for an alien incarcerated by a State or local government, a 90-day "removal period" during which the federal government "shall" detain and then "shall" remove an alien from the U.S. "begins" no later than "the date the alien is released from ... confinement"; also, the federal government is expressly authorized to make payments to a "State or a political subdivision of the State ... with respect to the incarceration of [an] undocumented criminal alien"); 8 U.S.C. 1226 (the federal government "shall take into custody" certain criminal aliens "when the alien is released"); and 8 U.S.C. 1366 (requiring an annual report to Congress on "the number of illegal alien[felons] in Federal and State prisons" and programs underway "to ensure the prompt removal" from the U.S. of removable "criminal aliens")—no State or local government entity, agency, or official (including a government-contracted correctional facility) may use funds under this award to interfere with the "removal" process by failing to provide (as early as practicable (see para. 5.B. below)) advance notice to DHS of the scheduled release date and time for a particular alien, if a State or local government (or government-contracted) correctional facility receives from DHS a formal written request pursuant to the INA that seeks such advance notice.

2. Noninterference with "removal" process: Notice of scheduled release date and time within the funded "program or activity."

With respect to the "program or activity" funded in whole or part under this award (including any such program or activity of any subrecipient at any tier), and consonant with federal law enforcement statutes as cited in para. 1 of this condition, no State or local government entity, agency, or official (including a government-contracted correctional facility) within the funded program or activity may interfere with the "removal" process by failing to provide (as early as practicable (see para. 4.B. below)) advance notice to DHS of the scheduled release date and time for a particular alien, if a State or local government (or government-contracted) correctional facility receives from DHS a formal written request pursuant to the INA that seeks such advance notice.

3. Monitoring. The recipient's monitoring responsibilities include monitoring of subrecipient compliance with this condition.

4. Allowable costs. To the extent that such costs are not reimbursed under any other federal program, award funds may be obligated for the reasonable, necessary, and allocable costs (if any) of actions (e.g., training) designed to ensure compliance with this condition.

5. Rules of construction

A. Nothing in this condition shall be understood to authorize or require any recipient, any subrecipient at any tier, any State or local government, or any other entity or individual to maintain (or detain) any individual in custody beyond the date and time the individual otherwise would have been released.

B. Applicability.

(1) Current DHS practice is ordinarily to request advance notice of scheduled release "as early as practicable (at least 48 hours, if possible)." (See DHS Form I-247A (3/17)). If (e.g., in light of the date DHS made such request) the scheduled release date and time for an alien are such as not to allow for the advance notice that DHS has requested, it

shall NOT be a violation of this condition to provide only as much advance notice as, in fact, practicable.

(2) Current DHS practice is to use the same form for a second, distinct purpose—to request that an individual be detained for up to 48 hours AFTER the scheduled release. This condition does NOT encompass such DHS requests for detention.

C. This condition shall be enforceable to the extent that it does not otherwise contravene any express requirement of any federal law, or of any judicial ruling, governing or applicable to the award.

D. The "Rules of Construction" set out in the "Noninterference (with award funds and within the funded "program or activity") with federal law enforcement: Interrogation of certain aliens" award condition are incorporated by reference as though set forth here in full.

Condition 54

Noninterference (with award funds and within the funded "program or activity") with federal law enforcement:

Interrogation of certain aliens

SCOPE. This condition applies throughout the entire award period of performance. Its provisions must be among those included in any subaward (at any tier).

1. No use of funds to interfere with statutory law enforcement access to correctional facilities.

Consonant with federal law enforcement statutes and regulations—including 8 U.S.C. 1357(a) (under which certain federal officers and employees "have power without warrant ... to interrogate any alien or person believed to be an alien as to his right to be or to remain" in the United States), and 8 C.F.R. 287.5(a) (under which that power may be exercised "anywhere in or outside" the United States)—no State or local government entity, agency, or official within the funded program or activity may use funds under this award to interfere with the exercise of that power to interrogate "without warrant" (by agents of the United States acting under color of federal law) by impeding access to any State or local government (or government-contracted) correctional facility by such agents for the purpose of "interrogat[ing] any alien or person believed to be an alien as to his [or her] right to be or to remain in the United States."

2. Noninterference with statutory law enforcement access to correctional facilities within the funded "program or activity."

With respect to the "program or activity" funded in whole or part under this award (including any such program or activity of any subrecipient at any tier), and consonant with federal law enforcement statutes and regulations as cited in para. 1 of this condition, no State or local government entity, agency, or official within the funded program or activity may interfere with the exercise of that power to interrogate "without warrant" (by agents of the United States acting under color of federal law) by impeding access to any State or local government (or government-contracted) correctional facility by such agents for the purpose of "interrogat[ing] any alien or person believed to be an alien as to his [or her] right to be or to remain in the United States."

3. Monitoring. The recipient's monitoring responsibilities include monitoring of subrecipient compliance with this condition.

4. Allowable costs. To the extent that such costs are not reimbursed under any other federal program, award funds may be obligated for the reasonable, necessary, and allocable costs (if any) of actions (e.g., training) designed to ensure compliance with this condition.

5. Rules of construction

A. For purposes of this condition:

(1) The term "alien" means what it means under sec. 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(3)), except that, with respect to a juvenile offender, it means "criminal alien."

(2) The term "juvenile offender" means what it means under 28 C.F.R. 31.304(f) (as in effect on Jan. 1, 2026.)

(3) The term "criminal alien" means, with respect to a juvenile offender, an alien who is deportable on the basis of—

(a) conviction described in 8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(2), or

(b) conduct described in 8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(4).

(4) The term "conviction" means what it means under 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(48). (Adjudication of a juvenile as having committed an offense does not constitute "conviction" for purposes of this condition.)

(5) The term "correctional facility" means what it means under 34 U.S.C. 10251(a)(7)) as of Jan. 1, 2026.

(6) The term "impede" includes taking or continuing any action, or implementing or maintaining any law, policy, rule, or practice, that—

(a) is designed to prevent or to significantly delay or complicate, or

(b) has the effect of preventing or of significantly delaying or complicating.

(7) "State" and "local government" include any agency or other entity thereof, but not any public institution of higher education or Indian tribe.

(8) "Program or activity" means what it means under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (see 42 U.S.C. 2000d-4a).

B. Nothing in this condition shall be understood to authorize or require any recipient, any subrecipient at any tier, any State or local government, or any other entity (or individual) to violate any federal law, including any applicable civil

rights or nondiscrimination law.

C. This condition shall be enforceable to the extent that it does not otherwise contravene any express requirement of any federal law, or of any judicial ruling, governing or applicable to the award.

Condition 55

The recipient understands and agrees that no award funds may be used for any expenses related to public awareness campaigns for an extreme risk protection program.

Condition 56

Extreme risk protection order (ERPO) programs funded under this award must include, at a minimum: pre-deprivation and post-deprivation due process rights that prevent any violation or infringement of the Constitution of the United States, including but not limited to the Bill of Rights, and the substantive or procedural due process rights guaranteed under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, as applied to the States, and as interpreted by State courts and United States courts (including the Supreme Court of the United States). Such programs must include, at the appropriate phase to prevent any violation of constitutional rights, at minimum, notice, the right to an in-person hearing, an unbiased adjudicator, the right to know opposing evidence, the right to present evidence, and the right to confront adverse witnesses; the right to be represented by counsel at no expense to the government; pre-deprivation and post-deprivation heightened evidentiary standards and proof which mean not less than the protections afforded to a similarly situated litigant in Federal court or promulgated by the State's evidentiary body, and sufficient to ensure the full protections of the Constitution of the United States, including but not limited to the Bill of Rights, and the substantive and procedural due process rights guaranteed under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, as applied to the States, and as interpreted by State courts and United States courts (including the Supreme Court of the United States). The heightened evidentiary standards and proof under such programs must, at all appropriate phases to prevent any violation of any constitutional right, at minimum, prevent reliance upon evidence that is unsworn or unaffirmed, irrelevant, based on inadmissible hearsay, unreliable, vague, speculative, and lacking a foundation; and penalties for abuse of the program.

Recipients who plan to use funding to support ERPO programs must submit a Certification Relating to Pub. L. No. 90-351, Title I, Sec. 501(a)(1)(I)(iv), signed by the principal legal officer, certifying that the ERPO program to be funded satisfies each of the listed requirements prior to the use of award funds for ERPO programs. Funds proposed for ERPO programs may be withheld, pending confirmation of compliance with the terms of this award.

Condition 57

No funds may be used for C-UAS except with express prior approval from BJA. To request such approval, the recipient (or subrecipient, at any tier) must submit to BJA a written certification that, among other things, certifies that any C-UAS purchased with award funds will only be procured and used in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations, including criminal, surveillance, aviation, and communications laws. Any C-UAS purchased with award funds will be included on the list of technologies established by subsection (d)(2)(A)(iii) section 210G of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124n(d)(2)(A)(iii)) to exercise the authority granted under subsection (a)(2) of such section. The certification also requires that the award recipient consult qualified legal counsel to review the proposed purchase and operation of C-UAS, and that the recipient will complete required trainings and obtain all required approvals, certifications, licenses, and authorizations prior to deployment, and will coordinate with relevant authorities as required. The recipient (or subrecipient) also must assure BJA that it has sufficient policies and procedures regarding privacy, civil liberties, and information technology cybersecurity related to the operation of the C-UAS. Finally, the recipient (or subrecipient) may be required to provide additional documentation to verify purchase and the related policies for the C-UAS. Funds proposed for the purchase of C-UAS may be withheld, pending confirmation of compliance with the terms of this award. Additional information and the required certification form may be found here: <https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/uas>.

Condition 58

Expenditures prohibited without waiver

No funds under this award may be expended on the purchase of items prohibited by the JAG program statute, unless, as set forth at 34 U.S.C. 10152, the BJA Director certifies that extraordinary and exigent circumstances exist, making such expenditures essential to the maintenance of public safety and good order. Funds proposed for the purchase of prohibited items may be withheld, pending confirmation of compliance with the terms of this award.

Condition 59

No funds may be used for UAS except with express prior approval from BJA. To request such approval, the recipient (or subrecipient, at any tier) must submit to BJA a written certification that, among other things, certifies that only UAS verified by the Defense Contract Monitoring Agency's "Blue UAS Cleared List" or any successor list (available at <https://bluelist.appsplatformportals.us/>) as not manufactured by a "covered foreign entity" may be purchased or operated under the federal award and, further, that no modifications or additional accessories may be introduced to the UAS funded by the award. The purchased UAS may not be used to process, store, or transmit Federal information. The recipient (or subrecipient) also must assure BJA that it has sufficient policies and procedures regarding privacy, civil liberties, and information technology cybersecurity related to the operation of the UAS. Finally, the recipient (or subrecipient) may be required to provide additional documentation to verify purchase and the related policies for the UAS. Funds proposed for the purchase of UAS may be withheld, pending confirmation of compliance with the terms of this award. Additional information and the required certification form may be found here: <https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/uas>.

Condition 60

In accepting this award, the recipient agrees not to use award funds for purchases of body-worn cameras (BWCs) or related expenses for any agency unless that agency has submitted a certification to BJA that it has policies and procedures in place that reinforce appropriate agency Use of Force policies and training and address technology usage, evidence acquisition, data storage and retention, as well as privacy issues, accountability and discipline. The recipient must keep signed certifications on file for any subrecipients planning to utilize funds from this award for BWCs or related expenses. Funds proposed for the purchase of BWCs or related expenses may be withheld, pending confirmation of compliance with the terms of this award.

Condition 61

Certification of body armor "mandatory wear" policies, and compliance with NIJ standards

If the recipient uses funds under this award to purchase body armor, the recipient must submit a signed certification that each law enforcement agency receiving body armor purchased with funds from this award has a written "mandatory wear" policy in effect. The recipient must keep signed certifications on file for any subrecipients planning to utilize funds from this award for ballistic-resistant and stab-resistant body armor purchases. This policy must be in place for at least all uniformed officers before any funds from this award may be used by an agency for body armor. There are no requirements regarding the nature of the policy other than it be a mandatory wear policy for all uniformed officers while on duty. Funds proposed for the purchase of body armor may be withheld, pending confirmation of compliance with the terms of this award.

Ballistic-resistant and stab-resistant body armor purchased with award funds may be purchased at any threat level, make or model, from any distributor or manufacturer, as long as the body armor has been tested and found to comply with applicable National Institute of Justice (NIJ) ballistic or stab standards, and is listed on the NIJ Compliant Body Armor Model List. In addition, ballistic-resistant and stab-resistant body armor purchased must be uniquely fitted, as set forth in 34 U.S.C. 10202(c)(1)(A). The latest NIJ standard information and the NIJ Compliant Body Armor List may be found by following the links located on the NIJ Body Armor page: <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/equipment-and-technology/body-armor>

Condition 62

Withholding of funds for Required certification from the chief executive of the applicant government

The recipient may not expend or draw down any award funds until the recipient submits the required "Certifications and Assurances by the Chief Executive of the Applicant Government," properly-executed (as determined by OJP), and an Award Condition Modification (ACM) has been issued to remove this condition.

Condition 63

Withholding of funds for Budget narrative or information

The recipient may not expend or draw down any award funds until the recipient submits, and BJA reviews and accepts, the required budget information or narrative for the award, and an Award Condition Modification (ACM) has been issued to remove this condition.

[] *I have read and understand the information presented in this section of the Federal Award Instrument.*

Award Acceptance

Declaration and Certification to the U.S. Department of Justice as to Acceptance

By checking the declaration and certification box below, I--

- A. Declare to the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), under penalty of perjury, that I have authority to make this declaration and certification on behalf of the applicant.
- B. Certify to DOJ, under penalty of perjury, on behalf of myself and the applicant, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that the following are true as of the date of this award acceptance: (1) I have conducted or there was conducted (including by applicant's legal counsel as appropriate and made available to me) a diligent review of all terms and conditions of, and all supporting materials submitted in connection with, this award, including any assurances and certifications (including anything submitted in connection therewith by a person on behalf of the applicant before, after, or at the time of the application submission and any materials that accompany this acceptance and certification); and (2) I have the legal authority to accept this award on behalf of the applicant.
- C. Accept this award on behalf of the applicant.
- D. Declare the following to DOJ, under penalty of perjury, on behalf of myself and the applicant: (1) I understand that, in taking (or not taking) any action pursuant to this declaration and certification, DOJ will rely upon this declaration and certification as a material representation; and (2) I understand that any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent information or statement in this declaration and certification (or concealment or omission of a material fact as to either) may be the subject of criminal prosecution (including under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001 and/or 1621, and/or 34 U.S.C. §§ 10271-10273), and also may subject me and the applicant to civil penalties and administrative remedies under the federal False Claims Act (including under 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3730 and/or §§ 3801-3812) or otherwise.

Agency Approval

Title of Approving Official	Name of Approving Official	Signed Date And Time
Deputy Assistant Attorney General	Maureen A. Henneberg	7/28/26 1:46 AM

Authorized Representative

☐ Declaration and Certification

Entity Acceptance

Title of Authorized Entity Official
no value

Signed Date And Time
no value

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS**

Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program FY 2025 Local Solicitation

Certifications and Assurances by the Chief Executive of the Applicant Government

On behalf of the applicant unit of local government named below, in support of that locality's application for an award under the FY 2025 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant ("JAG") Program, and further to 34 U.S.C. § 10153(a), I certify to the Office of Justice Programs ("OJP"), U.S. Department of Justice ("USDOJ"), that all of the following are true and correct:

1. I am the chief executive of the applicant unit of local government named below, and I have the authority to make the following representations on my own behalf as chief executive and on behalf of the applicant unit of local government. I understand that these representations will be relied upon as material in any OJP decision to make an award, under the application described above, to the applicant unit of local government.
2. I certify that no federal funds made available by the award (if any) that OJP makes based on the application described above will be used to supplant local funds but will be used to increase the amounts of such funds that would, in the absence of federal funds, be made available for law enforcement activities.
3. I assure that the application described above (and any amendment to that application) was submitted for review to the governing body of the unit of local government (e.g., city council or county commission), or to an organization designated by that governing body, not less than 30 days before the date of this certification.
4. I assure that, before the date of this certification— (a) the application described above (and any amendment to that application) was made public; and (b) an opportunity to comment on that application (or amendment) was provided to citizens and to neighborhood or community-based organizations, to the extent applicable law or established procedure made such an opportunity available.
5. I assure that, for each fiscal year of the award (if any) that OJP makes based on the application described above, the applicant unit of local government will maintain and report such data, records, and information (programmatic and financial), as OJP may reasonably require.
6. I have carefully reviewed 34 U.S.C. § 10153(a)(5), and, with respect to the programs to be funded by the award (if any), I hereby make the certification required by section 10153(a)(5), as to each of the items specified therein.
7. If the applicant named below is not the unit of local government itself, I certify that it is an instrumentality of the unit of local government and is approved to serve as the applicant and recipient of FY 2025 JAG funding on behalf of the unit of local government.

Signature of Chief Executive of the Applicant Unit of
Local Government

Date of Certification

Printed Name of Chief Executive

Title of Chief Executive

Name of Applicant Unit of Local Government



Office of the City Council

8000 South Redwood Road
West Jordan, Utah 84088
(801) 569-5017

CITY OF WEST JORDAN NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

A public hearing will be held before the West Jordan City Council on **Tuesday, September 8, 2026, at 7:00 pm** (*or as soon thereafter as possible*) at **West Jordan City Hall, 8000 S. Redwood Rd, 3rd Floor, West Jordan, UT 84088**.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive public comments regarding the following:

- Resolution No. 26-041 Authorizing the Mayor to Sign the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program Certifications and Assurances

If you are interested in participating in the public hearing, please visit the City of West Jordan website at <https://westjordan.primegov/public/portal> approximately four (4) days prior to the meeting for packet materials and Zoom login information.

Alternatively, you may share your comments with the Council prior to the meeting by calling the 24-Hour Public Comment line at (801) 569-5052 or by emailing councilcomments@westjordan.utah.gov. Please contact the Council Office at (801) 569-5017 for further information.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of West Jordan will make reasonable accommodations for participation in the meeting. Requests for assistance can be made by contacting the Council Office at (801) 569-5017 at least three working days' advance notice of the meeting.

Posted August 27, 2026
/s/ Cindy Quick
Council Office Clerk

Request For Council Action

Action: Need Council to Take Action

Meeting Date Requested : 09/08/2026

Presenter: Patrick S Boice, Senior Assistant City Attorney

Deadline of item :

Applicant: City Council

Department Sponsor: Council Office

Agenda Type: Business Items

Presentation Time: 10 Minutes

(Council may elect to provide more or less time)

1. Agenda Subject

Ordinance No. 26-45 Amending Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6 Prohibited Parking

2. Executive Summary

There have been some omissions in our Prohibited Parked code that will strengthen the community. These omissions include:

- Parking in front of mailboxes;
- Parking near intersection with or without a traffic control device (*e.g.*, a stop sign);
- Parking of vehicles with expired registration on public streets; and
- Parking within five feet of a public or private driveway.

PARKING IN FRONT OF MAILBOXES

There is no state law that prohibits parking in front of mailboxes and is more a local authority. The United State Post Office does have a regulation that allows postal carriers to skip mailboxes that are obstructed. [USPS Article 7110](#) provides a list of conditions that can prevent delivery of mail; mailbox blocked, dog on premises, hazardous conditions, full mailbox, obstructions, and no mailbox. Under Mailbox Blocked, a postmaster may withdraw postal delivery service if the carrier continually experiences a problem serving curb side boxes.

This has caused issues for a number of residents as we are presently unable to require cars to be moved in order for residents to receive their mail. Surrounding municipalities such as Taylorsville, Murray, West Valley City, and Salt Lake, all codify the prohibition against parking near mailboxes.

PARKING AROUND INTERSECTIONS

Law enforcement has also asked for amendments to prohibit parking near intersections. Currently, 7-3-6 lists that there is no parking near an intersection where a traffic control device prohibits it but not where there is no traffic control device. This causes safety issues where a resident may wish to leave a neighborhood street at a stop sign to enter a collector and on the collector, as there is no traffic control device, residents have been parking closer to the intersection, creating an unsafe way for a resident to enter a collector safely.

PARKING ON PUBLIC ROADS WITH EXPIRED REGISTRATION

Most Utah cities have ordinances prohibiting on street parking of vehicles with expired registrations after 72 hours. West Jordan code 7-3-6(A)(13) already prohibits cars parking on city street longer than 72 hours. State law allows a peace officer to seize and take possession of the vehicle that is operated on the highway with registration that is expired more than 3 months ([41-1a-1101\(3\)](#)) of 96

3. Time Sensitivity / Urgency

Immediate passage will have a beneficial enforcement effect.

4. Fiscal Note

There is no direct fiscal impact by adopting the resolution.

5. Planning Commission Recommendation

Title 7 is not a Land Use Title and does not need a recommendation from the Planning Commission

6. Mayor Recommendation

7. Council Staff Analysis

Plain Language Summary

The proposed ordinance would update the City's prohibited parking rules by adding several locations and situations where vehicles may not be parked. The changes would address parking near mailboxes, intersections, driveways, and parking vehicles with expired registrations.

The proposed change would prohibit parking:

- Within five feet of a public or private mailboxes. This would help prevent parked vehicles from blocking mail delivery.
- Within 30 feet of the radius of an intersection. This would provide a consistent parking restriction around intersections, including those without a traffic-control device.
- Within five feet of a public or private driveway. This would help keep driveways accessible.
- On a public street when the vehicle has expired license-plate registration.

Background Information and Timeline

Ordinance No. 24-51, adopted by the City Council on November 6, 2024, removed City Code language which prohibited parking "within five feet of a freestanding curbside mail box". The Ordinance was a major overhaul to City Code regarding motor vehicles and traffic safety.

Ordinance No. 26-11, adopted by the City Council on February 24, 2026, added City Code language which prohibited parking in front of mailboxes for commercial vehicles.

As these amendments are single lines in one section of code, and as there is common knowledge of the items, this has followed the simple workflow as outlined in Council Policies and Procedures and therefore has not been to a Committee of the Whole discussion. The Council may elect to refer this item back to a Committee of the Whole for further discussion if the Council agrees.

8. Possible Council Action

The Council may choose to take one of the following actions:

1. Approve the Ordinance as written and proposed OR with stated amendments;
2. Not Approve the Ordinance;
3. Continue the item to a future specified date;
4. Refer the item back to a Committee of the Whole Meeting, Council Subcommittee, or an Ad Hoc Committee;
5. Refer the item back to Council Staff or Administrative Staff.

9. Attachments

Ordinance No. 26-45

Attachment A - Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6 - Parking near mailboxes (legislative)

Attachment B - Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6 - Parking near mailboxes (clean)

1 **THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN, UTAH**
2 **ORDINANCE NO. 26-45**

3 **AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN CITY CODE**
4 **(PROHIBITED PARKING);**
5 **Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6**

6 WHEREAS, the City of West Jordan (“**City**”) adopted West Jordan City Code (“**City Code**”) in 2009; and the City Council of the City (“**Council**” or “**City Council**”) desires to amend Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6 of the City Code (“**proposed City Code amendments**”); and

9 WHEREAS, the City Council desires to amend the City Code to enable law enforcement to address situations which endanger the health and safety of the community; and

11 WHEREAS, the City Council finds it to be in the best interest of the public health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the City to adopt the proposed City Code amendments.

13 NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN, UTAH AS FOLLOWS:

15 **Section 1. Amendment of City Code Provision.** City Code Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6 is amended as shown in Attachments 1 (Legislative Version) and 2 (Clean Version) to this Ordinance.

17 **Section 2. Severability.** If any provision of this Ordinance is declared to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder shall not be affected thereby.

19 **Section 4. Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon posting or publication as provided by law and upon (i) the Mayor signing the Ordinance, (ii) the City Council duly overriding the veto of the Mayor as provided by law, or (iii) the Mayor failing to sign or veto the Ordinance within fifteen (15) days after the City Council presents the Ordinance to the Mayor.

23 PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN, UTAH, THIS
24 _____ DAY OF _____ 2026.

26 CITY OF WEST JORDAN

28 By: _____
29 Jessica Wignall
30 Council Chair

31 ATTEST:

32
33 _____
34 Cindy M. Quick, MMC
35 Council Office Clerk
36
37
38
39
40

Voting by the City Council

"YES"

"NO"

Council Chair Jessica Wignall

☐☐

Council Vice-Chair Kent Shelton

☐☐

Council Member Chad Lamb

☐☐

Council Member Kayleen Whitelock

☐☐

Council Member Annette Harris

☐☐

Council Member Bob Bedore

☐☐

Council Member Zach Jacob

☐☐

PRESENTED TO THE MAYOR BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON _____.

Mayor's Action: _____ Approve _____ Veto

By: _____
Mayor Dirk Burton Date

ATTEST:

Tangee Sloan, MMC, UCC
City Recorder

STATEMENT OF APPROVAL/PASSAGE (check one)

_____ The Mayor approved and signed Ordinance No. 26-45.

_____ The Mayor vetoed Ordinance No. 26-45 on _____ and the
City Council timely overrode the veto of the Mayor by a vote of _____ to _____.

_____ Ordinance No. 26-45 became effective by operation of law without the
Mayor's approval or disapproval.

Tangee Sloan, MMC, UCC
City Recorder

87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION

I, Tangee Sloan, certify that I am the City Recorder of the City of West Jordan, Utah, and that a short summary of the foregoing ordinance was published on the Utah Public Notice Website on the _____ day of _____ 2026. The fully executed copy of the ordinance is retained in the Office of the City Recorder pursuant to Utah Code Annotated, 10-3-711.

Tangee Sloan, MMC, UCC
City Recorder

(Attachments on the following pages.)

128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169

**Attachments 1 and 2 to
ORDINANCE NO. 26-45
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN CITY CODE
(PROHIBITED PARKING);
Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6**

Attachment 1 – Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6 - Legislative Version

Attachment 2 – Title 7, Chapter 3, Section 6 - Clean Version

(See the following pages for the attachments.)

1 7-3-6: PROHIBITED PARKING:

2 A. Except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic, or in compliance with law ,
3 the directions of a police officer , or traffic control device, a person may not stop, stand, or
4 park a vehicle:

5 1. On the roadway side of any vehicle stopped or parked at the edge of a curb or
6 a street ;

7 2. On a sidewalk;

8 3. Within an intersection or roundabout;

9 4. On a crosswalk or designated crossing;

10 5. Between a safety zone and the adjacent curb or within 30 feet of points on the
11 curb immediately opposite the ends of a safety zone, unless a different length is
12 indicated by signs or markings;

13 6. Alongside or opposite any street excavation or obstruction when stopping,
14 standing or parking would obstruct traffic;

15 7. On any bridge or other elevated structure, on a highway or within a highway
16 tunnel;

17 8. On any railroad tracks;

18 9. On any controlled-access highway;

19 10. In the area between roadways of a divided highway, including crossovers;

20 11. Any place where a traffic-control device prohibits stopping, standing, or
21 parking;

22 12. In a school bus parking zone ;

23 13. On any street more than 72 hours;

24 14. In front of any taxi or bus stop; or

25 15. On any median, or island, or in any dividing section of a divided highway.

26 B. A person may not stand or park a vehicle, whether occupied or not, except
27 momentarily to pick up or discharge a passenger or passengers:

28 1. In front of, or within five feet of, a public or private driveway;

29 2. Within 15 feet of a fire hydrant;

30 3. Within 20 feet of a crosswalk or designated crossing;

31 4. Within 30 feet upon the approach to any flashing signal, stop sign, yield sign,
32 or traffic-control signal located at the side of a roadway;

33 5. Within a public alley that blocks the driveway entrance to any abutting
34 property or interferes with the free movement of traffic;

35 6. Within 20 feet of the driveway entrance to any fire station and on the side of a
36 street opposite the entrance to any fire station within 75 feet of the entrance when
37 posted by signs;

38 7. At any place where a traffic-control device prohibits standing or parking.

39 8. Within five feet of any public or private mailbox.

40 9. Within 30 feet of the radius of an intersection.

41 C. A person may not park a vehicle, whether occupied or not, except temporarily for the
42 purpose of and while engaged in loading or unloading property or passengers:

43 1. Within 50 feet of the nearest rail of a railroad crossing; or

44 2. At any place where traffic-control devices prohibit parking.

45 3. With expired license plate registration. (2001 Code § 86-3-106; Ord. 24-51,
46 11-6-2024)

1 7-3-6: PROHIBITED PARKING:

2 A. Except when necessary to avoid conflict with other traffic, or in compliance with law ,
3 the directions of a police officer , or traffic control device, a person may not stop, stand, or
4 park a vehicle:

5 1. On the roadway side of any vehicle stopped or parked at the edge of a curb or
6 a street ;

7 2. On a sidewalk;

8 3. Within an intersection or roundabout;

9 4. On a crosswalk or designated crossing;

10 5. Between a safety zone and the adjacent curb or within 30 feet of points on the
11 curb immediately opposite the ends of a safety zone, unless a different length is
12 indicated by signs or markings;

13 6. Alongside or opposite any street excavation or obstruction when stopping,
14 standing or parking would obstruct traffic;

15 7. On any bridge or other elevated structure, on a highway or within a highway
16 tunnel;

17 8. On any railroad tracks;

18 9. On any controlled-access highway;

19 10. In the area between roadways of a divided highway, including crossovers;

20 11. Any place where a traffic-control device prohibits stopping, standing, or
21 parking;

22 12. In a school bus parking zone ;

23 13. On any street more than 72 hours;

24 14. In front of any taxi or bus stop; or

25 15. On any median, or island, or in any dividing section of a divided highway.

26 B. A person may not stand or park a vehicle, whether occupied or not, except
27 momentarily to pick up or discharge a passenger or passengers:

28 1. In front of, or within five feet of, a public or private driveway;

29 2. Within 15 feet of a fire hydrant;

30 3. Within 20 feet of a crosswalk or designated crossing;

31 4. Within 30 feet upon the approach to any flashing signal, stop sign, yield sign,
32 or traffic-control signal located at the side of a roadway;

33 5. Within a public alley that blocks the driveway entrance to any abutting
34 property or interferes with the free movement of traffic;

35 6. Within 20 feet of the driveway entrance to any fire station and on the side of a
36 street opposite the entrance to any fire station within 75 feet of the entrance when
37 posted by signs;

38 7. At any place where a traffic-control device prohibits standing or parking.

39 8. Within five feet of any public or private mailbox.

40 9. Within 30 feet of the radius of an intersection.

41 C. A person may not park a vehicle, whether occupied or not, except temporarily for the
42 purpose of and while engaged in loading or unloading property or passengers:

43 1. Within 50 feet of the nearest rail of a railroad crossing; or

44 2. At any place where traffic-control devices prohibit parking.

45 3. With expired license plate registration. (2001 Code § 86-3-106; Ord. 24-51,
46 11-6-2024)

Request For Council Action

Action: Need Council to Take Action

Meeting Date Requested : 09/08/2026

Presenter: Patrick S Boice, Senior Assistant City Attorney

Deadline of item :

Applicant: City Council

Department Sponsor: Council Office

Agenda Type: Business Items

Presentation Time: 10 Minutes

(Council may elect to provide more or less time)

1. Agenda Subject

Ordinance No. 26-24 Enacting Title 7, Chapter 6 Electric Bicycles

2. Executive Summary

The Council is being presented with a draft code amendment regulating electric bicycles within the City. This issue has come before the Council on September 23, 2025; March 24, 2026; June 30, 2026, and most recently August 25, 2026. Each of these meetings there was discussion on regulations of E-bikes as well as updates to legislative changes during the previous session. The City Council has discussed adding a chapter to the City Code to address the use of electric bicycles. State Law already contains extensive restrictions and requirements for the use of e-bikes. Changes to State Law have occurred in 2025, 2026, and are slated to occur again in 2027. (See Section 41- 6a-1115.5.) State law allows the City to regulate or restrict the use of e-bikes on sidewalks and paths. The City Council has asked that the addition to City Code adopt the State definitions and restrictions and place regulations on the use of electric bicycles on City paths and sidewalks. Proposed legislative language mirrors State Code and still allows for e-bikes to be used in reasonable manners.

3. Time Sensitivity / Urgency

None

4. Fiscal Note

There is no fiscal impact to implement the code.

5. Planning Commission Recommendation

Title 7 is not a land use regulation and a Planning Commission recommendation is not required.

6. Staff Analysis

The Council has discussed this topic on several occasions, as noted above, and had asked to review changes in State Law regarding e-bike regulations. This proposed legislation represents a majority of Council Member viewpoints on the subject from the various discussions.

7. Mayor Recommendation

8. Council Staff Analysis

Timeline & Background Information

The Council has discussed this topic at the following work session meetings:

- [September 23, 2025](#)
 - Council discussion included public safety hazards, resident complaints, physical park turf damage, speed concerns on residential sidewalks, and state legislative boundaries.
- [March 24, 2026](#)
 - Council review of the proposed draft code for **City Code Title 7, Chapter 6 (Electric Bicycles)** focused on sidewalk speed limits, bright-line prohibitions, helmet statistics, and law enforcement feedback.
- [June 30, 2026](#)
 - Council was presented with a final review incorporating 2025 and 2026 Utah State Legislative statutory changes, establishing explicit parameters for municipal trails, paved pathways, and natural surface trails.

Minutes for each of the meetings are included in the packet for review under Attachment C, D, and E

SUMMARY

Over the past year, the West Jordan City Council addressed the operational, safety, and legislative impacts of electric bicycles (e-bikes) and electric micro-mobility devices across three separate Committee of the Whole meetings:

BACKGROUND

The accelerated use of e-bikes and electric micro-mobility devices across West Jordan generated safety and enforcement challenges:

- **Pedestrian & Sidewalk Safety Risks:** Video evidence and resident complaints presented to the Council highlighted high-speed operation (35–40 mph) by youth on narrow residential sidewalks, creating acute collision risks with pedestrians.
- **Property Damage:** High-torque micro-mobility devices were reported causing turf damage in city parks.
- **Enforcement Barriers:** Law enforcement noted that under prior standards, enforcement varied significantly depending on device classification, necessitating clear, standardized prohibitions in City Code.
- **Evolving State Legislation:** The Utah State Legislature enacted statutory updates in 2025 and 2026 affecting e-bike definitions, age requirements, and classifications, requiring municipal code synchronization.

POLICY PROGRESSION

- ***September 23, 2025 – Committee of the Whole***
 - **Issue Identification:** Council Member Shelton presented resident safety concerns regarding youth operating electric devices at high speeds on sidewalks. Police Chief

Robertson noted state scooter velocity limits (up to 50 mph) and recommended local regulation of non-street-legal electric motorcycles.

- **Trial Interventions:** Mayor Burton proposed posting a 10 mph speed limit when pedestrians are present on the Jordan River Trail.
- **Direction Given:** Staff was directed to draft potential municipal code provisions aligned with state standards.

- ***March 24, 2026 – Committee of the Whole***

- **Sidewalk & Operational Rules:** Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice presented drafted amendments for Title 7, Chapter 6. The Council evaluated setting a 10 mph sidewalk limit versus a complete ban.
- **Consensus Reached:** A majority of the Council expressed explicit support for:
 - Prohibiting e-bike operation on city sidewalks.
 - Prohibiting operation in a negligent or hazardous manner near traffic or pedestrians.
- **Enforcement & Distinction:** Law enforcement confirmed that clear prohibitions would improve enforcement over discretionary standards. Council Member Jacob requested distinct, easily distinguishable definitions for sidewalks, multi-use paths, and trails.

- ***June 30, 2026 – Committee of the Whole***

- **State Law Alignment:** Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice updated the Council on newly passed 2025 and 2026 state statutory changes.
- **Trail Policy Refinement:** The Council evaluated where e-bikes should be permitted:
 - **Permitted:** Paved city trails, the Jordan River Parkway, and the Mountain View Corridor trail.
 - **Restricted/Prohibited:** Natural surface trails (for specific e-bike classes) and gas-powered vehicles (which remain banned on all city trails).
- **Scope Clarification:** Staff clarified that the proposed ordinance applies strictly to electric bicycles and does not affect mobility devices or traditional scooters.

The education component could be addressed in setting aside funds in the FY28 budget or amending the FY27 budget once the Executive Branch develops a program to educate E-bike users.

9. Possible Council Action

The Council may choose to take one of the following actions:

1. Approve the Ordinance as written and proposed OR with stated amendments;
2. Not Approve the Ordinance;
3. Continue the item to a future specified date;
4. Refer the item back to a Committee of the Whole Meeting, Council Subcommittee, or an Ad Hoc Committee;
5. Refer the item back to Council Staff or Administrative Staff.

10. Attachments

Attachment A – Title 7, Chapter 6 Electric Bicycle (legislative)

Attachment A – Title 7, Chapter 6 Electric Bicycle (clean)

Attachment C – Minutes 09/23/2025

Attachment D – Minutes 03/24/2026

Attachment E – Minutes 06/30/2026

1 THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN, UTAH
2 ORDINANCE NO. 26-24

3 AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN CITY CODE
4 (ELECTRIC BICYCLES); Title 7, Chapter 6

5 WHEREAS, the City of West Jordan (“City”) adopted West Jordan City Code (“City Code”) in 2009; and the City Council of the City (“Council” or “City Council”) desires to amend Title 7, Chapter 6 of the City Code (“proposed City Code amendments”); and

8 WHEREAS, the City Council desires to amend the City Code to reflect changes in State Law;
9 and

10 WHEREAS, the City Council recognizes the changes in technology and transportation, and
11 the need for safe operation of modes of transit; and

12 WHEREAS, the City Council finds it to be in the best interest of the public health, safety, and
13 welfare of the residents of the City to adopt the proposed City Code amendments.

14 NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
15 WEST JORDAN, UTAH AS FOLLOWS:

16 **Section 1.** Amendment of City Code Provision. City Code Title 7, Chapter 6 is amended as
17 shown in Attachment 1 to this Ordinance.

18 **Section 2.** Severability. If any provision of this Ordinance is declared to be invalid by a
19 court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder shall not be affected thereby.

20 **Section 4.** Effective Date. This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon posting
21 or publication as provided by law and upon (i) the Mayor signing the Ordinance, (ii) the City Council
22 duly overriding the veto of the Mayor as provided by law, or (iii) the Mayor failing to sign or veto
23 the Ordinance within fifteen (15) days after the City Council presents the Ordinance to the Mayor.

24 PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN, UTAH, THIS
25 _____ DAY OF _____ 2026.

26
27 CITY OF WEST JORDAN

28
29 By: _____
30 Jessica Wignall
31 Council Chair

32 ATTEST:

33
34 _____
35 Cindy M. Quick, MMC
36 Council Office Clerk
37
38
39

Voting by the City Council

"YES"

"NO"

Council Chair Jessica Wignall
Council Vice-Chair Kent Shelton
Council Member Annette Harris
Council Member Zach Jacob
Council Member Chad Lamb
Council Member Bob Bedore
Council Member Kayleen Whitelock

☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐
☐	☐

PRESENTED TO THE MAYOR BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON _____.

Mayor's Action: _____ Approve _____ Veto

By: _____
Mayor Dirk Burton Date

ATTEST:

Tangee Sloan, MMC, UCC
City Recorder

STATEMENT OF APPROVAL/PASSAGE (check one)

_____ The Mayor approved and signed Ordinance No. 26-24.

_____ The Mayor vetoed Ordinance No. 26-24 on _____ and the
City Council timely overrode the veto of the Mayor by a vote of _____ to _____.

_____ Ordinance No. 26-24 became effective by operation of law without the
Mayor's approval or disapproval.

Tangee Sloan, MMC, UCC
City Recorder

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION

I, Tangee Sloan, certify that I am the City Recorder of the City of West Jordan, Utah, and that a short summary of the foregoing ordinance was published on the Utah Public Notice Website on the _____ day of _____ 2026. The fully executed copy of the ordinance is retained in the Office of the City Recorder pursuant to Utah Code Annotated, 10-3-711.

Tangee Sloan, MMC, UCC
City Recorder

(Attachments on the following pages.)

126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167

Attachments to
ORDINANCE NO. 26-24
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN CITY CODE
(ELECTRIC BICYCLES); Title 7, Chapter 6

Attachment A – Title 7, Chapter 6 (legislative version)
Attachment B – Title 7, Chapter 6 (clean version)

(See the following pages for the attachment.)

TITLE 7

MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC

CHAPTER 6

ELECTRIC BICYCLES

SECTION:

7-6-1: Definitions

7-6-2: Restrictions

7-6-3: Penalties

7-6-1: DEFINITIONS:

The words and phrases used in this section shall have the meanings and definitions contained in section 1-3-2 of this code and in Utah Code section 41-6a-102, or its successor provision.

7-6-2: RESTRICTIONS:

- A. An individual under 14 years old may not operate an electric assisted bicycle with the electric motor engaged on any public property, path, or sidewalk unless the individual is under the direct supervision of the individual's parent or guardian.
- B. An individual may not operate an electric assisted bicycle in a negligent manner or in a way which creates an undue risk to pedestrians or interferes with pedestrian traffic.
- C. Electric motorcycles, not properly outfitted for street use and properly licensed, are prohibited on all highways. Electric motorcycles are prohibited from all public property, paths, and sidewalks.
- D. The owner of an electric assisted bicycle may not authorize or knowingly permit an individual to operate an electric assisted bicycle in violation of this section.

7-6-3: PENALTIES:

A violation of this section may be prosecuted as an infraction or as a civil citation.

TITLE 7
MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC

CHAPTER 6
ELECTRIC BICYCLES

SECTION:

7-6-1: Definitions

7-6-2: Restrictions

7-6-3: Penalties

7-6-1: DEFINITIONS:

The words and phrases used in this section shall have the meanings and definitions contained in section 1-3-2 of this code and in Utah Code section 41-6a-102, or its successor provision.

7-6-2: RESTRICTIONS:

- A. An individual under 14 years old may not operate an electric assisted bicycle with the electric motor engaged on any public property, path, or sidewalk unless the individual is under the direct supervision of the individual's parent or guardian.
- B. An individual may not operate an electric assisted bicycle in a negligent manner or in a way which creates an undue risk to pedestrians or interferes with pedestrian traffic.
- C. Electric motorcycles, not properly outfitted for street use and properly licensed, are prohibited on all highways. Electric motorcycles are prohibited from all public property, paths, and sidewalks.
- D. The owner of an electric assisted bicycle may not authorize or knowingly permit an individual to operate an electric assisted bicycle in violation of this section.

7-6-3: PENALTIES:

A violation of this section may be prosecuted as an infraction or as a civil citation.



MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Tuesday, September 23, 2025 – 4:00 pm
Approved October 14, 2025
8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor
West Jordan, UT 84088

1. CALL TO ORDER

COUNCIL: Chair Kayleen Whitelock, Vice Chair Bob Bedore, Pamela Bloom, Kelvin Green, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton

STAFF: Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice, Mayor Dirk Burton, City Attorney Josh Chandler, Public Works Director Brian Clegg, Policy Analyst & Public Liaison Warren Hallmark, Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome, Community Development Director Scott Langford, City Administrator Korban Lee, Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick, Attendee Brock Hudson

Chair Whitelock called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm and noted that Council Member Bloom had joined remotely.

2. DISCUSSION TOPICS

a. Presentation on “Transit Fresh Look” Study – Wasatch Front Regional Council

Ted Nolten with Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) gave an update on a 2024 “Transit Fresh Look” Study covering the southwest quadrant of Salt Lake County and northwest quadrant of Utah County. He said the purpose of the study was to align stakeholders on a unified transit vision, focus on regional transit connections, and explore options not previously considered. Communities included as stakeholders: Bluffdale, Eagle Mountain, Herriman, Lehi, Riverton, Saratoga Springs, South Jordan, and West Jordan. Mr. Nolten said Mayor Burton and Paul Jerome represented West Jordan on the partnership committee.

Mr. Nolten said the next step in the process was to refine the ideas and vision brainstormed in the previous step. He showed two drafted vision scenarios, and emphasized that proposed changes would be impactful on the entire transit system. Mr. Nolten said one idea involved Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) or enhanced bus with significant improvements along the Redwood Road corridor, and one scenario included BRT from 5600 West along Mountain View Corridor. Mayor Burton said he liked the Redwood Road idea because the improvements would cover three counties.

Mr. Nolten introduced Alex Beim and Chandler Beutler with Utah Transit Authority (UTA). Chair Whitelock expressed concern that Redwood was already a very busy road, and adding a bus would not provide faster transportation. She said investment needed to

be smart, and said she wanted to draw people into West Jordan without adding traffic to the streets. Council Member Jacob commented that Redwood Road was not far from the FrontRunner line, with buses providing transit between Redwood and FrontRunner. He suggested adding options further west.

Council Member Green said all transit options in the area were designed to get people to downtown Salt Lake City or the University of Utah. He commented that transit options in Tokyo, Japan were designed to get people to all areas of Tokyo. Council Member Green suggested the need to be more creative, and suggested offering TRAX lines that did not stop at every station for quicker transportation to targeted locations. Mr. Nolten said he had been excited about the focus on east/west connections with the partnership. Mr. Beim said he agreed the old paradigm had changed. Chair Whitelock said options needed to be provided along Mountain View Corridor to serve the southwest quadrant.

Council Member Shelton expressed the opinion that adding a bus would mean taking cars off the road, which would improve traffic flow. He said he believed BRT on Redwood Road would be useful and improve traffic on Redwood Road. Mayor Burton said the current Redwood Road bus was the most used in West Jordan, and often got full during commuter hours. Mr. Beim confirmed Route 217 on Redwood Road had some of the highest ridership and highest number of people riding per hour.

Council Member Shelton believed UTA had a particularly difficult job in providing services to a spread-out, dense population compared to countries in Europe. Council Member Green referred to the metro system in Washington DC.

Chair Whitelock said the scenarios presented did not include many east/west connections for West Jordan residents. Mr. Nolten said the focus of the study had been further south. He said there was a draft plan, part of the regional transportation plan, that included more ideas for West Jordan, with a work shop scheduled for later in the Fall.

Mr. Nolten said the amount of work required to accomplish the different elements needed to be considered. Council Member Green mentioned that planned UDOT work on Mountain View could provide an opportunity to add BRT. Mr. Nolten said he would take the comment back to the planning team, but said the idea would probably not show up on maps presented in the next few months. He said the planning process was nearing completion, and said the meeting scheduled for November 6, 2025 would focus on the West Jordan area. Mr. Nolten thanked the Council for their feedback.

b. Discussion of Amendments to Title 4, Chapter 2, Article D (Home Occupations)

Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice presented adjustments to proposed amendments to Title 4 made following a previous discussion with the Council, and asked for further direction.

Council Member Shelton supported encouraging and incentivizing home occupations to acquire a business license. Mr. Boice said the State did not allow cities to charge a license fee of non-impact home occupations. Council Member Green would not want to charge an application fee of non-impact home occupations that were not required by the City to

obtain a business license, but needed a business license as proof of legitimate business. He did not want the City to do anything to get in the way of the success of struggling, starting businesses. Council Member Bedore suggested some type of fee should be charged to contribute to the legitimacy of a business license, since City staff time would be involved. Chair Whitelock agreed with charging an application fee.

Mayor Burton had held a business license in several different communities, and had never felt he should not have to pay to obtain the license. He commented that requiring home occupations to have a business license would help with situations in which neighbors of a home occupation called the City with a complaint or question about the business. Council Member Green stated he did not like the idea of licensing every home-based business. He said he believed the requirement would be impossible to enforce, and pointed out the potential time impact on staff if all non-impact home-based businesses were required to obtain a license. Chair Whitelock commented that residential neighborhoods were not intended to be commercial, and said she liked the idea of having license information for all home businesses to help in addressing complaint situations.

Chair Whitelock suggested using the term “encourage” in the Title. She asked if the Council wanted to require all home businesses to have a business license. No Council Members appeared to respond. Mr. Boice said he suspected a lot of the non-impact home occupations would be computer-based, such as web designers, book keepers, CPAs, or attorneys. Mr. Boice said he suspected requiring a business license of non-impact home occupations would be difficult to enforce. He recommended charging an application fee whether a business license was required by the City or needed by the business owner. Mayor Burton said the application process for a home-based business included explanations of level of impact on a residential neighborhood to help residents know when a business was too impactful, and should be operated from a different location. Council Member Green repeated he did not want to require non-impact home occupations to obtain a business license.

Chair Whitelock read aloud the language proposed by staff. Council Members Green, Lamb, Shelton, and Bloom said they were comfortable with the proposed language. Council Member Jacob said he would be more comfortable reducing the application fee from \$55 to \$25. Mr. Boice said \$55 was the City’s standard application fee. Council Member Lamb said he would prefer not to reduce the application fee. Mr. Boice commented that the staff responsible for business licenses were busy all day, every day.

Chair Whitelock liked the idea of allowing online applications to make the process easier. Mr. Boice said he could look into the possibility. Council Member Shelton asked if an application fee was charged every year with renewal, and Mr. Boice said there was no fee associated with annual business license renewal. Council Members Lamb, Whitelock, Shelton, Bedore, and Bloom indicated they were comfortable with the current application fee. Council Member Jacob said he did not feel strongly either way.

Mr. Boice would bring the proposed amendments back to a future Committee of the Whole meeting.

c. Discussion on Proposed Amendments to West Jordan City Code Titles 2 and 3 Related to Fee Waivers

Council Office Director Alan Anderson said individuals and various groups had asked questions regarding fee waivers in recent years, and said staff requested clarification of City Code related to fee waivers. He said Council Member Green drafted proposed amendments to Titles 2 and 3 earlier in the year, which were subsequently reviewed by the Legal Department. Mr. Anderson said the proposed amendment to Title 2 would add a provision for an organization receiving a fee waiver in excess of \$5,000 to be subject to some auditing interest of the Council. Mr. Anderson said proposed amendments to Title 3 would clarify that the Mayor could forgive penalties, interest, or fines, but waiver of fees was reserved for the City Council.

Chair Whitelock asked how the \$5,000 amount was selected. Mr. Anderson said he and Mr. Boice chose \$5,000 as a starting point. Mr. Boice said Title 2 contemplated both monetary and non-monetary support from the City. Council Member Green was uncomfortable with language requiring proof of registration as a non-profit entity. He pointed out requiring proof of registration as a non-profit would exclude groups such as a neighborhood group planning a neighborhood clean-up event from seeking assistance in the form of fee waivers. Council Member Green wanted the Council to be able to encourage and assist not-for-profit neighborhood groups.

Mr. Boice said the Council could provide monetary assistance to a group if an amount was already set aside in the City Budget. Chair Whitelock asked if the Council could include an amount in the budget for waiving dumpster fees. Mr. Anderson suggested the Council include a line item in the budget from which an amount would be transferred to the Solid Waste Fund when dumpster fees were waived so the Solid Waste Fund remained whole. Responding to a question from Council Member Green about exceeding the budgeted amount, Mr. Anderson said the Council could approve a budget amendment to increase the amount if needed.

Mr. Anderson commented that the Council had recently received a fee waiver request for \$75, which was less than the cost of staff time expended to process the request. Council Member Green responded that government was not always efficient when it was transparent. Mr. Anderson suggested the amount budgeted by the Council for fee waivers could be used to process the waiving of fees totaling less than a specific amount administratively (he suggested \$200), with a report given to the Council. Council Member Green said the goal of State Code 10-8-2, and the goal of the Council in waiving fees, was for transparency. He emphasized that 10-8-2 was designed for accountability, not efficiency.

Council Member Green expressed the opinion that the definition of non-profit included in the language was too narrow. Mr. Boice explained the State process for filing as a non-profit. Council Member Green asked if the City wanted to require neighborhood groups to formally file as a non-profit entity to get a fee waiver. Chair Whitelock asked how to accomplish providing waiver options for both non-profits and neighborhood groups. Mr. Boice said State Code 10-8-2 specifically stated waivers were for non-profit entities, and did not provide for individuals or community groups.

Council Member Bedore said during his time on the Council, the Council had not denied any request for a fee waiver. He suggested a weekly or bi-weekly report to the Council would be transparent, and said staff could alert the Council if waiver requests were submitted that did not seem to fit the Council's idea of recognized entity or neighborhood group.

Chair Whitelock asked if it would be possible for fee waiver requests to be listed with business items on the Council agenda instead of under public hearings, with money set aside in the budget for such requests. Council Member Green said he believed funds would need to be budgeted for a specific organization to get around 10-8-2 requirements.

Mr. Boice read aloud from West Jordan Code 2-6-1 Attachment A, stating the City may provide both monetary and non-monetary assistance to individuals and entities for the safety, health, prosperity, moral well-being, peace, order, comfort, and convenience of City residents.

Council Member Green did not like that Section 2-6-1 did not address how to administer a 10-8-2 study. He suggested taking fee waivers out of Council Contingency funds, with a line item for Council Contingency and Fee Waivers, with requests included with consent items on Council meeting agendas. City Attorney Josh Chandler said he believed the suggestion could work. Mr. Boice recommended avoiding use of the term "fee waiver" if the Council wanted to avoid the need for public hearing. Chair Whitelock suggested "resident requests for betterment of the City." Mr. Chandler said he agreed with avoiding use of the words "fee waiver."

Council Member Green did not want to put the budgeted funds in any specific department budget because requests for waiver of fees could apply to more than dumpster rentals. Chair Whitelock said she agreed the budgeted amount for fee waivers should be a separate line item from Council Contingency. Mr. Chandler suggested the name "community requested projects." Chair Whitelock said she wanted to require a public hearing for entities such as the Jordan Education Foundation.

Council Members Lamb and Jacob asked why the current process needed to change. Chair Whitelock responded that for waiver requests approved for dumpster fees, the Solid Waste Fund would lose. Mr. Chandler said the current process did not align with 10-8-2, and asked the Council if they wanted a process that contemplated for-profit entities and individuals. Council Member Green suggested using 10-8-2 for non-profit entities, and allocating a line item in the Council Budget to waive fees for dumpsters and other requests from groups or individuals not meeting the definition of non-profit entity, with the request added to consent items on the Council agenda.

Mr. Boice said he believed proposed amendments to Titles 2 and 3 would work with what the Council had discussed, with administrative changes to address some situations. Council Member Green said he would be comfortable adopting the proposed amendments for non-profits, and establishing a process in Council Rules to transfer funds to department budgets to cover costs waived. Council Member Lamb said he had never

heard an accounting of how much situations in which fees were waived cost the different departments.

Mr. Anderson said there was not as much impact with fees waived on the General Fund as on restricted accounts (such as the Solid Waste Fund for dumpsters). He commented that solid waste fees would need to be raised over time to cover the impact of fees waived, unless a transfer of funds were approved to make the Fund whole.

Chair Whitelock wanted a different budget line item for fee waivers separate from Council Contingency. Council Member Jacob suggested the Council needed to address which fees they would want to waive, and which fees should not be waived. Council Member Green believed the Council needed to address fee waivers as a whole, and not get in the weeds of which fees the Council would or would not waive. Mr. Boice noted most school districts listed two facility use fees, with a reduced fee for non-profit entities.

Council Member Jacob expressed concern that proposed 3-4-3a did not address requirements for a fee waiver beyond being a non-profit entity. Mr. Boice said under 10-8-2, the language could not address fee waivers for any other group or individual. He said the goal of the proposed amendments was to bring Code more in line with 10-8-2, and repeated that a contingency fund could cover waiver of fees for other groups or individuals.

Mr. Chandler said staff were hoping to learn if a majority of the Council agreed with establishing a policy and budget to reduce or waive fees for groups or individuals who did not fall under the definition of non-profit entity. Chair Whitelock suggested the Council direct staff to work on a way to allow distribution of funds for groups and individuals.

City Administrator Korban Lee referred to 2-6-3, and asked if the intent was to apply to \$5,000 or more in just monetary support, or in-kind and monetary support. Council Member Green suggested changing the language from "city support" to "city funds." Council Members Whitelock, Lamb, Green, and Shelton expressed support. Council Member Green said he was comfortable with a required report if the support was monetary. Council Members Shelton, Whitelock, Bedore, Jacob, and Bloom expressed agreement.

Council Member Bloom asked if the proposed Code was clear on when audits would be required. Mr. Boice said the situation would not involve an audit of books, as much as an inspection of the way funds were managed. Council Member Bloom wanted the language to be clear. Responding to a question from Mr. Lee, a majority of the Council indicated support for proposed Code Section 2-6-3a.

Mr. Boice would bring amendments back to a future work session.

d. Discussion of Regulations on Electric Micro-Mobility Vehicles

Council Member Shelton said he knew the South Jordan City Council was currently addressing problems with children using electric micro-mobility vehicles. He said he knew children in West Jordan were using electric bikes/motorcycles, and expressed

concern about resident safety. Council Member Shelton read aloud a resident complaint. The Council discussed situations they had seen or heard about involving electric micro-mobility vehicles and potential injury of unexpecting individuals. A video of a child riding an e-bike at approximately 35-40 mph on a residential sidewalk was shown.

Chair Whitelock asked if the Council wanted to put a policy in place. Staff commented that electric micro-mobility vehicles with torque could rip up and damage grass in City parks. Mayor Burton showed a sign that read “speed limit 10 mph when pedestrians present”, and said he wanted to post the sign on the Jordan River Trail, and expand to other trails if the sign helped improve the situation. Mayor Burton expressed the opinion that the City should have a policy of 10 miles per hour maximum on residential sidewalks regardless of the mode of transportation.

Responding to a question from Council Member Green, Chief Robertson said State Code set a limit of 50 mph for a scooter. Chair Whitelock believed public education was needed, and suggested the State Legislature should put something in place since all communities were affected. Chief Robertson said his department planned to put some public education information on their social media. He suggested the Council consider putting regulations in place for motorcycles that were not street legal.

Chair Whitelock said she supported the Mayor’s idea to post signs on the Jordan River Trail. Council Members did not voice disagreement. Chair Whitelock asked if data could be collected. Council Member Jacob wanted to see State law. Council Member Green asked if it would be beneficial to restate State Code in City Code to make the expectation clear. A majority of the Council indicated support for directing staff to draft a potential code to bring back at a future Committee of the Whole meeting.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

None

4. ADJOURN

Chair Whitelock adjourned the meeting at 6:20 pm.

I certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on September 23, 2025. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan Committee of the Whole meeting.

Cindy M. Quick, MMC
Council Office Clerk

Approved this 14th day of October 2025



MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Tuesday, March 24, 2026 – 4:00 pm
Approved April 14, 2026
8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor
West Jordan, UT 84088

1. CALL TO ORDER

COUNCIL: Chair Bob Bedore, Vice Chair Jessica Wignall, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kayleen Whitelock

STAFF: Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice, Mayor Dirk Burton, City Attorney Josh Chandler, Utilities Manager Greg Davenport, Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome, Community Development Director Scott Langford, City Administrator Korban Lee, City Recorder Tangee Sloan

Chair Bedore called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm and noted that Council Member Shelton was excused.

2. DISCUSSION TOPICS

a. Discussion of Performing a Sports Venue Study for the West Jordan Rodeo Arena

City Administrator Korban Lee said a few months ago the Council discussed wanting to do something more with the Rodeo Arena. He said he contacted rodeo and sports venue consultants regarding the cost of a study, and reported a cost range of \$40,000-\$100,000, depending on the scope of the study. He presented questions to the Council to help determine the desired scope.

- Did the Council want the consulting team to look holistically at the sports and entertainment venue competitive landscape in Salt Lake County?
- Did the Council want to consider a sports and entertainment venue at the site that was outside the rodeo tradition for the site? Was it more important to maintain the history and tradition of rodeo at the site, or was it more important to get the best return on investment and frequent use?

Council Member Harris said she wanted the site to remain a rodeo arena. Council Member Jacob said he knew many people felt it was important to preserve a place to have the rodeo. He said he would be interested in a venue that could accommodate the rodeo and other things. Council Member Lamb said he was interested in a venue that was for rodeo first, but similar to the previous Salt Palace in Salt Lake City in terms of flexibility. Council Member Whitelock said she wanted to explore what could be accommodated at the venue in addition to the rodeo to bring in revenue. Chair Bedore said he would love to see more uses at the venue but emphasized the need to consider noise and other possible impacts to the area.

Mr. Lee summarized that the Council felt other uses would be okay, but not at the expense of the rodeo. Vice Chair Wignall suggested the additional uses would not need to be big events with big impacts.

- Did the Council want a study about cost revenue analysis and market feasibility, or a study about architectural design, or both?

The Council discussed the question. Mr. Lee said responses from the Council indicated a desire for the study team to include experts on sports venues and market, as well as architects for building and cost of construction analysis with possible renderings.

Council Member Jacob suggested a study was not necessary if the goal was simply to improve viewer experience at the rodeo. Public Services Director Cory Fralick commented that changing the grandstand would change the footprint, which would require changes to most other aspects of the arena, including utilities, and said new seats alone would cost a minimum of \$1.5 million.

Mr. Lee said City staff had brainstormed a number of ideas for ways to get more use from the arena, but said consultants would hopefully bring a national perspective.

- Did the Council want the study to include an economic impact analysis?

Council Member Lamb said the economic impact that mattered was whether costs would be covered. Council Member Jacob said an economic impact study was needed. Council Member Harris said she believed the Council would regret it if they did not include an economic impact study.

- Did the Council want the study to include a proforma business analysis to know if events would make or lose money?

Council Members Harris and Whitelock said they were more interested in a proforma business analysis than an economic impact analysis. Council Member Jacob suggested both the economic impact analysis and the proforma business analysis would be valid. Mr. Lee said an economic impact analysis worked best on a state or county level.

- Did the Council want to involve the community in the study with a survey?

Mr. Anderson suggested questions could be added to the annual citizen survey. Council Member Whitelock said she would support adding a few questions to the annual survey but was not interested in paying for a separate survey.

Chair Bedore suggested the survey should indicate the Council was considering improvements to the Rodeo Arena, with questions to narrow which improvements the community would want and what level of investment the community would support. A majority of the Council indicated support for adding questions to the annual survey and not including a survey in the scope of the study.

- Did the Council want to ask the Rodeo Committee for input?

Mr. Lee said he knew the Rodeo Committee would be able to provide a big wish list of improvements and ways in which the venue could be made better. If desired, focus groups could be included in the scope of the study. Chair Bedore said he believed the

Rodeo Committee would be able to help with ways to make the venue safer. Council Member Whitelock expressed agreement. She suggested the three groups that used the venue regularly would probably provide three different perspectives. Council Member Whitelock said she agreed with asking the West Jordan Rodeo Committee for input but suggested that asking all the groups may bring complications.

Mr. Lee summarized that the Council wanted to include focus groups in the study, including the Rodeo Committee, recognizing that if other groups were included, competing interests may be involved.

Vice Chair Wignall asked if the venue was used year-round, or only in the summer for the rodeo. Mr. Lee said there was no outstanding debt on the venue, and costs were limited to venue maintenance. He reported there were four event nights when the stands were filled in the last year: three evenings of the Western Stampede and one evening of the Demolition Derby. Previous years may have included a Monster Truck Rally or Mexican Rodeo. In addition to the 4-8 event nights per year, the venue was used for many subevents that did not fill the stands. Mr. Lee said all uses occurred between April and September.

Council Member Whitelock mentioned that several improvements had been made in recent years. Mr. Lee confirmed an average of \$20,000-\$40,000 per year had been allocated for improvements to the venue in the last seven or eight years.

Mr. Lee summarized that the Council wanted the rodeo to remain the core use of the arena with as many other uses as possible, but not at the expense of the rodeo. The Council wanted the study to include: an architectural analysis and venue analysis, cost of scenarios for improvements and construction, creative ideas for additional uses of the venue, economic impact analysis (if not an added cost), proforma business analysis (cost revenue analysis of different possible uses). The Council would add questions to the annual citizen survey about the rodeo arena, and wanted the study to include focus groups with engagement from current or potential users or stakeholders of the venue. Mr. Fralick pointed out expanded uses may require additional staff, and suggested the study include a staffing analysis.

Mr. Lee asked what other aspects the Council wanted the study to consider. Council Member Lamb suggested addressing aesthetics of the park and how the rodeo grounds were integrated and expressed interest in knowing more about adding hookups for rodeo participants.

Mr. Lee said the budget for the current fiscal year did not include funding for a study, and said staff planned to include the cost in the FY2027 Budget. He asked what timeframe the Council had in mind. Council Member Jacob said the study was a one-time expense, and suggested using reserve funds to move forward. Council Member Whitelock expressed agreement, and said she would rather not delay the study. Council Member Lamb said he would prefer to do the study in the current fiscal year. A majority of the Council expressed support for a budget amendment to move forward with a study in the current fiscal year.

b. Discussion of West Jordan City Code – Title 7, Chapter 6 – Electric Bicycles

Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice outlined proposed amendments to City Code to add new language for Title 7, Chapter 6 regarding Electric Bicycles. He asked if the

Council was interested in setting a speed limit of 10 miles per hour (mph) for all vehicles on sidewalks. Mr. Boice spoke of a need for bicycle safety awareness and education.

Council Member Harris asked about Code Enforcement for electronic bicycles. Staff responded that enforcement had depended on the classification of the electronic bicycles, and said a lot of public education had taken place as individuals had been stopped. Deputy Chief Bell said the Police Department would like to see regulation that could be enforced regardless of classification.

Mr. Boice said State restrictions were already adopted in City Code. He suggested specific restrictions should be incorporated into Title 7, Chapter 6 for sidewalks and paths, and speed limits for bicycles on sidewalks. Mr. Boice emphasized the need for continued public awareness.

Council Member Whitelock said she believed electronic bicycles belonged in bicycle lanes on the streets, not on sidewalks. She said it seemed like bicycle speed limits would be difficult to enforce. Mr. Boice asked about limits on the Jordan River Trail. Council Member Whitelock said she would not want to reduce citizen desire to use City trails as long as trail users were not hurt. Council Member Jacob suggested the definitions of sidewalks, multi-use paths, and trails needed to be easily distinguishable from each other.

Deputy Chief Bell said enforceable restrictions were in place for disorderly conduct, and if someone caused a problem the first step would be education, with further action if the problem continued. Mr. Boice said law enforcement had indicated that clear prohibitions for enforcement would be beneficial.

Mr. Boice said State Code provided regulation for use of helmets. Staff provided statistics for accidents and use of helmets. Council Member Jacob said it made common sense that wearing a helmet was better than not wearing a helmet, and suggested part of the discussion should include setting funds aside for public education. Mr. Boice said he knew the Police Department had put out information about electronic bicycle safety, and would continue to do so.

A majority of the Council indicated support for prohibiting use of electronic bicycles on sidewalks, and no operation of electronic bicycles in a negligent or hazardous manner near traffic or pedestrians. Mr. Boice said he would bring back proposed language at a future meeting.

c. Discussion on Proposed Amendments to Council Policies and Procedures Rule 4.1, 4.3, 6.2, 9.3, and Appendix C

Council Office Director Alan Anderson provided a brief background of Council Policies and Procedures (Council Rules). He explained the proposal to remove “attempt to” from Council Rule 4.1(C) regarding Attendance of Members, with the following language remaining: “To participate remotely/electronically in a meeting, a Council Member shall provide advance notice to the Council Chair and the Council Director (or Council Director’s designee) at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.” Mr. Anderson said staff needed time to prepare for electronic Council participation.

Council Member Jacob asked about the possibility of electronic participation in situations of last-minute personal complications. Mr. Anderson emphasized Council Member participation was not required at every meeting. He suggested altering the language to address scheduled versus unscheduled electronic participation.

Mr. Anderson presented proposed amendments to Rules 4.1(v), 4.3(A), 6.2(B), 6.2(C), 6.2(D)(i)(a)(1). The Council discussed proposed changes to 6.2(D)(i)(h) regarding Council Transition Phase. A majority of the Council indicated support for out-going members of the Council not being eligible to participate in Council travel for conferences between the time of the Board of Canvass meeting and the Oath of Office. The Council discussed whether incoming members of the Council should be eligible to participate in conferences for training purposes between the Board of Canvass meeting and the Oath of Office. Council Members Jacob and Bedore said the idea made sense. Vice Chair Wignall said she would not have been comfortable with City money being expended for the purpose prior to her taking the Oath of Office. Mr. Anderson suggested requiring a consensus of the body for conference participation by both incoming and out-going members of the Council.

Mr. Anderson presented proposed amendments to Rule 9.3 regarding Removal of Agenda Item, and proposed amendments to Appendix C regarding Item Workflows. He said he would make changes discussed and bring the amendments back to a future meeting.

d. *Post Legislative Session Overview*

Adam Gardiner provided an overview of the 2026 Legislative Session. He highlighted legislation that would impact West Jordan, including: House Bill 68 concerning housing; House Bill 76 concerning data centers; House Bill 236 concerning tax increases; House Bill 492 and House Bill 507 concerning transportation funding, revitalization, tax increment funding, and infrastructure funding; Senate Bill 130, which appropriated \$2 million for Jordan River Projects; and Senate Bill 197 concerning the makeup of UTA. The Council thanked Mr. Gardiner for the report.

3. *ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS*

Chair Bedore reminded the Council of a Committee of the Whole meeting scheduled for March 31, 2026 for discussion of the Southwest Quadrant. Council Members Jacob and Whitelock asked that a clear definition of “high tech manufacturing” and a use table be prepared. Mr. Lee said staff had questions for the Council regarding what was wanted in the Southwest Quadrant. Chair Bedore said he agreed the Council wanted definitions.

4. *ADJOURN*

Chair Bedore adjourned the meeting at 6:19 pm.

I certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on March 24, 2026. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan Committee of the Whole meeting.

Cindy M. Quick, MMC
Council Office Clerk

Approved this 14th day of April 2026



**Minutes of the City of West Jordan
City Council Meeting
Tuesday, June 23, 2026 – 7:00 pm
Approved July 14, 2026
8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor
West Jordan, UT 84088**

1. Call to Order

Council: Chair Bob Bedore, Vice Chair Jessica Wignall, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock

Staff: Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice, Mayor Dirk Burton, City Attorney Josh Chandler, Budget & Management Analyst Rebecca Condie, Public Services Director Cory Fralick, Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome, Community Development Director Scott Langford, Public Information Manager Marie Magers, City Administrator Korban Lee, Fire Chief Derek Maxfield, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick, Administrative Services Director Danyce Steck, Attendee Walter Schmidt

Chair Bedore called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm, and noted that Council Member Jacob participated remotely.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Utah Veterans of Foreign Wars provided a flag ceremony.

3. Council & Mayor Reports

a. City Council Reports

- Chair Bedore invited Christian Meador, Commander of Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) Post 12087, to the microphone. Commander Metter presented gifts of appreciation to Fire Department and Police Department leadership for letting Post 12087 meet at Fire Station 54. The Council took the opportunity for a photograph.
- Chair Bedore said it had been an honor to serve as Council Chair during the last six months, and said he looked forward to Council Member Wignall serving as Chair.
- Council Member Whitelock said she appreciated the opportunity to attend the dedication and blessing of the new Holy Cross CommonSpirit Hospital Chapel.
- Council Member Harris thanked City staff for the recent movie in the park event.
- Council Member Shelton reported on a recent Association of Municipal Councils meeting. He thanked West Jordan Animal Services for serving his family recently with kindness and patience as they said goodbye to a dear family pet.

b. Mayor's Report

Mayor Burton reported on recent events in the community and encouraged participation in

upcoming activities. City offices would be closed on July 3, 2026.

c. City Administrator's Report

City Administrator Korban Lee recognized the role Public Services Director Cory Fralick played in the addition of the newly opened Mini-Pitch amenity. Mr. Lee said staff were working hard to reduce the City's water use while also keeping the parks usable. He reported a Recreation Bond proposal for a recreation center in the Ron Wood Park area had been submitted, and said he anticipated giving a presentation to the bond board on July 10, 2026. Mr. Lee provided an update on a water tank mural.

4. Public Comment

Chair Bedore opened public comment at 7:21 pm.

Comments:

Kelvin Green, West Jordan resident and representative on the Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District (SLVMAD) Board, provided an update on SLVMAD. Mr. Green thanked Mayor Burton and Korban Lee for helping on some recent projects. He said the Council Members had each been given an envelope with an America 250 coin and pin, asked the Council to wear the pins, and invited the Council to his neighborhood's America 250 potluck block party.

Ann Marie Barrett, Bingham Creek Library Manager, reported the summer reading kickoff party was well attended. She announced upcoming programs and encouraged participation.

Sarah Stevens expressed concern about the current lack of water, and encouraged the Council to change with the environment. She said she did not understand how no one seemed concerned that Hoover Dam did not have enough water.

Ryan Wilkinson said he liked Sarah Stevens' comments. He said his comments kept getting cut off during the public comment period before he finished his thoughts. Mr. Wilkinson said he continued to comment during Council meetings even though he no longer lived in West Jordan because Council Member Jacob sent him a cease-and-desist letter. Mr. Wilkinson stated shutting down public speech was illegal.

Chair Bedore mentioned that the three-minute time limit ran out for both Ms. Stevens and Mr. Wilkinson, and explained that the microphone automatically turned off after three minutes.

Chair Bedore closed public comments at 7:36 pm.

5. Public Hearings

a. Resolution No. 26-034 Amending the Property Tax Impact Schedule for Fiscal Year 2027

Administrative Services Director Danyce Steck presented a proposed resolution to amend the Property Tax Impact Schedule for FY2027, and said the Council discussed the proposed amendment during the work session prior to the Council meeting. She said updated certified property tax information was received from the County on June 12, 2026, necessitating an

update to the Property Tax Impact Schedule, which had been initially put together with estimates made in May.

	Original	Amended
Proposed Revenue with Tax Change	\$22,667,562	\$23,638,541
West Jordan Certified Property Tax Revenue	\$22,167,144	\$23,138,123
Additional Property Tax Revenue to West Jordan	\$500,418	\$500,418
West Jordan City 2025 Property Tax Rate	0.001328	0.001328
West Jordan City 2026 Certified Property Tax Rate	NA	0.001281
West Jordan City 2026 Proposed Property Tax Rate	NA	0.001309
Increase to West Jordan Property Tax Revenue	2.26%	2.19%

Ms. Steck said the City would receive certified property tax revenue exceeding what had been anticipated, due to new growth in West Jordan. The original schedule did not include any revenue for new growth. Ms. Steck said the Property Tax Impact Schedule should include items the Council was willing to go without if the property tax increase did not pass, and items the Council was willing to restrict until September 1, 2026.

Ms. Steck said the Council had discussed and determined that items previously disclosed on the Property Tax Impact Schedule as items to be funded with a property tax increase, were items attributed to new growth that would be paid for by the new growth. She said the property tax increase was proposed to cover inflationary cost increases. The Council determined that the following two items would be listed on the Property Tax Impact Schedule for FY2027:

Fuel Cost Increase (inflationary)	\$250,209
IT Cost Increase (inflationary)	\$250,209
Total	\$500,418

Ms. Steck said the proposed property tax increase was consistent with the Council's philosophy that tax increases should be small and align with inflation. She said inflation was currently at 4%, and the proposed increase was only 2.19%.

Chair Bedore opened a public hearing at 7:43 pm.

Comments:

None

Chair Bedore closed the public hearing at 7:44 pm.

Motion: Council Member Shelton moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 26-034 Amending the Property Tax Impact Schedule for Fiscal Year 2027.

Vice Chair Wignall seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

Council Member Whitelock thanked staff for preparing the information so quickly after the previous work session.

b. Public Hearing on the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2027

Ms. Steck said when it was adopted, the Interim Budget would become the City's operational budget on July 1, 2026. Items funded by the property tax increase (listed on the Property Tax Impact Schedule) would be held as restricted until after the truth-in-taxation process and final budget adoption in August. Budget amendments could be made at any time with the proper noticing and public hearing process.

Ms. Steck presented administrative changes to the budget to carry forward projects from FY2026. The proposed resolution would set a public hearing for the proposed property tax increase and adoption of the Annual Budget for August 11, 2026.

Chair Bedore opened a public hearing at 7:50 pm.

Comments:

None

Chair Bedore closed the public hearing at 7:51 pm.

6. Business Items

a. Ordinance No. 26-32 Amending the Street Lighting Design and Construction Standards, Section 16500

Public Services Director Cory Fralick presented updated Street Lighting Design and Construction Standards, and asked the Council to adopt the proposed ordinance. Mr. Fralick answered questions from the Council. Mayor Burton commented that the proposed specs would give manufacturers more flexibility and opportunity to compete. Council Member Shelton thanked Mr. Fralick for his work on the amendments.

Motion: Council Member Whitelock moved to **APPROVE Ordinance No. 26-32 Amending the Street Lighting Design and Construction Standards, Section 16500.**

Vice Chair Wignall seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

b. Resolution No. 26-020 Establishing the Water and Sewer Rates

Administrative Services Director Danyce Steck said the Council reviewed water and sewer rate studies during the work session prior to the Council meeting. She said no change was recommended to the water base charge and usage rates, and a 5% increase was recommended for the sewer rate, effective October 1, 2026.

Council Member Whitelock asked how the lead and copper charge was assessed. Greg Davenport said the lead and copper charge was a fee that could be charged to individuals who chose not to participate in the program required by the federal government.

Motion: Chair Bedore moved to **APPROVE Resolution No. 26-020 Establishing the Water and Sewer Rates.**

Council Member Lamb seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

c. Resolution No. 26-021 Amending the West Jordan City Consolidated Fee Schedule

Ms. Steck said all departments were asked to review related fees and submit any changes as part of annual budget preparation. She presented an updated Consolidated Fee Schedule. Council Member Whitelock said she believed cemetery fees needed to be reviewed and increased.

Motion: Vice Chair Wignall moved to **APPROVE Resolution No. 26-021 Amending the West Jordan City Consolidated Fee Schedule.**

Council Member Shelton seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

d. Resolution No. 26-024 Acknowledging the Intent to Exceed the Certified Tax Levy and Scheduling a Public Hearing Regarding the Proposed Property Tax Increase

Ms. Steck showed how the average home value in West Jordan had changed since 2015, and explained that in Utah, as home values went up, property tax rates went down. Property tax revenue received by a municipality did not increase except from new growth, unless the municipality went through the truth-in-taxation process to increase the tax rate. Ms. Steck showed that property tax on an average home in West Jordan went down by \$13 from 2024 to 2025. Without the proposed property tax rate increase, the property tax on an average home would go down by \$6 per year in 2026, and with the proposed increase would go up by \$3. She said a majority of the Council had indicated support for setting the property tax rate at 0.001309 (a 2.19% increase), and said the proposed resolution would acknowledge the intent to exceed the certified tax rate and set a public hearing.

Motion: Council Member Lamb moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 26-024 Acknowledging the Intent to Exceed the Certified Tax Levy and Scheduling a Public Hearing Regarding the Proposed Property Tax Increase.

Chair Bedore seconded the motion.

Council Member Whitelock said she would vote in favor of the motion, but would not necessarily vote in favor of a property tax increase in August. She said she hoped the Council would be able to make more changes, and hoped for more public input.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

e. Resolution No. 26-025 Amending the Tentative Budget and Adopting the Interim Budget for FY 2027, and Scheduling a Public Hearing Before Adoption of the Annual Budget

Ms. Steck said the proposed resolution would amend the Tentative Budget and adopt the Interim Budget for FY2027, and schedule a public hearing for August 11, 2026.

Motion: Vice Chair Wignall moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 26-025 Amending the Tentative Budget and Adopting the Interim Budget for FY2027 and Scheduling a Public Hearing Before Adoption of the Annual Budget.

Council Member Shelton seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

f. Resolution No. 26-030 and Ordinance No. 26-33 Amendments to Council Policies and Procedures and City Code for Advice and Consent

Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice presented proposed amendments to Council Policies and Procedures (Resolution No. 26-030) and City Code for Advice and Consent (Ordinance No. 26-33).

Motion: Council Member Whitelock moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 26-030 Amendments to Council Policies and Procedures.

Vice Chair Wignall seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

Motion: Council Member Whitelock moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 26-33 amending City Code Title 1, Chapter 7 and Title 2, Chapter 1 Advice and Consent.

Chair Bedore seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

g. Resolution No. 26-033 Formalizing the Appointment of Council Leadership Positions (Chair, Vice Chair, and Past Chair) for the Period of July - December 2026

Council Office Director Alan Anderson said the Council adopted a rotation schedule for Chair, Vice Chair, and Past Chair positions. Beginning July 1, 2026, Council Member Wignall would be Council Chair. Following the set rotation, Council Member Jacob would be the next Vice Chair. Acknowledging that the intent was to make sure everyone had a turn while in office, Council Members Jacob and Shelton agreed to swap, with Council Member Shelton serving as the next Vice Chair. Mr. Anderson explained rotation provisions that provided for an experienced member of the Council to fill the position of Chair following elections.

Council Member Lamb expressed frustration that he had previously proposed a rotation process that would ensure a member of the Council had at least six months experience before serving in a leadership position, but his proposal had not been accepted, yet the Council were now asked to approve a change to the rotation.

Motion: Chair Bedore moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 26-033 Formalizing the Appointment of Council Leadership Positions (Chair, Vice-Chair, and Past Chair) for the Period of July - December 2026.
Vice Chair Wignall seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

Chair Bedore said he had faith that everyone on the Council would be able to fill the roll of Chair.

7. Council Office Report

Policy Analyst Walter Schmidt provided an update on the Youth Council. Chair Bedore said he looked forward to seeing the 2026-2027 Youth Council

8. Consent Items

a. Approve Meeting Minutes

- **June 9, 2026 – Committee of the Whole Meeting**
- **June 9, 2026 – Regular City Council Meeting**

Motion: Council Member Whitelock moved to APPROVE Consent Items as listed.
Chair Bedore seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

9. Adjourn

Chair Bedore adjourned the meeting at 8:31 pm.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on June 23, 2026. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan City Council meeting.

/s/ Cindy M. Quick, MMC
Council Office Clerk

Approved this 14th day of July 2026

Request For Council Action

Action: Need Council to Take Action

Meeting Date Requested : 09/08/2026

Presenter: Patrick S Boice, Senior Assistant City Attorney

Deadline of item :

Applicant: City Attorney's Office

Department Sponsor: City Attorney's Office

Agenda Type: Business Items

Presentation Time: 10 Minutes

(Council may elect to provide more or less time)

1. Agenda Subject

Ordinance No. 26-46 Enacting Title 7, Chapter 2, Section 3 Negligently Colliding

2. Executive Summary

On April 14, 2026, amendments were made to the City Code which removed certain code sections in favor of deferring to State Code. The council adopted these changes with Ordinance 26-22. One of the deleted sections of Code was 7-2-4, Negligently Colliding. That particular charge, though not necessarily used by law enforcement officers, is used by the City's prosecution team to charge and prosecute traffic matters within the City. It has historically been a valuable tool. This text amendment seeks to reinsert the charge of negligently colliding back into the City Code, exactly as previously stated, to assist in ensuring the safety of the community.

3. Time Sensitivity / Urgency

This charge is a valuable courtroom tool which assists our City prosecution team.

4. Fiscal Note

None

5. Staff Analysis

There is no staff analysis as this is a reinsertion of the same code from April.

6. Mayor Recommendation

7. Council Staff Analysis

The proposed ordinance would restore a traffic violation that was recently removed from the West Jordan City Code. It would make it a City violation to operate a vehicle without reasonable care and, as a result, collide with another vehicle, a person, or an object. The provision was previously part of the City Code and has historically been used by the City's prosecution team in traffic-related cases. The Council may wish to consider whether restoring this provision would continue to provide a useful local option for prosecuting these types of cases.

This same language was included from the 2001 code until 2026.

8. Possible Council Action

The Council may choose to take one of the following actions:

1. Approve the Ordinance as written and proposed OR with stated amendments;
2. Not Approve the Ordinance;
3. Refer the item back to a Committee of the Whole Meeting;
4. Refer the item back to Council Staff or Administrative Staff.

9. Attachments

Ordinance No. 26-46

Attachment A - Title 7, Chapter 2, Section 3 - Negligently Colliding (Legislative)

Attachment B - Title 7, Chapter 2, Section 3 - Negligently Colliding (Clean)

1 THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN, UTAH
2 ORDINANCE NO. 26-46

3 AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN CITY CODE
4 (NEGLIGENT COLLISION);
5 Title 7, Chapter 2, Section 3

6 WHEREAS, the City of West Jordan (“City”) adopted West Jordan City Code (“City Code”) in 2009; and the City Council of the City (“Council” or “City Council”) desires to amend Title 7, Chapter 2 of the City Code (“proposed City Code amendments”); and

9 WHEREAS, the City Council desires to amend the City Code to enable law enforcement to address situations which endanger the health and safety of the community; and

11 WHEREAS, the City Council finds it to be in the best interest of the public health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the City to adopt the proposed City Code amendments.

13 NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN, UTAH AS FOLLOWS:

15 **Section 1. Amendment of City Code Provision.** City Code Title 7, Chapter 2, Section 3 is amended as shown in Attachments 1 (Legislative Version) and 2 (Clean Version) to this Ordinance.

17 **Section 2. Severability.** If any provision of this Ordinance is declared to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder shall not be affected thereby.

19 **Section 4. Effective Date.** This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon posting or publication as provided by law and upon (i) the Mayor signing the Ordinance, (ii) the City Council duly overriding the veto of the Mayor as provided by law, or (iii) the Mayor failing to sign or veto the Ordinance within fifteen (15) days after the City Council presents the Ordinance to the Mayor.

23 PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN, UTAH, THIS
24 _____ DAY OF _____ 2026.

26 CITY OF WEST JORDAN

28 By: _____
29 Jessica Wignall
30 Council Chair

31 ATTEST:

32 _____
33
34 Cindy M. Quick, MMC
35 Council Office Clerk
36
37
38
39
40

Voting by the City Council

"YES"

"NO"

Council Chair Jessica Wignall

☐☐

Council Vice-Chair Kent Shelton

☐☐

Council Member Chad Lamb

☐☐

Council Member Kayleen Whitelock

☐☐

Council Member Annette Harris

☐☐

Council Member Bob Bedore

☐☐

Council Member Zach Jacob

☐☐

PRESENTED TO THE MAYOR BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON _____.

Mayor's Action: _____ Approve _____ Veto

By: _____
Mayor Dirk Burton Date

ATTEST:

Tangee Sloan, MMC, UCC
City Recorder

STATEMENT OF APPROVAL/PASSAGE (check one)

_____ The Mayor approved and signed Ordinance No. 26-46.

_____ The Mayor vetoed Ordinance No. 26-46 on _____ and the
City Council timely overrode the veto of the Mayor by a vote of _____ to _____.

_____ Ordinance No. 26-46 became effective by operation of law without the
Mayor's approval or disapproval.

Tangee Sloan, MMC, UCC
City Recorder

87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION

I, Tangee Sloan, certify that I am the City Recorder of the City of West Jordan, Utah, and that a short summary of the foregoing ordinance was published on the Utah Public Notice Website on the _____ day of _____ 2026. The fully executed copy of the ordinance is retained in the Office of the City Recorder pursuant to Utah Code Annotated, 10-3-711.

Tangee Sloan, MMC, UCC
City Recorder

(Attachments on the following pages.)

128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170

**Attachments 1 and 2 to
ORDINANCE NO. 26-46
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN CITY CODE
(NEGLIGENT COLLISION);
Title 7, Chapter 2, Section 3**

Attachment 1 – Title 7, Chapter 2, Section 3 - Legislative Version

Attachment 2 – Title 7, Chapter 2, Section 3 - Clean Version

(See the following pages for the attachments.)

1 TITLE 7
2 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC

3 CHAPTER 2
4 OPERATION OF VEHICLES

5 SECTION:

6 7-2-1: Cutting Through Corners

7 7-2-2: Improper Lookout

8 7-2-3: Negligently Colliding

9

10 7-2-1: CUTTING THROUGH CORNERS:

11 It is unlawful for any person to drive a motor vehicle through any private driveway, lot or
12 similar area, whether vacant or not, for the purpose and with the intent of avoiding
13 obedience to any traffic regulation or for the purpose and with intent of harassing and
14 annoying the owner or his patrons. (2001 Code § 86-2-112)

15

16 7-2-2: IMPROPER LOOKOUT:

17 It is unlawful for any person to drive a vehicle on the roadway without keeping a
18 reasonable and proper lookout for other traffic, objects, fixtures or property on or adjacent
19 to the roadway. (2001 Code § 86-2-118)

20

21 7-2-3: NEGLIGENCE COLLIDING:

22 It is unlawful for any person to operate a vehicle with such lack of due care and in such
23 negligent manner as to cause the vehicle to collide with any vehicle, person or object. (2001
24 Code § 86-2-121)

1 TITLE 7
2 MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC
3 CHAPTER 2
4 OPERATION OF VEHICLES
5 SECTION:
6 7-2-1: Cutting Through Corners
7 7-2-2: Improper Lookout
8 7-2-3: Negligently Colliding
9
10 7-2-1: CUTTING THROUGH CORNERS:
11 It is unlawful for any person to drive a motor vehicle through any private driveway, lot or
12 similar area, whether vacant or not, for the purpose and with the intent of avoiding
13 obedience to any traffic regulation or for the purpose and with intent of harassing and
14 annoying the owner or his patrons. (2001 Code § 86-2-112)
15
16 7-2-2: IMPROPER LOOKOUT:
17 It is unlawful for any person to drive a vehicle on the roadway without keeping a
18 reasonable and proper lookout for other traffic, objects, fixtures or property on or adjacent
19 to the roadway. (2001 Code § 86-2-118)
20
21 7-2-3: NEGLIGENCELY COLLIDING:
22 It is unlawful for any person to operate a vehicle with such lack of due care and in such
23 negligent manner as to cause the vehicle to collide with any vehicle, person or object. (2001
24 Code § 86-2-121)



Minutes of the City of West Jordan
Committee of the Whole
Tuesday, August 25, 2026 – 4:00 pm
Waiting Formal Approval
8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor
West Jordan, UT 84088

1. Call to Order

Council: Chair Jessica Wignall, Vice Chair Kent Shelton, Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kayleen Whitelock

Staff: Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Senior Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice, Mayor Dirk Burton, Public Works Director Brian Clegg, Utilities Manager Greg Davenport, Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome, Community Development Director Scott Langford, City Administrator Korban Lee, Public Information Manager Marie Magers, Senior Planner Ray McCandless, Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick, City Recorder Tangee Sloan, Policy Analyst Walter Schmidt

Chair Wignall called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm, and noted that Council Member Bedore participated remotely, and Council Member Harris would join shortly.

2. Discussion Topics

a. Follow up Discussion of Revised Concept Plan, Land Use, and Zoning for Sundial Townhomes (West Ridge Academy)

Senior Planner Ray McCandless presented a revised concept plan for Sundial Townhomes on West Ridge Academy property. Community Development Director Scott Langford said he believed DAI Utah had done a great job of listening to the Council and revising their plan. Mr. Langford said some of the existing uses in the area were fairly heavy and intense, and said he received complaint calls from both residents and businesses about other businesses in the area. He said mitigating and resolving some of the impacts were difficult.

Council Member Harris joined at 4:05 pm.

Chase Andrizzi with DAI Utah said a lot of Council feedback and neighborhood feedback had been incorporated into the concept plan. He showed the revised concept plan compared to the previous plan, and emphasized that the proposed number of units had reduced from 345 to 299, with overall density reduced from 10.8 to 9.64 units per acre. Parking spaces per unit had increased from 3.75 to 4.36. All units along Bagley Park Road had been flipped to be inward facing, and an eight-foot wall on top of a two-foot berm was proposed.

Mr. Andrizzi said concerns were expressed by residents about a trail connection to

Wildflower Park, so alternatively, a sidewalk along Bagley Park Road that would connect to the existing neighborhood was proposed to provide safe pedestrian access. Council Member Lamb questioned whether it would be right to block access for the development to the City park.

Mr. Andrizzi said the previous plan included converting existing buildings for some type of affordable housing, but with further discussion, the applicant proposed to remove the existing buildings to put in more houses that would look like the rest of the neighborhood. One existing building would remain for a daycare. The previous plan included a number of three-story units, and the revised plan did not exceed two stories. The revised plan contained townhomes with a two-bedroom unit upstairs and a one-bedroom unit downstairs, as shown in the previous plan. Both units would have a garage and driveway space. Mr. Andrizzi encouraged members of the Council to visit the DAI Utah H2O development in West Valley City.

Mr. Andrizzi showed proposed amenities, including a clubhouse (converted existing building), tot lot, dog park, fire pit, and an outdoor ping pong/putting green/cornhole area. He proposed that the existing six-foot precast fence remain, with addition of an eight-foot precast fence added to areas without precast fencing to complete the perimeter.

Responding to a question from Council Member Whitelock, Mr. Andrizzi said the shortest proposed driveway length was 20 feet. He showed a proposed parking plan, and said the hope with providing off-street guest parking areas would be to take parking pressure off of Bagley Park Road. He showed public transportation access from the development, and showed an expected traffic flow map, emphasizing there were many accesses in and out of the development. Mr. Andrizzi emphasized that the applicant had tried to address all the feedback that had been received.

Council Member Whitelock asked how many of the units the applicant intended to rent versus sell. Mr. Andrizzi said they had talked about 2/3 for rent and 1/3 for sale to start. Council Member Whitelock asked if the applicant would sell a portion or all of the project to American Homes 4 Rent (AMH Homes). Brian Flam with DAI Utah said they had never before talked to AMH Homes about selling a project. Mr. Andrizzi said the applicant would be willing to commit to not selling the project to AMH Homes if necessary. He said DAI Utah had found it was easiest if they were the only group involved.

Council Member Whitelock felt the proposed unit count was still higher than the City had water and sewer for, and said she could not support the development unless the applicant could tell her how they would get water. She agreed that a trail to Wildflower Park was not necessary from the development, adding the belief that people in Utah just don't walk to TRAX stations. Council Member Whitelock stated that every driveway needed to be 22 feet long. She was interested to hear that residents and other business representatives at a recent neighborhood meeting said they would rather have more businesses or industrial on the property.

Council Member Whitelock was concerned about the practice of entitling development and giving direction to an applicant to find enough water before beginning construction. She suggested the Council not entitle properties for more development than the City already had water for without the applicant presenting where they would get the needed water. Council Member Jacob said he would not personally need that level of information. He said he had yet to see a house built in West Jordan without sewer or water.

Council Member Jacob did not like the idea of walling off the City park. Council Member Lamb suggested adding gate access to the park. Council Member Whitelock noted that current residents did not want the new development to have direct access to the park. Council Member Jacob expressed the opinion that City residents should not be walled off from access to a City park. Council Member Whitelock pointed out the property was already walled off from the park with the Boys Ranch, and Council Member Jacob responded the Boys Ranch use was entirely different from a residential neighborhood. Council Member Whitelock said existing residents bought homes in a single-family neighborhood for a reason, and the proposed development was much higher density. Mr. Andrizzi said the applicant would be fine with or without access to the park.

Chair Wignall said she had the same concerns with density as Council Member Whitelock. Vice Chair Shelton expressed the opinion that the density was too high. He said he did not think he would be in favor of residential use at the subject location even if the homes were on quarter-acre lots, because the use was wrong for the location. Vice Chair Shelton suggested the appropriate use was industrial. He pointed out there was no sidewalk on Old Bingham Highway for safe pedestrian access to the TRAX station. He commented that whatever was approved would be a blueprint for the Girls Ranch property in the future. Vice Chair Shelton said he was looking for some sort of light industrial and office warehouse. He congratulated the applicant on an impressive development plan, and said he had nothing against what was proposed except the location.

Council Member Jacob commented that every development was different, and said he tried to work off a set of principles and best practices that made sense to him. He said low-density residential next to industrial was not compatible, and something was needed in between. He said the existing Public Facility Zone would work, as well as really light industrial, possibly commercial, or a denser residential project. Council Member Jacob expressed the opinion that the proposed project would be compatible with both surrounding uses, as long as details were worked out.

Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome said the applicant needed to know what use the Council would favor. Vice Chair Shelton said he would not be in favor of any residential, regardless of the density. He said he could not in good faith ask a resident to walk to the TRAX station with zero sidewalk. Council Member Jacob suggested that with trail access to the City park, residents would not have to walk to the station without sidewalk. Vice Chair Shelton said he could not ask residents to accept that scenario either.

Mr. Flam commented that industrial had been proposed for the property six years ago and

was denied. Council Members Whitelock and Lamb said the objection had been to the type of industrial proposed.

Council Member Harris liked the proposed design with the imperial units and wanted something like them in West Jordan. Council Member Harris felt she needed more time for consideration and wanted to better understand Vice Chair Shelton's opinion. Council Member Lamb said his biggest concerns were density, location, and traffic, and mentioned concerns about water as well.

Mayor Burton said staff needed to know what the Council wanted and how to best help the property owner. He asked for further direction. Mr. Flam suggested changing the outer-most layer to single-family for another layer of transition. Responding to the Mayor's comments, Mr. Langford said the issue boiled down to land use. He said there were other zones staff could suggest for the property if the Council did not believe residential was a good fit.

Chair Wignall said she wanted to better understand Vice Chair Shelton's opinion, and said she had concerns with density and utilities. She said she was interested in hearing other zones that staff would recommend for the location. Council Member Whitelock said she was not against residential, but the proposal was too dense. She said the General Plan specified that a rezone needed to work with existing uses, and suggested a mix with single-family adjacent to existing single-family, and businesses (incubator space) on Bagley.

Chair Wignall said she appreciated the work the applicant had done. She suggested Mr. Langford give a presentation to the Council concerning alternative land uses at a future meeting. At least three members of the Council expressed agreement. Mr. Andrizzi said continued discussion with staff about particular issues would be helpful. Council Member Lamb said he did not think the current proposal would pass with the current Council. Council Office Director Alan Anderson commented that the risk of expending funds on a direction the Council may not approve was on the applicant. Mr. Anderson said it was clear that at least four members of the Council would not approve the concept plan included in the agenda packet.

Council Member Whitelock suggested Mr. Langford share information about alternative land uses at the end of the meeting if there was time.

b. * ~~Discussion of Lewiston Place, a 176-Unit Townhome Development Involving a Preliminary Development Plan and an Amendment to The Highlands Master Development Plan~~

c. Discussion of Solid Waste Collection Contract Levels of Service

Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome reported three responses were received to the RFP (request for proposals) for solid waste collection. The responses included a 10-year price guarantee, and an inflationary factor of no more than 5% per year, based on the CPI. Mr. Jerome shared the following current service numbers:

Total # of accounts:	26,644	
Basic service cans:	79,932	\$24.72 per month
2 nd garbage cans:	4,928	\$15.19 per month
2 nd recycling cans:	438	\$7.61 per month
2 nd seasonal cans:	496	\$9.51 per month

Responding to a question from Council Member Jacob, Mayor Burton said a majority of recycling collected in West Jordan was recycled. Staff reported 26% in 2026 had been contaminated and had gone to the landfill. Mayor Burton encouraged members of the Council to schedule a ride-along. He said he had watched reaction in cities that discontinued recycling service, and found that residents had not been happy with the decision to discontinue the service.

Mr. Jerome said collection represented between 47% and 57% of the total cost of solid waste services. Landfill costs, the dumpster program, and support services influenced future fee calculation. He emphasized that the new contract fees presented were estimates, and rates were not guaranteed. Mr. Jerome said the seasonal green can service had been a problem, and staff did not recommend continuing the seasonal can service between April and November each year.

The Council and staff discussed recycling utilization and contamination rates, and the possibility of switching from weekly recycling collection to bi-weekly collection. Mr. Jerome said staff had wondered if bi-weekly collection would decrease contamination because space would become more of a 'premium'. He presented two options for base level of service with bi-weekly recycling collection: Option A with a black can and bi-weekly blue recycling can at \$20.00 per month; or Option B with a black can, bi-weekly blue can, and a year-round green can that would no longer function as a seasonal can for \$22.50 per month. Mr. Jerome said staff recommended bi-weekly recycling collection, with the seasonal green can eliminated. Council Member Lamb said he thought most residents would be willing to pay the additional \$2.50 per month to have an additional year-round can.

Mr. Jerome presented two options for base service with weekly recycling collection: Option C with a black can and a blue can for \$21.50 per month; or Option D with weekly black, blue, and green cans (no longer seasonal) for \$24.75. Council Member Whitelock suggested the tipping fees paid by the City would increase with weekly collection of three cans per account. Council Member Lamb said he did not use his green can every week.

Administrative Services Director Danyce Steck said the questions for the Council to discuss were whether they wanted weekly or bi-weekly recycling collection, and whether they wanted two or three cans as the base service level. Vice Chair Shelton said he had an older neighbor who he suspected would only need one black can, and suggested a single black can base level with the ability to add more as needed. Mr. Jerome said the bids were based on an assumption of a certain amount of recycling collected.

Vice Chair Shelton said for his household he thought Option B would be the best deal, but

said he was not sure it would be the best deal for the City as a whole. Council Member Harris said based on census data, she did not think most residents would need three cans. Council Member Whitelock said she was in favor of bi-weekly recycling collection. Council Member Harris said she agreed. Chair Wignall said her recycling was already collected bi-weekly. Council Member Lamb said he was in favor of Option B. Council Member Jacob said his home was under private contract with only one black can.

Council Member Jacob asked if residents would get confused about which week it was with bi-weekly recycling collection. Mayor Burton said some confusion was possible, but people would get used to it.

Council Member Jacob said he preferred Option C, but for bi-weekly recycling collection he liked Option A. City Administrator Korban Lee commented that if the Council chose Option A as the base level of service, residents would still be able to choose to pay to have a third can. He said staff recommended Option A as the base level because every resident could buy up according to their needs. Ms. Steck explained that in the billing system, existing accounts with a green can would be automatically billed for the extra can (additional \$9 per month) unless the residents contacted the City to opt out of the third can. New accounts would default to Option A. Ms. Steck said the new billing would be implemented on July 1, 2027, so residents would have nine months to contact the City and have an unwanted green can picked up. Council Member Whitelock said she liked Option A for the base level.

Mr. Anderson commented that the current base level was a black can, a blue can, and a green can. Council Member Harris said she anticipated that taking the green can away would make residents mad. Chair Wignall said she agreed. Council Member Lamb said he did not think it made sense to remove the green can from the base level of service if the additional cost to provide a three-can base level was only \$2.50 per month. He said he wanted a third can, and would rather pay an extra \$2.50 than \$9.00 per month.

Public Information Manager Marie Magers said there had already been a lot of public comment online, and many residents had said they did not want the green can unless it was used for green waste (original intention). Staff emphasized that both Options B and D would have the green cans functioning as year-round regular waste cans. Council Member Lamb said he had heard from many residents that they wanted green waste collection in March and November, when it had not been available.

Mr. Jerome said when the Council had determined the desired service levels, the City's purchasing agent would reach out to all bid respondents to request a 'best and final' bid. Final technical scores would be combined with the score from 'best and final' bids to determine the winning bidder. The new contract would begin on July 1, 2027.

Council Member Jacob said he was told by a representative of Wasatch Front Waste & Recycling District (WFWRD) that WFWRD could provide green waste collection service as a separate contract.

Council Member Jacob said he would support Options A or C. Council Members Whitelock, Harris, Wignall, and Shelton said they would support Option A. Council Member Lamb said he supported Option B, and expressed frustration that he would need to pay more to keep the extra can. Vice Chair Shelton said he wanted to do what was best for the City as a whole, and said he understood Council Member Lamb's point. Council Member Lamb said he had needed the third seasonal can at his home. Council Member Whitelock said she was interested in learning more about the green waste collection option with WFWRD.

Council Member Bedore said he regularly filled up the blue recycling can weekly. With bi-weekly recycling, he said he would probably have to take cardboard somewhere else to recycle. He said he would prefer Option C, but would support the majority decision. Council Member Jacob said he agreed. Chair Wignall said she could support Options A or B.

Staff emphasized that the green can would function as a regular 'black' can going forward. Vice Chair Shelton said it seemed that Option B would provide a big benefit for only \$2.50 extra per month. Council Member Lamb said he saw the green cans on the street every week in his neighborhood. Council Members Lamb, Shelton, and Wignall indicated support for Option B. Council Members Whitelock, Harris, Jacob, and Bedore indicated support for Option A.

d. Discussion Regarding Proposed Amendments to City Code 1-15-4 (D) Disclosure of Campaign Contributions and Expenditures

City Recorder Tangee Sloan updated the Council on State requirements concerning year-end campaign financial reports (SB321). An annual candidate financial disclosure would be due January 10 following any general election. The requirement would apply to all candidates, including those who did not prevail, and annual reporting would continue while campaign funds remained or until a Campaign Account Dissolution Form was filed. Current City Code, adopted in December 2020, required an annual updated campaign finance report for sitting elected officials due April 1 of each year.

Ms. Sloan asked if the Council wanted to require both reports, one due January 10 for the State and one due April 1 for the City, or wanted to amend City Code to align with SB321. A majority of the Council indicated support for amending City Code to eliminate the City-required annual report due in April.

e. Follow up Discussion on Proposed Code for E-Bikes

Assistant City Attorney Patrick Boice presented proposed Code concerning e-bikes consistent with State Code. Proposed language would: adopt State definitions; require parent or guardian supervision for riders under 14 years old on a sidewalk or path when motor was engaged; prohibit operating in a negligent manner or in a way that created risk to pedestrians or traffic; prohibit electric motorcycles that were not properly equipped and licensed from paths, sidewalks, and public property; hold owners responsible for knowingly allowing an e-bike to be operated in violation of the Code; and allow violations to be handled as either an infraction or civil citation.

The Council and staff discussed what might constitute operating in a negligent manner. Responding to a question from Council Member Harris, Mr. Boice said State requirements continued to change every year. Mr. Boice said law enforcement had indicated that many of the issues were related to electric motorcycle use. Police Chief Jeremy Robertson said most of the enforcement would be focused on unlicensed electric motorcycles on the road. He said the proposed language would be helpful in enforcing operation in a negligent manner. All seven members of the Council indicated support for the proposed Code.

3. Administrative Items

Chair Wignall asked Mr. Langford to share additional information about land use options related to the DAI Utah (West Ridge Academy) project. Mr. Langford said the number one question for the Council to determine was whether residential was appropriate for the location. He emphasized that transition between land uses was an important consideration. Mr. Langford listed the following zoning options: Manufacturing Park (MP); General Commercial (CG); Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial (CM); Light Industrial (M-1); and Heavy Industrial (M-2). He said the M-1 Zone could get pretty intense, and said he did not recommend M-2 or CG for the location.

Council Member Whitelock spoke of The Other Side Academy, and asked if something similar would be possible under the Public Facilities (PF) Zone. Mr. Langford said he would need to look at the business model, but it sounded like it would fit within the existing PF Zone. He said DAI Utah had submitted applications to the City, but staff had not been able to fully accept the applications before discussion with the Council because of the Balanced Housing Ordinance. Council Member Jacob said he would be willing to get rid of the Balanced Housing Ordinance.

Mr. Langford asked if the Council was in favor of residential at the subject location. Vice Chair Shelton stated the roads in the area were built for industrial, with no sidewalk. Council Member Jacob said he did not think most people would consider walking to the TRAX station from the property. He said it was not a walkable community. Mr. Langford commented that the other zones he mentioned required a minimum 20-foot-wide landscape buffer to help with transitioning.

Vice Chair Shelton said the area had been industrial for 60+ years, and said he did not want the industrial users to feel they were being displaced or encroached on. He expressed confidence that if residential went in, there would be complaints about the industrial uses. Vice Chair Shelton said a business user would be more tolerant than a residential user in the area. Council Member Whitelock said she did not love having residential in the area, but said she did like having a buffer. Vice Chair Shelton said the buffer could be light industrial use. Mr. Langford commented that land use was a very important lever available to the Council. Mayor Burton said land use was one of the most important things on which the Council made decisions.

Council Member Jacob said he was in favor of residential at the location. Council Member Harris expressed the opinion there should be some residential next to existing residential that transitioned to some type of light industrial. Mayor Burton commented that the property could have multiple zones.

Council Member Bedore said he felt similar to Vice Chair Shelton. He suggested a transition from any residential to any light industrial would not really have a buffer. Council Member Bedore expressed concern that the area was not facilitated to be residential, concern about the noise of existing industrial, and concern that whatever the Council approved in the area would become a blueprint for the other campus. He said he liked the DAI Utah design, but said the City would need to make the roads in the area safer for residents.

Council Member Jacob said density did not belong in the middle of an area with no residential infrastructure. He said the other campus would have to fit into the transition. Council Member Whitelock said she agreed with Council Members Bedore and Shelton that the property should remain zoned PF. Council Member Lamb said he agreed. He said the location was not conducive to the proposed concept plan. Council Member Harris said she wanted to see what the options were for the property under the current zone. Vice Chair Shelton suggested lighter uses toward the back with heavier uses along Bagley.

4. Adjourn

The Committee of the Whole adjourned at 6:26 pm.

I certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on August 25, 2026. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan Committee of the Whole meeting.

/s/ Cindy M. Quick, MMC
Council Office Clerk

Approved this ____ day of ____ 2026



Minutes of the City of West Jordan
City Council Meeting
Tuesday, August 25, 2026 – 7:10 pm
Waiting Formal Approval
8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor
West Jordan, UT 84088

1. Call to Order

Council: Chair Jessica Wignall, Vice Chair Kent Shelton, Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kayleen Whitelock

Staff: Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Mayor Dirk Burton, City Attorney Josh Chandler, Budget & Management Analyst Rebecca Condie, Public Services Director Cory Fralick, Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome, Community Development Director Scott Langford, Public Information Manager Marie Magers, City Administrator Korban Lee, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick, Administrative Services Director Danyce Steck, Policy Analyst Walter Schmidt

Chair Wignall called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm, and noted that Council Member Bedore participated remotely.

2. Special Recognition

a. Recognition of Tiny Tim's Foundation

Chair Wignall recognized Tiny Tim's Foundation for Kids for 30 years of service, and thanked the Foundation for compassion, generosity, and dedication to making a difference in the lives of children. Randalf Tayler, representing JustServe.org and Tiny Tim's Foundation for Kids, said West Jordan became a JustServe city in 2025, with ability to present Hero Awards. He expressed appreciation for the West Jordan City Council and the chance to celebrate what a community could accomplish when it chose compassion as its craft.

On behalf of the America250 Organization, Mr. Tayler presented Heart of Service Awards to: Emily Johnson, Ashley Krause, Nikki Thacker, Jason Merrill, and Julie Merrill, all representatives of Tiny Tim's Foundation. Emily Johnson, Executive Director of Tiny Tim's Foundation for Kids, expressed gratitude to the Foundation's more than 100 regular volunteers, and said she was proud to be part of the West Jordan community.

Chair Wignall presented Mr. Tayler with a certificate, and the Council took the opportunity for a photograph.

3. Council & Mayor Reports

a. City Council Reports

Council Member Whitelock thanked the Fuller family for inviting the Council to their farm. She said the Fuller family operated Utah Natural Meats, and said she appreciated the

experience.

b. Mayor's Report

Mayor Burton reported on recent events in West Jordan, recognized awards received by the Police Department, and spoke of a bond renewal and future recreation center in West Jordan. The Mayor said certain street parking restrictions had been lifted during four-year construction at West Jordan High School. He encouraged participation at upcoming activities, and said City offices would be closed on September 7 for Labor Day.

c. City Administrator's Report

City Administrator Korban Lee invited attendance at a small ceremony to 'unveil' the new water tank mural. He spoke of park strip improvements along Copper Hills Parkway, construction at Ron Wood Park, and said a professional bike race would be held in West Jordan on September 18 and 19.

4. Public Comment

Chair Wignall opened public comment at 7:38 pm.

Chair Wignall noted that Council discussed the DAI Utah project proposal during the earlier Committee of the Whole meeting and would continue to consider options available.

Comments:

Kurt Baumgartner, West Jordan resident, expressed gratitude to the Council for voting against the DAI Utah proposal. He thanked Council Members Whitelock and Shelton for visiting the neighborhood and taking the time to listen. Mr. Baumgartner said he was speaking with his partners about the possibility of putting a charter school on the property.

Jeanine Norris, West Jordan resident, said she attended to speak in opposition to the DAI Utah proposal. She expressed the opinion that schools really needed to be considered when discussing new development, and proposed that the Council give schools strong consideration.

Chair Wignall commented that the Council was not legally allowed to consider schools when making development decisions.

Sally Sawyer, West Jordan resident, thanked the Council for listening to her request six year ago concerning possible construction adjacent to her property. She said she was attending to speak against the proposed DAI Utah project because of the density, and said she agreed with Council Member Whitelock's suggestion for incubator firms and 'intelligent industry'. Ms. Sawyer said Bagley Park Road and Old Bingham were not safe for children or pets.

Tiffany Martinez, West Jordan resident, thanked the Council for taking comments from constituents about the DAI Utah project seriously. She thanked Council Members Shelton and Whitelock for delivering fliers to get community members aware of what was happening. She said safety was a huge concern in the area, and said addition of high-density housing would be a travesty.

Wayde Wright, West Jordan resident, expressed appreciation to the Council for listening to the concerns of the community, and said he appreciated the open, welcoming platform for hearing citizen comments.

Corey Caddell, State Senior Vice Commander with Disabled American Veterans, invited the Council and all County residents to the annual Chapter Veteran Appreciation Picnic on September 26, 2026.

Ann Marie Barrett, Bingham Creek Library Manager, announced upcoming activities at the library.

Chair Wignall closed the public comment period at 7:52 pm.

5. Public Hearings

a. Resolution No. 26-038 Requesting a Fee Waiver in the Amount of \$3,365.00 for the 2026 Bradley Taylor Police Memorial K9 Trial

Bill Taylor presented a fee waiver request for the 2026 Bradley Taylor Police Memorial K9 Trial. He said the Bradley W Taylor K9 Memorial Fund was dedicated to strengthening and supporting the bond between police and their K9 companions, and described events involved in the trials. Vice Chair Shelton said he had witnessed K9 capabilities first hand, and knew they saved lives. Mr. Taylor said there were currently 88 individuals signed up to participate, and invited the Council to attend.

Chair Wignall opened a public hearing at 8:03 pm.

Comments:

None

Chair Wignall closed the public hearing at 8:03 pm.

Motion: Vice Chair Shelton moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 26-038 a Fee Waiver in the Amount of \$3,365.00 for the 2026 Bradley Taylor Police Memorial K9 Trial.
Council Member Whitelock seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

b. Resolution No. 26-039 Requesting a Fee Waiver in the Amount of \$935.00 for the 2026 Comunidad Salvadoreña Event

Victor Rodriguez, cofounder of the Comunidad Salvadoreña Foundation, said the Foundation was dedicated to celebrating the rich cultural heritage of Mexico and Central America while

fostering unity and inclusion in the community. He presented a fee waiver request for the 2026 Comunidad Salvadoreña Event on September 12 in the amount of \$935.00. He welcomed community attendance at the event.

Chair Wignall opened a public hearing at 8:07 pm.

Comments:

None

Chair Wignall closed the public hearing at 8:07 pm.

Motion: Council Member Lamb moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 26-039 a Fee Waiver in the Amount of \$935.00 for the 2026 Comunidad Salvadoreña Event.

Council Member Harris seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

6. Business Items

a. Ordinance No. 26-38 Setting the 2026 Property Tax Rate

Administrative Services Director Danyce Steck outlined the truth-in-taxation timeline, and presented proposed Ordinance No. 26-38 to set the 2026 property tax rate at 0.001309. The City was required to adopt a property tax rate and final budget before September 1st.

Motion: Vice Chair Shelton moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 26-38 setting the 2026 Property Tax Rate.

Council Member Lamb seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Jessica Wignall

No: Kayleen Whitelock

Absent:

The motion passed 6-1.

b. Ordinance No. 26-39 Adopting the Final Budget for the City of West Jordan Fiscal Year 2027

Ms. Steck outlined the budget process timeline, and showed the different fund totals. Council Member Whitelock said many staff positions had been added during her time on the Council, and said she believed some of the positions were more wants than needs. She expressed the

opinion that a tax increase was not necessary every year, and said she would vote against the proposed budget. Council Member Whitelock said she appreciated all the work done on the budget.

Motion: Council Member Lamb moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 26-39 adopting the Final Budget for the City of West Jordan Fiscal Year 2027.

Council Member Harris seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Jessica Wignall

No: Kayleen Whitelock

Absent:

The motion passed 6-1.

7. Council Office Report

Policy Analyst Walter Schmidt provided an update on the 2026-2027 Youth Council.

8. Consent Items

a. Approve Meeting Minutes

- July 20, 2026 – City Council Emergency Meeting
- July 28, 2026 – Committee of the Whole Meeting
- July 28, 2026 – Regular City Council Meeting
- August 11, 2026 – Truth in Taxation Hearing

b. Resolution No. 26-040 Approving Sale of Seized Firearms Stored in the Police Evidence Facility and Allocating the Proceeds to the General Fund

Motion: Council Member Whitelock moved to APPROVE consent items as listed.

Council Member Jacob seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

9. Closed Meeting

At 8:26 pm, Council Member Whitelock moved to recess in a closed session to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property as provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205.

Chair Wignall seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

Yes: Bob Bedore, Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, Jessica Wignall

No:

Absent:

The motion passed 7-0.

The closed meeting began at 8:27 pm

Those present during the closed session included Council Members Bob Bedore (remote), Annette Harris, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, Kent Shelton, Kayleen Whitelock, and Jessica Wignall. Staff members Mayor Dirk Burton, City Administrator Korban Lee, Assistant City Administrator Paul Jerome, City Attorney Josh Chandler, Economic Development Director Jim Grover, Community Development Director Scott Langford, Policy Analyst Walter Schmidt, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick (left at 8:33pm), and Council Office Director Alan Anderson.

City Council Members discussed the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property as follows:

Property #1: 8:28 to 9:33 pm

Property #2: 9:33 to 9:47 pm

Council Member Jacob moved to adjourn the closed session. Chair Wignall seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

The closed session adjourned at 9:48 pm

10. Adjourn

Chair Wignall closed the meeting at 9:49 pm.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on August 25, 2026. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan City Council meeting.

/s/ Cindy M. Quick, MMC
Council Office Clerk

Approved this ____ day of ____ 2026