



**Minutes of the City of West Jordan
Committee of the Whole
Tuesday, August 25, 2026 – 4:00 pm
Approved September 8, 2026
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 8th day of September 2026