**Salt Lake County Council**

Committee of the Whole

~Minutes~

Tuesday, January 24, 2017

11:06:15 AM

Committee Members

Present: Jennifer Wilson

 Richard Snelgrove

 Jim Bradley

 Arlyn Bradshaw

 Michael Jensen

 Aimee Winder Newton

 Sam Granato

 Max Burdick

 Steven DeBry, Chair

Citizen Public Input (11:06:33 AM)

 **Ms. Marie Taylor** spoke under “Citizen Public Input” urging the Council to vote no to the appointment of Laynee Jones to the Community and Economic Development Council. Ms. Jones, as the coordinator for Mountain Accord, disregarded transparency by blocking the public from attending meetings, and made misleading statements to the public. Ms. Jones shepherded the spending of close to $8 million of taxpayer money, acting in tandem with Mayor McAdams while spending County allocated funds, yet claimed Mountain Accord was nothing more than a logo. The State Auditor’s Office has outlined affidavits regarding its concerns, and the Attorney’s General is looking into possible violations of state statute. Ms. Jones and Mayor McAdams were invited to attend a stewardship for public lands sharing, at which they could have answered questions by legislators, but both declined to attend and neither sent a representative.

Ms. Taylor also spoke regarding concerns with an application by Salt Lake Public Utilities for the construction of a dam in both Big and Little Cottonwood. These two dams will be up to 400' tall and hold over 100,000 acre feet of water, which is equivalent to the Deer Creek reservoir.  The original permit was done in 1930, but kept intact as recently as 2008. Since the lakes in the canyons will engulf many cabins and homes, she asked if there was a plan and money to accommodate the private homeowners for their losses.

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Review of New Hires (11:11:48 AM)

 **Mr. Brad Kendrick**, Budget & Policy Analyst, Council Office, reviewed the following proposed hires:

Agency Position

*Assessor’s Office*  Personal Property Appraiser 22

*Center for the Arts*  Administrative & Fiscal Manager 18

*Parks & Recreation Division* Farm to School Program Coordinator 23

*Office of Regional Development* Business Outreach Program Manager 16

*District Attorney’s Office* Unit Chief 19

*Recorder’s Office* Administrative & Fiscal Manager 17

 Fiscal Coordinator 13 (part-time)

*Sheriff’s Office*  2 Corrections Specialists 16

 2 Jail Clerks 10

*Salt Lake County Health Department* Office Coordinator 12

 Office Specialist 10

 4 Public Health Nurses 16

 Chronic Disease Program Manager 16

*Aging and Adult Services Division* Associate Division Director 17

*Criminal Justice Services Division* Treatment Specialist 15

 Treatment Supervisor 16

*Library Services Division* Electrician 13

 3 Customer Service Specialists 15 (part-time)

 2 Shelvers 11 (part-time)

*Animal Services Division* Animal Control Officer 12

*Public Works Department* Sweeper Operator 18

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Budget Adjustments (11:12:14 AM)

 **Mr. Brad Kendrick**, Budget & Policy Analyst, Council Office, reviewed the following budget adjustment requests:

*Youth Services Division*

Interim budget adjustment of $15,310 to purchase and install a walk-in freezer to store group home food and commodities. The Utah State Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) will reimburse the County for this purchase with grant funds.

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*District Attorney’s Office*

 Interim budget adjustment of $19,409 to pay the yearly maintenance on the Virtra Simulation Software at the gun range. This will entail using Asset Forfeiture funds.

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*Criminal Justice Services Division*

 Interim budget adjustment of $50,000 to support the YWCA’s Family Justice Center. This will entail transferring funds from Expense Account No. 639025.

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*Library Services Division*

 Interim budget adjustment to reclassify a Senior Librarian #3226 position to a position in children’s services and reference.

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*Salt Lake County Health Department*

Interim budget adjustment of $1,915,600 for increased construction costs and contingency needs for the new health building project.

 Interim budget adjustment of $122,400 to replace the HVAC system at the Ellis Shipp Public Health Center. This will entail transferring funds from other areas in the Health Department’s operating budget.

 **Council Member Bradley** asked why the health building costs increased by $1.9 million.

 **Mr. Darrin Casper**, Chief Financial Officer, Mayor’s Office, stated that is just cost escalation over multiple years from when the original estimates were made. However, there is another issue, which is that the County has not secured the New Market Tax Credits (NMTC). The Mayor’s Office is proposing making that amount up in the bond proceeds. The bond documents have been structured so that the proceeds can be used for other previously approved projects if the County does get the NMTCs. The bond sell date is in two weeks.

 **Council Member Wilson** asked how much the County was hoping to get from NMTCs.

 **Mr. Casper** stated the County was expecting $3.5 million. So instead of the bond proceeds being $52.5 million, they will be roughly $56 million.

 **Council Member DeBry** asked what the odds were the County would get the NMTCs, and when it would know. He wondered if the County should be finding cuts rather than spending money it did not have.

 **Mr. Casper** stated the odds of getting the NMTCs are fifty-fifty. The County’s consultant believed they were going to get an allocation from the federal government, and planned to use it on the County’s project, but did not get it. However, the consultant is optimistic it will be an attractive project for other Community Development Areas (CDE) – the entities that actually receive allocations. A qualified health building is a federally preferred project for NMTC purposes, and the County’s project is in a low income area. The Health Department has spoken with several investors who have a strong interest in the project, but they would need to obtain an allocation from a CDE.

 **Council Member Wilson** stated she thought there was an issue related to the project design and the operational impact based on Salt Lake City’s ordinance. Then, not knowing what the new president has planned for NMTC programs, she was concerned about the County’s ability to even utilize them.

 **Council Member Wilson, seconded by Council Member Jensen, moved to approve the interim budget adjustment requests and forward them to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal consideration, with the exception of the Health Department’s request for additional funding for the new health building, asking the Mayor’s Office provide the Council with more information on that during the lunch break, and the Council will reconsider it when it reconvenes after lunch. The motion passed unanimously. Council Members Snelgrove and Burdick were absent for the vote.**

[Later in the meeting 1:39:53 PM]

 **Council Member Wilson** stated the Human Services Department answered questions she had regarding to the Health Department’s request for an additional $1.9 million for the new health building project, and understood NMTCs were a lot of work to get, so was now comfortable with the request.

 **Council Member DeBry** asked what FF&E was and why it went from $165,282 and $200,000 to $665,282, and why there was a contingency of $1.2 million.

 **Ms. Karen Crompton**, Director, Human Services Department, stated the contingency in the original budget was $187,000, and on a project of this scale, that would never be adequate. The $1.2 million is a realistic figure.

 **Mr. Gary Edwards**, Director, Salt Lake County Health Department, stated FF&E is furniture, fixtures, and equipment. The initial project was for one building, but that later became two buildings – one in West Jordan, one in Salt Lake.

 **Council Member Newton, seconded by Council Member Bradshaw, moved to approve the request and forward it to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal consideration. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Jensen was absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Ordinance Amending Title 5 – Business License Applications (11:24:39 AM)

 **Ms. Brittany Allen**, Planning & Development Services Division, reviewed the ordinance amending Title 5 – Business License Applications relating to business licensing application requirements and grounds for denial in order to be consistent with prior practices and other ordinances. It adds a time period for denial, and takes out the requirement for health department certificates for dancers. The request to remove the requirement for health department certificates for dancers came from the Unified Police Department’s Investigations Division, which issues the certificates. Planning & Development sent a copy of the draft to Millcreek, but it will be adopting its own ordinances.

 **Council Member DeBry** stated this is in Millcreek’s arena so it is up to it to make any ordinance decisions. He wondered if the County was wasting its time with these amendments.

 **Council Member Snelgrove** stated this would not impact metro townships either.

 **Mr. Jason Rose**, Legal Counsel, Council Office, stated this would apply to the remaining unincorporated area, although there may not be any relevant businesses there.

 **Council Member Newton** stated the County is still responsible for 270 homes in the unincorporated area, so it made sense to proceed with these changes and other changes that need to be made in the future.

 **Council Member Bradshaw** stated it may be less applicable now due to the changes in governance, but the ordinance may be a good model for metro townships if they want to adopt it.

 **Council Member Snelgrove, seconded by Council Member Jensen, moved to approve the ordinance and forward it to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal introduction. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Burdick was absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Presentation of Metro 311 Report (11:29:02 AM)

 **Mr. Carlton Christensen**, Director, Office of Regional Development, stated three years ago, the Council approved an annual budget appropriation in the Office of Regional Development’s budget to look at 311. There were three components to that: the Greater Salt Lake Metro 311 study, updating the GIS, and the work order system.

 **Ms. Megan Hillyard**, Associate Director, Administrative Services Department, delivered a PowerPoint presentation of the Greater Salt Lake Metro 311 study timeline of procuring International City/County Management Association (ICMA) to conduct a 311 report/needs assessment, how the study was conducted, and the delivered 311 “road map.” She stated the average cost of serving a customer via assisted channels, i.e. walk-in traffic, phone calls, is nine times more expensive than serving them through self-service channels, such as online forms or mobile apps. On average, the County receives 2.1 million contacts annually, and over half of those contacts are via phone, yet only 54 percent of those calls are for general information. Then, 27 percent of employees find it difficult to locate contact information for divisions on the internet/intranet.

 **Council Member DeBry** asked if the number of phone calls included calls to police dispatch.

 **Ms. Hillyard** stated it does not include emergency phone calls to Valley Emergency Communications Center (VECC). It does include general requests on law enforcement that anybody with central knowledge can answer. She also reviewed Provo’s 311 system regarding phone calls versus self-service, which has shown a decrease in the number of calls to the 311 center and an increase in self-service mobile channels.

 **Council Member Newton** asked if the County was currently tracking the number of views on different website pages.

 **Ms. Hillyard** stated some of the information in the report was tracking some of those analytics.

 **Ms. Cory Fleming**, Director of Constituent Relationship Management 311 Sector, International City/County Management Association, continued the PowerPoint presentation on projected population increases by County in years 2010 through 2013, showing Utah’s population will increase by 1.1 million, which means phone calls will increase by 30 percent, at a cost of $2 to $4 million. Four areas for the Council to think about moving forward on are: 1) business to better handle internal resources, 2) constituents to alleviate customer frustration, 3) employees to enable work time to be spent on core business function, and 4) policy makers to generate data.

 **Ms. Hillyard** reviewed the next steps, which are to take this to the technology advisory board for discussion; and form a regional steering committee that would collectively be able to make a recommendation to the Council for the 2018 budget proposal. The vision is to have a one stop-shop where a constituent could go to a regional portal and ask their question; then be referred to the appropriate County agency or other entity.

 **Council Member Newton** stated it makes great sense for city governments to have one place for residents to go, but she considered it a municipal function and did not want the County to front the costs. She suggested asking the cities if they were willing to chip in on a population basis. The County could facilitate it, but the cities should help pay for it. She asked how much it would cost the County to continue looking into this, and the long-term costs. The County should not continue down a path without knowing the price tag.

 **Ms. Hillyard** stated part of the internal conversation has been to look at pay to play models, and the Mayor’s Office has had conversations with some of the cities about that. The County is the only player that can do the regional facilitation. The goal is to drive that, and use websites or apps as the service method. As to the initial phase, the contract with ICMA is over, and the Mayor’s Office does not have additional 311 funding to continue. The proposal is to work internally from here on out.

 **Council Member Newton** stated there are things the County could do internally to become more efficient. The County’s website could be revamped. Currently, it is not super friendly in terms of citizens knowing who to talk to for their needs. The overall phone system and how calls are funneled also needs to be restructured.

 **Ms. Fleming** stated ICMA has done a road map report of the next steps, and there are some low hanging fruit pieces to consider. The County needs to determine what it wants its system to look like. Some systems cost $3,000 a year, some up to millions of dollars per year. The report also identifies the most frequently asked questions in each of the departments, and that is a new knowledge base.

 **Council Member Bradshaw** asked what the municipalities’ expectations were of the County going forward.

 **Mr. Christensen** stated the larger cities all know they need to do something. He thought they wanted the County to fund a core piece out of the Regional Development Fund, but also know they will have to add onto that for their cities. Some may actually want to take advantage of the work order system too, and pay their share of maintenance costs, which would lower the County’s costs. The information the cities would feed to the County would help it when referring something out that is not a County issue.

 **Council Member Bradshaw** stated the County could move forward to put the structure in place, and then the cities that want to could buy into the service level they think is most appropriate for them.

 **Mr. Christensen** stated this is an opportunity for the County to create a better system in a way that has not been done elsewhere in the United States. One reason to look into a digital model is to handle traffic in ways other than phone calls.

 **Council Member Snelgrove** asked how much had been spent to date, not including overhead costs, although there is a cost to the County every time County staff works on this.

 **Ms. Hillyard** stated the ICMA contract was $180,000.

 **Council Member Snelgrove** stated adopting a phone number for people to call in when the County is a technical savvy community is not the way to go. He wanted to stay away from the high overhead cost models of customer service, but could warm up to a more digital internet-based, mobile-friendly type of thing. This may be able to be developed free with some partners in the internet business. A partner may be willing to develop it in return for advertisement revenue. Then, there are methods to capture data over the internet, such as pop-ups or cookies.

 **Ms. Hillyard** stated what the County wants to do is avoid the cost of not doing anything. It already operates an unofficial call center. If there was a way to track a decrease in phone calls at the same time as digital services were increasing, that would be the goal.

 **Council Member Snelgrove** stated the County should fully optimize its website with search engine optimization (SEO) and search engine marketing (SEM) to get more search engine visitors. If it developed the system in-house or subcontracted out, it should be the benefactor of 100 percent of the revenue.

 **Council Member Newton** stated the County’s Information Services Division is working on a study to see what the technology needs are in the County, and to prioritize them. She asked if it made sense for this to be part of that.

 **Council Member DeBry** stated this should be included as part of the technology prioritization process. The County needs to be fiscally responsible, but do what is right for its constituents at the same time. Then, it needs to help municipalities without stepping on their toes.

 **Council Member Snelgrove** stated the different municipalities would not need to go through the County. They could simply upload their own content.

 **Council Member DeBry** asked how many Council staff members should be on the steering committee and how much time they would be required to give.

 **Ms. Hillyard** suggested the Council provide two advisors, and that the steering committee meet every other week for an hour or two for about six to eight months to be ready for the 2018 budget.

 **Council Member Snelgrove** suggested doing a request for proposals to get an idea of parameters and costs the County should be looking at.

 **Ms. Hillyard** stated the requirements need to be established first, and the steering committee can discuss those. At that point, the County could do a request-for-information to see if there was any interest.

 **Council Member Wilson** asked if the Council wanted to appoint the two advisors now.

 **Council Member Newton** stated Nic Dunn, Senior Policy Advisor, can participate on the steering committee. He has a communications background.

 **Council Member Bradshaw** stated Isaac Higham, Senior Policy Advisor, can also participate on the steering committee.

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Utah Association of Counties – Legislative Priorities (1:44:26 PM)

 **Mr. Lincoln Shurtz**, Director of Government Affairs, Utah Association of Counties, (UAC), reviewed some of the bills UAC is focusing on during the 2017 legislative session. He stated there seems to be a real opportunity to receive additional funds for the Homelessness Initiative and the Justice Reform Initiative (JRI).

* *Homelessness Initiative*

 **Mr. Shurtz** stated Gregory Hughes, Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, has reaffirmed his commitment for the additional $9 million to go towards the homeless shelter in Salt Lake City. Mr. Hughes is also working with Sheriff Jim Winder to free up additional jail beds to make room for the criminal element from the Rio Grande District in Salt Lake City.

* *Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI)*

 **Mr. Shurtz** stated UAC has met with the House and Senate leadership teams letting them know of the approximately $21 million of additional funds needed for JRI ($16 million for the non-Medicaid portion of JRI and $5 million in Medicaid matching funds). Approximately 40 percent of these funds would come to Salt Lake County.

The $5 million in Medicaid matching funds could be used to match the federal dollars. It would result in a sizeable amount of money for Salt Lake County. These funds would be restricted and could only be used for Medicaid services.

 **Ms. Elizabeth Klc,** Operations and Planning, Utah Association of Counties, stated the $5 million Medicaid match would be used for existing population - people that Salt Lake County are already serving. It would be more or less a catch up for the last couple of years.

 **Mr. Shurtz** stated approximately 40 percent of the $16 million for the non-Medicaid portion of JRI would come to Salt Lake County and could be used for behavioral health treatment services. The funds could be used for Operation Diversion, behavioral health services, relocation services, employment services, or a whole list of things that come along with substance abuse.

 **Council Member Snelgrove** stated Salt Lake County has 43 to 45 percent of the State’s population, but in terms of the impact of JRI, it should be closer to 55 percent of the actual impact.

 **Mr. Shurtz** stated if the funds are distributed based on population, then the County would get 43 to 45 percent; however, it would get closer to 55 percent if the distribution was based on members served. How the funds will be distributed has not yet been decided.

* *Transportation Funding*

 **Mr. Shurtz** stated UAC is introducing legislation, which would create flexibility on how corridor preservation funds can be used. The legislation would allow Counties to use up to 50 percent of these funds for operation and maintenance of existing systems.

* *Food Trucks*

 **Mr. Shurtz** stated he will be meeting with representatives from various health departments regarding the licensing of food trucks. There are numerous jurisdictions and licenses that a food truck vendor has to have. The goal is to streamline the licensing process.

* *Special Districts*

 **Mr. Shurtz** stated a bill is being introduced relating to the governance model for special districts. This bill would change the governance structure for special and local districts by pulling back property tax authority from these districts unless two-thirds of the governance board consists of elected officials. UAC is requesting guidance from counties before it determines its stand on this issue.

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Legislative Updates (1:57:54 PM)

 **Ms. Kara Trevino**, Legislative Specialist, Council Office, reviewed the following bills that are being considered at the State Legislature:

*H.B. 115 – Solid Waste Revisions (Rep. Mike McKell)*

*This bill states that no person may own, construct, modify, or operate any facility or site for the purpose of transferring, treating, storing, or disposing of nonhazardous solid waste without first submitting and receiving the approval of the director for an operations plan for that facility or site; modifies fee structures for nonhazardous solid waste streams; includes a sunset repeal date for certain language; and makes technical changes.*

This bill enacts provisions related to local government.
10 **Highlighted Provisions:**
11 This bill:
12 ▸ defines terms;
13 ▸ provides population classification for a metro township;
14 ▸ amends municipal annexation provisions;
15 ▸ enacts "Municipal Incorporation," including:
16 • general provisions;
17 • incorporation of a city provisions;
18 • incorporation of a town provisions; and
19 • incorporation provisions of metro townships and unincorporated islands in a
20 county of the first class on and after May 12, 2015;
21 ▸ requires a county of the first class to hold a special election on November 3, 2015,
22 for the following ballot propositions:
23 • the incorporation of a planning township as a city, town, metro township; and
24 • whether unincorporated islands should be annexed by an eligible city or remain
25 unincorporated;

 **Mr. Scott Baird**, Interim Director, Public Works Department, stated this bill will impose a flat fee on public landfills based on how many tons of material is brought in. Currently, the County pays the State $33,000 a year. This bill would change the fee to over $100,000 a year. This bill is being driven to even the playing field between public and private landfills.

 **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Burdick, to oppose H.B. 115. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Jensen was absent for the vote.**

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*S. B. 81 – Local Government Licensing Amendments (Sen. Jacob Anderegg)*

*This bill modifies provisions related to a municipality’s or a county’s authority to license a business.*

 **Ms. Brittany Allen**, Associate Division Director, Planning & Development Services Division, stated this bill removes the requirement to license home-based businesses. This is problematic for several reasons. One reason is the County would be treating a home- based business and a commercial business doing the same thing differently. Another reason is it would take away the County’s authority to regulate approximately 35 percent of the businesses it is currently licensing.

 **Council Member Snelgrove, seconded by Council Member Bradshaw, moved to oppose S.B. 81. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Jensen was absent for the vote.**

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*S.B. 37 – Statewide Crisis Line (Sen. Daniel W. Thatcher)*

*This bill enacts provisions related to the creation of a statewide mental health crisis line. It defines terms, creates the Mental Health Crisis Line Commission; addresses the membership and duties of the commission, and requires the commission to report to the Political Subdivision Interim Committee.*

 **Ms. Kara Trevino**, Legislative Specialist, Council Office, stated this bill has already passed the Senate. A commission will be created to work on a suicide prevention hotline. The commission has a seat available for a representative from a first or second class county.

 **Council Member DeBry** asked if the concern was that a suicide prevention hotline would not be manned with a licensed therapist.

 **Council Member Newton** stated Salt Lake County has a University Neuropsychiatric Institute (UNI) line that is available 24/7, but other hotlines throughout the state are not always manned - sometimes the calls go directly to 911 or a voice mail. This bill sets up a commission that can look at this and figure out how to better help everyone throughout the state.

 **Council Member Wilson** stated she is in favor of the work being done; however, she is concerned about the utilization of the 311 number.

 **Council Member Newton** stated the bill does not designate a number, but the number being looked at is 611.

 **Mayor Ben McAdams** stated the bill sets up a forum to move this issue forward. He suggested an amendment to the bill, which would take the appointment of a County representative from the chair of the newly created commission to have the appointment come through the Utah Association of Counties (UAC).

 **Council Member Snelgrove, seconded by Council Member Newton, moved to support S.B. 37 with the amendment that the County representative be appointed through UAC. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Jensen was absent for the vote.**

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*H.B. 78 – Nonbinding Opinion Questions (Rep. Norman Thurston)*

 *This bill establishes procedures for submitting a nonbinding opinion question to the voters of Utah; describes the duties of the lieutenant governor and county clerks to submitted the opinion question to the voters; establishes procedures for the ballot form, voter information pamphlet, public notice, manner of voting, and canvass of returns in relation to the nonbinding opinion questions.*

 **Ms. Sherrie Swensen**, County Clerk, stated this bill gives the state the opportunity to place nonbinding opinion questions on the ballot. There is little to no room on a ballot now. If opinion questions were placed on the ballot, it would require the use a a two-card ballot. This would double the work load for her office with a cost exceeding $100,000 to process an additional ballot page. The Clerk’s Association took a position to oppose this bill because of the financial impact it would have.

 **Council Member Bradshaw** asked if the nonbinding question would only apply to questions from the State.

 **Ms. Swensen** stated yes.

 **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Burdick, moved to oppose H.B. 78. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Jensen was absent for the vote.**

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*H.B. 105 – Early Voting Amendments (Rep. Craig Hall)*

 *This extends the last day of the early voting period to the day before the election date.*

 **Ms. Sherrie Swensen**, County Clerk, stated she requested this bill. The bill would allow early voting up to the day before the election as an option. Current law ends the early voting on the Friday before the election.

 **Council Member Wilson, seconded by Council Member Granato, moved to support H.B. 105. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Jensen was absent for the vote.**

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*S. B. 13 Amendments to Election Law (Sen. Margaret Dayton)*

 *This bill changes the deadline for publication of a municipal election notice; amends provisions relating to a midterm vacancy in a municipal office; provides a deadline for information a voter registration applicant of action taken on the application; amends provisions relating to a local voter information pamphlet; amends political party registration petition requirements; amends provisions relating to municipal elections; amends provisions relating to the certification provided by the lieutenant governor for a regular primary election; changes the deadline for a qualified political party to provide certification regarding who may vote for the qualified political party’s candidates in a primary election; amends provisions relating to the declaration of candidacy for the office of lieutenant governor; and amends provisions relating to an election to create a new school district*

 **Ms. Sherrie Swensen**, County Clerk, stated this is a cleanup bill and it has little effect on her office.

 **Council Member Wilson, seconded by Council Member Bradley, moved to support S.B. 13. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Jensen was absent for the vote.**

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*S.B. 29 – Utah Marriage Commission Amendments (Sen. Allen Christensen)*

 *This bill increases the marriage license fee by $20 and creates a restricted account to support marriage and relationship strengthening efforts in the state; offers a couple at $20 rebate if both parties complete premarital education or counseling that meets specific criteria; provides content requirements for premarital education and counseling; provides requirements for providers of premarital education and counseling; creates the Marriage Education Restrict Account; and provides a reporting requirement*

 **Ms. Sherrie Swensen**, County Clerk, stated this bill increases the marriage license fee by $20, which would be submitted to the state to fund a Marriage Education Restricted Account. If a couple opts to get counseling before marriage and can provide a certificate indicating that counseling was done, then the Clerk’s Office would provide a $20 rebate. The most troubling part of this bill is that it authorizes anyone who performs ceremonies to provide counseling.

 **Council Member Snelgrove, seconded by Council Member Bradley, moved to oppose S.B. 29.**

 **Council Member Newton** stated there is a good reason to get marriage counseling and asked if the counseling had to be from a licensed professional.

 **Ms. Swensen** stated counseling can come from a licensed professional, but can also come from ministers, or anyone who has the authority to perform marriage ceremonies.

 **Council Member Snelgrove, seconded by Council Member Bradley, moved to oppose S.B. 29. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Jensen was absent for the vote.**

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*H.B. 135 – Deposit of Public Funds (Rep. Adam Gardiner)*

*H.B. 143 – Tax Advisory Board Amendments (Rep. Adam Gardiner)*

 **Ms. Kara Trevino**, Legislative Specialist, Council Office, stated the Council took a position to support these two bills during its January 10, 2017, meeting. Rep. Gardiner is running these bills for the County. The bills will be in committee this Friday, January 27, 2017.

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

 *During the January 10, 2017, Committee of the Whole meeting, Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Jensen, moved to…. affirm the operations of the legislative team consisting of Kara Trevino, Legislative Specialist, Council Office, Patrick Reimherr, Senior Advisor & Director of Government Relations, Mayor’s Office, Council Member Bradshaw from the Democratic caucus, and Council Member Jensen from the Republican caucus to coordinate on the issues that the County supports or opposes.*

 **Council Member Wilson** stated she differed from this direction and would prefer each Council Member who has the time or an interest in any bill to work directly with Ms. Trevino, rather than having designees.

 **Council Member Wilson moved to allow all Council Members to work directly with Kara Trevino on any legislative item they are interested in.**

 **Council Member Newton** stated the two Council Members were appointed to coordinate with the County’s lobbyist team on strategy. Any Council Member can go up to the Legislature to speak on any issue.

 **Ms. Kara Trevino**, Legislative Specialist, Council Office, stated the minutes from the January 10, 2017, Committee of the Whole meeting, indicate the designated Council Members will be the spokespersons up on the hill. This has not been the case in the past. In the past, she has been able to ask any Council Member to help at the Legislature.

 **Council Member Snelgrove** stated it is important to have point persons who are involved to a higher degree to reflect the will of the Council. The Council will be best served with these point persons.

 **Council Member Wilson, seconded by Council Member Bradshaw, moved to allow all Council Members to work directly with Kara Trevino on any legislative item they are interested in.**

 **Council Member Newton** asked what the two point people would do.

 **Ms. Trevino** stated the point person is the first person she would go to if an issue came up during the week. The entire Council would weigh in on any issue during its Committee of the Whole meeting.

 **Council Member DeBry** stated it is nice to have a go to person when he has any questions relating to legislative issues.

 **Ms. Trevino** stated she would like to keep the process as informal as possible. The goal is to coordinate to make sure everyone is informed. It is helpful to have a point person from each caucus.

 **Mayor Ben McAdams** stated it is important for the County to speak with unified voice.

 **Council Member Newton, seconded by Council Member Snelgrove, made a substitute motion that the Council no longer have an official committee, but that each caucus appoint a Council Member to be the point person with Ms. Trevino on an informal basis. The motion passed unanimously. Council Member Jensen was absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Appointment of the Salt Lake County Board of Health (2:49:08 PM)

 Mayor Ben McAdams submitted a letter requesting the Council’s advice and consent to the appointment of **Jose Enriquez** as a member of the Salt Lake County Board of Health to serve a partial term.  His term will end June 30, 2019.

 After a question and answer period, the Council made the following motion:

 **Council Member Wilson, seconded by Council Member Burdick, moved to approve the appointment and forward it to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal consideration. The motion passed unanimously.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Overview of Mountain Resort Zone (MRZ) (2:55:05 PM)

 **Mr. Curtis Woodward**, Planning & Development Services Division, reviewed aspects of the proposed Mountain Resort Zone (MRZ) ordinance. He stated the MRZ was recommended by the Blue Ribbon Commission as a new zone for mountain resorts. Since this was a new concept, County staff researched various ordinances in all kinds of jurisdictions. An ordinance in Aspen, Colorado, was used as the framework for the proposed Salt Lake County ordinance.

* *Resort Boundaries and MRZ Boundary*

 The Mountainous Planning District Planning Commission wanted a clause in the ordinance tying the MRZ boundary to the resort boundaries. Resorts operate under a special use permit issued by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). In this case, Snowbird Village would not be included in the MRZ, but the remainder of the resort would be. The same is true with Solitude Resort. There are some problems tying the MRZ boundary strictly to the USFS special use permit. When this issue was presented to the planning commission, a 1999 map from Snowbird’s Environmental Impact Statement was used. That map included the entire village and some property north of the highway. Somewhere between 1999 and the date of the current USFS permit boundary, there was a change whereby Snowbird Village was excluded. That now creates a conflict between the two concepts. The Council will have to make a decision about this after the public hearing. There are three ways to look at the issue:

1. Leave the provision in the ordinance and force the USFS and ski resorts to work together on amending their permit boundary to include the Snowbird Village. He has not yet received confirmation from the USFS as to whether it would agree to this. Its interest is in federal property; it cannot regulate what happens on private property.
2. Remove that provision and not go with the planning commission recommendation. It would then be up to the Council to decide where the boundary gets drawn at the time of a rezoning application.
3. Tie the MRZ to the boundaries of the resorts as indicated in the adopted general plan.

 **Mr. Bob Bonar**, President, Snowbird Ski & Summer Resort, stated the original language submitted by the planning staff indicated this boundary issue would be tied to the existing resort boundaries and to 1,000 contiguous acres of property. Through some of the commission hearings, it eventually got tied to the USFS permit area. The resorts see that as off track. About half of the land Snowbird uses operates under the USFS special use permit. The other half, including all base facilities, is privately owned property. Snowbird’s preference is to have the MRZ tied to 1,000 acres of contiguous property located within the Mountainous Planning District.

 **Mr. Carl Fisher**, Executive Director, Save Our Canyons, stated he is concerned about the boundary issue and expansion of the resorts. This zone gives significant opportunities to the resorts, but he does not want to see that expand geographically. He would like to see the ordinance tied to the geography in the canyons, not just confined to these 1,000 acres.

 **Council Member Wilson** stated she would like to see maps of all the proposed boundaries, with some overlays if necessary.

 **Mr. Woodward** stated currently, all the boundaries are theoretical until Snowbird or Solitude comes up with a rezone application.

* *Transfer of Development Rights*

 **Mr. Woodward** stated transfer of development rights (TDR) was suggested by the Blue Ribbon Commission. It would involve the purchase of remote canyon properties, and the building densities from those properties would transfer to the resort villages. The remote properties would then be designated as open space. However, the planning commission recommended removal of the TDR section from the ordinance until a broader study can be conducted.

* *MRZ Village and MRZ Recreation Area*

 **Mr. Woodward** stated the idea behind the MRZ Village would be that the village would have a lot more residential and commercial uses, but be more in compliance with the Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone (FCOZ). MRZ Recreation Areas would have a shorter list of uses but there would be waivers built into such things as slope restrictions. For example, resorts need restaurants built within their recreation area. However, they were not given FCOZ waivers to slope and ridgelines in the recreation area. If the resorts can find areas where the slopes are less than 30 percent in the recreation area, they can build a restaurant there.

It is an oversimplification to assume the village is always at the base of the mountain; therefore, less than 30 percent slope. There are areas in the village with more than 30 percent slope where a support facility will need to be built. The draft ordinance reflects the fact that recreation facilities that extend into the village also qualify for the waivers of slope.

One use included in the planning commission’s recommendation was the “Natural Resource Based Recreation.” That term is used by the USFS in conjunction with the Ski Area Recreation Opportunity Enhancement Act. That is federal legislation regarding year-round resort activaties limited to recreation, taking advantage of flora, fauna, topography, etc.

The resorts also requested the ability to request a waiver to build on 30-40 percent slopes. The Aspen ordinance allows for that type of application, but with a list of criteria (soil, engineering studies, etc.) that should be submitted with the application.

 **Council Member Snelgrove** asked if the Aspen ordinance had been in place long enough to quantify its effectiveness.

 **Mr. Zachary Shaw**, Deputy District Attorney, stated he did not know. County staff went to a planning conference of mountain resorts where the consensus among attendees was that Aspen’s ordinance was very robust, precise, clear, and helpful. He reviewed dozens of ordinances regarding mountain resorts and most were very short on details.

* *Tree Replacement*

 **Mr. Woodward** stated the resorts have also requested a waiver from the tree replacement provision. FCOZ already has such a waiver for minor ski resort improvements, defined as improvements to existing facilities. For larger projects, the resorts did not think a three to one tree replacement ratio would work. Resorts are already required to submit a vegetation management plan to the USFS. The planning commission recommended a new provision in the ordinance that requires a new ski resort, when removing large numbers of trees, to submit a forestry study that analyzes the number of trees removed, where they are, and what mitigation is recommended.

 **Council Member DeBry** stated he was concerned that a resort could submit such a report created by someone with no expertise in the field.

 **Mr. Woodward** stated the State Forester’s Office indicated it would be willing to analyze any report submitted by a ski resort.

* *Environmental Dashboard Project*

 **Mr. Woodward** stated the Environmental Dashboard Project (EDP), which is not yet complete, will be a repository of raw environmental data. The County will eventually be able to develop certain policies based on that data. The County’s proposal refers to consulting the environmental data when the resorts are creating an overall master plan.

 **Mr. Fisher** stated Save Our Canyons has some significant issues with transfer of development rights (TDR), and he is glad that issue has been removed from the ordinance. Although density may be transferrable, water is not. That would create a conflict between the County and Salt Lake City. His organization is concerned about how the boundaries are drawn between the villages and recreation areas. It does not want to see the villages expand up the mountainside. It also has issues with the types of uses that are appropriate in the canyons. Zip riders, coasters, and the slides contribute to a “Disneyland” environment on the mountains. The Environmental Dashboard is great tool that can be tied to the ordinance to utilize the data. He also understands that resorts have to do some building, but is not in favor of an all-out waiver of tree replacement. One suggestion is for resorts to pay into a tree bank for restoration elsewhere in the canyons.

 **Mr. Bonar** stated he felt everyone was close to an agreement on this ordinance. Snowbird’s issues are:

* 1. There should be 1,000 contiguous acres included in the Mountainous Planning District.
	2. Year-round activities should be included in the ordinance. With an increasing population and changing weather conditions, it is important that resorts provide both summer and winter activities.
	3. The MRZ should provide for different uses in different districts. Recreation districts should be more closely aligned with the USFS perspective on recreational and nature based uses. He was okay with the definition of the recreation zone, but felt there should be a broader definition of permitted facilities and uses within the existing base area. This will allow Snowbird to be competitive in the future because this is how it works at other resorts in Utah and throughout the country.

 **Ms. Linda Johnson**, Mountainous Planning District Planning Commission, spoke of her concern about the transfer of development rights, relying too heavily on the Aspen ordinance, and the Disneyland aspect of development at resorts. She also indicated she would more fully express her thoughts in a letter to the Council.

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

***CONSENT AGENDA*** (3:47:51 PM)

Board Appointments

                        Mayor Ben McAdams submitted letters requesting the Council’s advice and consent to the appointments of **Karen Krieger** and **Ryan Benson** as members of the Zoo, Arts, & Parks (ZAP) Tier II Advisory Board to serve three-year terms. Their terms will begin January 25, 2017, and end January 24, 2020.

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

                        Mayor Ben McAdams submitted letters requesting the Council’s advice and consent to the appointments of **Laynee Jones**, **Kori Renwick** and **Todd Richards** as members of the Community and Economic Development Council to serve three-year terms.  Their terms will begin January 24, 2017, and end January 24, 2020.

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

                        Mayor Ben McAdams submitted letters requesting the Council’s advice and consent to the reappointments of **Weston Clark** and **Thomas Beckett** as members of the Clark Planetarium Advisory Board to serve three-year terms.  Their terms will begin January 24, 2017, and end January 24, 2020.

                        **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Granato, moved to approve the appointments and forward them to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal consideration. The motion passed unanimously. Council Members Jensen, Newton, Bradley and Wilson were absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Tax Matters

 The Council reviewed the tax matters, which have been placed on the Council agenda for final approval and execution.

 **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Granato, moved to approve the tax matters and forward them to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal consideration. The motion passed unanimously. Council Members Jensen, Newton, Bradley and Wilson were absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Resolution

 The Council reviewed the following resolution authorizing execution of an interlocal agreement and quit claim deed, which has been placed on the Council agenda for final approval and execution:

Declaring Cree Drive as surplus and conveying it to *West Valley City* for no fee to be used for public purposes as part of a public right-of-way.

 **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Granato, moved to approve the resolution and forward it to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal consideration. The motion passed unanimously. Council Members Jensen, Newton, Bradley and Wilson were absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Indigent and Hardship Tax Relief Sliding Scale

 The Council reviewed the sliding scale for use in administering indigent and hardship tax relief for the 2017 tax year, which will use the same guidelines as the Utah State Circuit Breaker program.

 **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Granato, moved to approve the sliding scale and forward it to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal consideration. The motion passed unanimously. Council Members Jensen, Newton, Bradley and Wilson were absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Gift to Salt Lake County

 The Council reviewed the following gift to Salt Lake County. The Declaration of Gift form has been placed on the Council agenda for final approval and execution:

*Animal Services Division*

 *Utah FACES* has offered to donate microchips, vaccinations, sterilization surgeries, and injured animal surgeries. The estimated value of this gift is $31,818.47.

 **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Granato, moved to accept the donation, and forward the Declaration of Gift form to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal consideration. The motion passed unanimously. Council Members Jensen, Newton, Bradley and Wilson were absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Mayor’s Community Contributions

 The Council reviewed the recommendations of the Contribution Review Committee for the following community contributions to be appropriated from the Mayor’s 2017 budget:

**People Helping People (2) $100 Golf gift cards**

 **(8) $ 50 Planetarium gift cards**

**Kostopulos Dream Foundation/Camp-K $250**

 **(2) $100 Golf gift cards**

 **(2) $ 50 Planetarium gift cards**

 **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Granato, moved to approve the recommendations and forward them to the 4:00 p.m. Council meeting for formal consideration, finding the County received fair and adequate consideration for the contribution. The motion passed unanimously. Council Members Jensen, Newton, Bradley and Wilson were absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

Other Business (3:47:51 PM)

*Approval of Minutes*

 **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Granato, moved to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes for Tuesday, January 3, 2016, and Tuesday, January 10, 2017. The motion passed unanimously. Council Members Jensen, Newton, Bradley and Wilson were absent for the vote.**

− − − − − − − − − − − − − −

*Cancellation of Meeting*

 **Council Member Bradshaw, seconded by Council Member Granato, moved to cancel the Committee of the Whole meeting for Tuesday, February 21, 2017. The motion passed unanimously. Council Members Jensen, Newton, Bradley and Wilson were absent for the vote.**

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

 The meeting adjourned at 3:48:40 PM.

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Chair, Committee of the Whole

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Deputy Clerk

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦

♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦ ♦♦♦