

**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

**Wednesday, December 4, 2019**

**5:30 p.m.**

**Council Chambers**

**8000 South Redwood Road**

**West Jordan, Utah 84088**

---

**COUNCIL:** Mayor Jim Riding, and Councilmembers Alan Anderson, Dirk Burton, Zach Jacob, Chad Lamb, and Chris McConnehey. Councilmember Whitelock attended electronically.

**STAFF:** David R. Brickey, City Manager; Korban Lee, Assistant City Manager; Rob Wall, City Attorney; Scott Langford, Community Development Director; Danyce Steck, Finance Director; Brock Hudson, Community Preservation Director; Brian Clegg, Public Works Director; Derek Maxfield, Fire Chief; Ken Wallentine, Police Chief; Dave Naylor, Parks Manager; Duncan Murray, Assistant City Attorney; Jared Tingey, Assistant City Attorney; Larry Gardner, City Planner; Kent Page, Associate Planner; David Murphy, Engineering Manager for CIP; Tauni Barker, Communications and Events Manager; Joe Bryant, Procurement Manager; Paul Brockbank, Fire Marshall; Rachel Mackay, I.T. Administrative Assistant, and Jamie Brooks, Interim City Clerk.

***I. CALL TO ORDER***

Mayor Riding called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

***II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE***

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Scott Langford.

***III. CITIZEN COMMENTS***

Carmen Valdez said she believed West Jordan was a beautiful city, but was disappointed the City had not moved forward with renewable energy. She briefly explained HB 411, and asked the City Council to commit to 100% clean energy by 2030 by passing a City resolution in support of HB 411 prior to December 31, 2019.

Russ Ridge, West Jordan resident, expressed dismay over the masonry block chosen for the new Public Works building, and said he would be persistent in seeking a resolution.

Steve Jones, West Jordan resident, asked the Council to get back to basics and provide for public safety. He said he was tired of feeling he did not get anything in return for his tax dollars, and said he was beginning to feel unsafe in his own neighborhood.

There was no one else who wished to speak.

The proposed amendment would affect 10.02 total acres at approximately 7401 South 5490 West. The southern parcel (20-25-300-008) contained one single-family dwelling; the northern parcel (20-25-300-007) had no existing dwelling; both parcels had been used for agriculture.

If the land use map amendment and rezoning were approved, the applicant proposed to subdivide the properties into 19 single-family residential lots. (Please see Exhibit D)

Exhibit D was a revised Concept Plan submitted before the City Council. The Concept Plan showed 19 lots over 10.02 acres with R-1-12 and RE-20 zoning. Because the rezone application from Planning Commission to City Council had been revised to have less dense potential density, staff believed it was not necessary for the Planning Commission to give a recommendation based on this revised Concept Plan.

One of the concerns voiced in the August 20, 2019 Planning Commission meeting was the potential conflict between lots zoned Rural Residential (RR) with greater animal rights and lots zoned just "Residential" (R-1-12). Since the August 20, 2019 Planning Commission meeting, the rezone application was revised to show R-1-12 and RE-20. However, unlike Rural Residential zones, Residential Estate zones did not provide additional animals rights over just Residential zones, so the potential conflict between animal rights would still exist.

The subject property's surrounding zoning and land uses were as follows:

	<b>Future Land Use</b>	<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Existing Land Use</b>
<b>North</b>	Very Low Density & Low Density Residential	RR-1D & RR-.5D	Agriculture & Single-family Residential
<b>South</b>	Low Density Residential	R-1-12F	Single-family Residential
<b>East</b>	Medium Density Residential	RR-1E	Single-family Residential
<b>West</b>	Very Low Density & Low Density Residential	A-1 & RR-1D	Agriculture & Single-family Residential

#### **Section 13-7C-6: Amendments to the Land Use Map**

According to City Code, Section 13-7C-6, any amendments to the general plan, including maps, shall be approved only if the following are met.

**Finding A:** *The proposed amendment conforms to and is consistent with the adopted goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the City General Plan.*

**Discussion:** Statements, goals, and policies in the General Plan support and do not support the proposed Land Use Amendment (pp.18-32)

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Conforms</b>
Maintain Stability & Consistency In Land Use Decision-Making	No

**Finding B:** *The development pattern contained on the land use plan inadequately provides the appropriate optional sites for the use and/or change proposed in the amendment. (See Comprehensive General Plan, pp. 23-32)*

**Discussion:** The City has relatively few undeveloped acres classified as “Low Density Residential”. Most “Low Density Residential” properties are built-out.

It is a General Plan residential goal and policy to provide a safe and healthy, living environment for all citizens of the city and to ensure safety, accessibility, and walkability within and between neighborhoods (p.26). While the official Future Land Use Map should accurately represent the future land use needs and goals of the city (p.19), walkability within and between “Very Low Density” or “Low Density” can be unrealistic.

**Finding:** The development pattern contained on the land use plan inadequately provided the appropriate optional sites for the use and/or change proposed in the amendment.

**Finding C:** *The proposed amendment will be compatible with other land uses, existing or planned, in the vicinity*

**Discussion:** The proposed amendment is compatible with adjacent “Low Density Residential” and single-family land use to the south; but it will be less compatible with adjacent “Very Low Density Residential” to the north and to the west. The Future Land Use Map calls for this property to remain “Very Low Density Residential.”

“Low Density Residential” is often not compatible with “Very Low Density Residential” because zones considered “Very Low Density Residential” need more acreage to conduct rural residential land uses such as the maintaining and keeping of large animals. However, the adjacent “agricultural” land is minor agricultural – often considered “hobby farming”. And, zones classified as “Very Low Density Residential” need more acreage to buffer potential nuisances (insects, odors, noises) between properties that maintain animals and fowl and properties which do not. Only the Rural Residential (RR) zones classified in the “Low Density” designation allows the maintaining and keeping of animal and fowl; most zones in this designation do not allow the maintaining and keeping of animal and fowl.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment would be compatible with and incompatible with other land uses, existing or planned, in the vicinity.

**5. Potential of the proposed amendment to hinder or obstruct attainment of the general plan's policies.**

The proposed amendment supports the general plan's policies regarding keeping a majority of new development as single-family lots. The proposed amendment also supports the general plan's policies on the location of low-density single-family housing.

**6. Adverse impacts on adjacent land owners.**

The impacts to adjacent landowners will be minimal. Access to this subdivision will be gained from the existing stub road in the Bella Estates subdivision and from 5490 West. Due to the 4-minute response time for fire/emergency vehicles it is required that we stub onto 5490 West. We are proposing 17 lots (19 with revised concept) so there will be minimal impact on traffic through the existing neighborhood. It will trigger the development of 5490 W. adjacent to and south of these parcels into a public street so there will be less traffic drawn through the existing neighborhood to the south and will allow a more direct route onto 5490 W. and out onto the arterial street 5600 W. This will allow for more direct vehicular and pedestrian access from the existing neighborhood to the commercial center on 5600 W. and 7800 S.

**7. Verification that the correctness in the original zoning or general land use plan map is correct for the area in question.**

The original zoning is consistent with the general land use plan map.

**8. Impacts on City services such as water, sewer, storm drain, public streets, traffic, fire and police services.**

There is water, sewer, and storm drain stubbed in 5400 West. 5490 W. will be constructed on the portion adjacent to this project. There will only be an estimated 17 lots in this project so impact to traffic will be minimal. This project will not have a large impact on fire and police services.

**9. Impacts on schools.**

This project will have minimal impact on schools due to it only including 16 new lots (19 with revised Concept Plan).

**10. Impacts on the local economy and other factors as requested by the planning department.**

This project will have minimal impact on the local economy.

**Finding:** It was unclear whether the proposed amendment constituted an overall improvement to the adopted general land use map.

*“Very Low Density will include development having up to two dwelling units per acre. Characteristics of land in this category range from extremely large acreages of land still in agricultural production, to fairly large lots (an acre or more) some of which may allow horses and other farm animals to be kept. Very low density residential uses are appropriate as a buffer between higher density single-family development and dedicated open lands or on hillsides where sensitive slopes make higher density development inadvisable.” (p.24)*

*“Low Density Residential will include development providing for low intensity single-family detached residential uses typically found in suburban and traditional neighborhoods.” (Page 25)*

The current zoning map shows few properties zoned R-1-12, and the Future Land Use Map shows few properties classified as Very Low Density Residential.

The General Plan classifies the proposed zone of R-1-12 as “Low Density Residential” and this particular property to be “Very Low Density Residential.”

The following is the Residential Density table from the General Plan:

Residential Density - Adjusted Net Density		
Density Designation	Density Range (Dwelling Units Per Acre)	Zoning Districts
Very Low Density	Up to 2.0	All A, RR, RE Zones, PC, PRD
Low Density	1 to 3.0	RR, RE, R-1-12, R-1-14, PC, PRD
Medium Density	3.1 to 5.0	R-1-8, R-1-9, R-1-10, PC, PRD
High Density	5.1 to 10.0	RM, R-1-5, R-1-6, R-2, R-3-6, R-3-8, R-3-10, PC, PRD
Very High Density	10.1 and up	R-3-12, R-3-16, R-3-20, R-3-22, PC, PRD

The proposed R-1-12F zoning is compatible with the southern adjacent property zoned R-1-12F. However, it is not compatible with the A-1 property to the west, the RR-1D to the north, nor the RR-1E to the east. (This general area will continue to experience pressures for denser zoning due to surrounding areas having denser zoning.)

With sufficient road dedication, the concept plan is compliant with the master transportation plan for 5490 West to become a two or three lane collector road.

The proposed rezone to R-1-12F is not in compliance with the current General Plan’s land use designation of “Very Low Density”, and the proposed rezone to RE-20 is probably considered “Low Density” while RE-40 is considered “Very Low Density”.

development of 5490 West. The Fire Department says that the concept plan submitted with this rezone application provides adequate emergency access.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment should not unduly impact the adequacy of public services and facilities intended to serve the subject zoning area and property than would otherwise be needed without the proposed change, such as, but not limited to, police and fire protection, water, sewer and roadways.

**Criteria 5:** *The proposed amendment is consistent with the provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.*

**Discussion:** This property is within the Airport Overlay Conical Zone (Ac): “A zone that commences at the periphery of the horizontal zone and extends outward therefrom a horizontal distance of four thousand feet (4,000’).” The Conical Zone is considered the least impactful area of the Airport Overlay Zone. When this property is platted, the plat should state that this area is within the “Airport Overlay Conical Zone (Ac)”.

**Finding:** The proposed amendment was consistent with the provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.

This application’s proposed Future Land Use Map amendment from Very Low Density Residential to Low Density Residential, and proposed Rezoning from RR-1D to R-1-12F and R-E-20 was partially supported by the General Plan.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Jacob, Fire Marshall Paul Brockbank explained that emergency response time could be within the required four minutes if the proposed development connected to 5490 West. He said it would be possible to limit the access at 5490 West with a gate.

Mr. Gardner stated that converting 5490 West to a dedicated public road was part of the City’s transportation master plan. He explained that in response to concerns raised by the Planning Commission, the applicant altered the proposed development plan to put half-acre residential lots along the east boundary of the development, adjacent to existing half-acre lots. Scott Langford commented that the Council would need to decide whether or not they wanted to continue the trend of development in the subject neighborhood. He said there was precedent in both directions.

Mayor Riding opened the public hearing.

Tiffany Ostrander, West Jordan resident, said she lived directly east of the proposed development. Ms. Ostrander said she attended a neighborhood meeting with Peterson Development and thought a resolution had been reached regarding animal properties, but seeing that non-animal lots were included in the development plan in the staff report, it appeared a resolution was not reached. She said only 2% of the neighborhoods in West

- 2) Access at 5490 West (private road);
- 3) General plan for the area – Mr. Bowler said it would make sense to first take a macro-view; and
- 4) 450-foot cul-de-sac length that would allow two lots.

Mr. Bowler asked that the Council approve development in a smart and orderly fashion.

Amy Martz, West Jordan resident, stated that residents relied on the zoning that was in place when they purchased property, and asked that the Council withstand pressure from developers.

Justin Hendricks, West Jordan resident, felt the proposed development would be a continuation of development begun with the Bella Estates and Winter Circle developments, and would fit in the West Jordan area. Referring to lot sizes, he did not believe bigger was always better.

Randy Bowler, West Jordan resident, said he had experience farming land and developing land. Mr. Bowler did not see a clear pathway to complete the proposed development, and suggested the Council not approve the requested rezone until a clear pathway was in place. He felt the property should be zoned R-.5 to retain animal rights.

Jeff Seaman with Petersen Development said he was at the recent meeting with neighborhood residents and heard a few primary concerns: 1) no one wanted change; and 2) concern regarding increased traffic as a result of the project. He did not believe the HOA residents were familiar with the HOA covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs).

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, Mayor Riding closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Jacob commented that animal rights could not be granted in an RE Zone. Staff agreed, and suggested an RR-20 Zone could be approved instead of an RE-20. Councilmember Jacob said it was his understanding that the Council had the choice between the current zoning and the proposed zoning. Mr. Gardner responded that it was within the Council's legislative discretion to determine appropriate zoning consistent with the zoning map.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Jacob, Staff said they were not aware of any complaints about animals originating from the Bella Estates development.

Councilmember McConnehey questioned whether the City had the right to dictate who could or must connect to 5490 West, which was a private road, and questioned whether the proposed development would put an undue burden on the owners of 5490 West. Councilmember McConnehey said he liked the idea of animal rights being incorporated into the subject property. He commented that the Planning Commission forwarded a negative recommendation for this application multiple times, and said he appreciated Staff's comments. Councilmember McConnehey said he felt the developer was headed in the right direction, but said he was leaning toward a denial to allow further discussion.

Councilmember Anderson agreed with Councilmember Jacob that a compromise could be found. He referred to the Staff comment that there was a similar intensity between RR-20 and RE-20, with RR-20 allowing animal rights.

**MOTION: Councilmember Anderson moved to approve Ordinance 19-45 as written, replacing RE-20 with RR-20 throughout the document. Councilmember Jacob seconded the motion.**

Councilmember Burton asked if Councilmember Anderson would consider altering the motion to designate RR-20 across the entire property. Councilmember Anderson responded that he would not approve that amendment to the motion because it did not match what the applicant presented.

Councilmembers McConnehey and Whitelock said they would be interested in knowing how many of the citizens in attendance were in favor of the change from RE-20 to RR-20. Mayor Riding asked for a show of hands.

A roll call vote was taken

<b>Councilmember Anderson</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Burton</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Councilmember Jacob</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Lamb</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Councilmember McConnehey</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Councilmember Whitelock</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Mayor Riding</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion failed 3-4.**

Councilmember McConnehey said he would be in favor of the applicant returning with a proposal with a clear pathway for completion that was recommended by the Planning Commission.

**MOTION: Councilmember Lamb moved to deny Ordinance 19-45. Councilmember McConnehey seconded the motion.**

Mr. Wall informed the Council that City ordinance prohibited an applicant after a rezone denial from reapplying with a substantially similar application for at least one year.

Councilmember Lamb withdrew his motion.

Councilmember McConnehey said he felt it was clear the Council considered RR-20 to be substantially different from RE-20. Staff stated that RR-20 and RE-20 had historically been treated as substantially similar. Councilmember McConnehey asked if the Council could make a motion to deny the application but allow the applicant to return with a proposal that included an RR element in less than a year. Mr. Wall said he believed that would be enough

The Council recessed at 7:51 and the meeting reconvened without Councilmembers Burton and Jacob at 8:02 p.m.

Councilmember Burton returned at 8:03 p.m. and Councilmember Jacob returned at 8:06 p.m.

**RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT AND CONSIDER FOR APPROVAL  
RESOLUTION 19-201, APPROVING BUDGET AMENDMENTS  
CLARIFYING THE ANNUAL COMPENSATION OF THE MAYOR  
AFTER JANUARY 6, 2020**

Danyce Steck explained the Office of the City Manager, Office of the City Attorney, and Finance Department recommended the following text-only changes to the budget for clarification purposes:

In the General Fund Summary under Notes, the budget includes the following narrative (with recommended amended text in red):

1. "In November 2017, the residents of West Jordan voted to change the form of government from the Council-Manager to the Council-Mayor Form of Government. Below is the estimated annual personnel cost of this transition. One-half of this cost and has been included in this year's budget since the change will not take effect until January 2020 (or mid-budget year). These costs are estimates and based on full benefits (family-coverage). The actual cost will be determined after (i) the City Council votes in a separate action on the annual salary of the "Mayor (New)", and (ii) ~~vary depending on~~ the candidates and employees who ~~occupies~~ occupy the four positions shown under "Additions" select a medical benefit coverage. In addition, there will be some one-time building renovations costs needed to accommodate these changes."
2. In the Appendix: Staffing Document section of the budget, the effective date of the Mayor's salary was listed as 01/01/2020, however, since the Mayor will not be sworn in until 01/06/2020, it is recommended this date be changed in the budget document and a note be added.

**MAYOR'S OFFICE**

Mayor (thru 12/31/2019)				\$89,500 per year		0.5
Mayor (after 01/06/2020)				*\$120,000 per year		0.5
Intergovernmental Liaison			38.51	54.79	GR77	1
	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>				<u>2</u>
						<u>0</u>

\* The number of \$120,000 shown above for the Mayor's salary is an estimate only and included for budgeting purposes. The final Mayor's salary will be determined by separate vote of the City Council in a subsequent action.

Councilmember Burton said he believed this item and the next agenda item would be a conflict of interest for him as Mayor-elect. Councilmember McConnehey agreed that the next agenda item would be a conflict of interest for the Mayor-elect, but suggested this item, being only a change in date, would not be a conflict of interest.

1. The salary for the first elected Mayor under the new form of government;
2. The benefits to which the first elected Mayor was entitled under the new form of government;
3. The process for setting the salary and the benefits for any elected mayor that was elected following the first four-year term of the first elected Mayor under the new form of government;
4. The compensation to which an individual appointed to fill an unexpired term of a departed mayor was entitled; and
5. The role of the West Jordan City Ethics Commission in the determination of compensation of West Jordan City elected officials.

If the City Council chose to adopt the proposed ordinance, the motion to adopt the ordinance should specify the dollar amount of the annual salary for the office of Mayor that would become effective on January 6, 2020. To assist the City Council in determining the specific dollar amount of the annual salary for the office of Mayor, the City Manager's Office provided a copy of a survey conducted by the Human Resource Office. The survey showed a comparison of Mayor compensation among nine cities in Utah that currently governed under the Council-Mayor form of government. The survey was included at the end of the materials that accompanied this *Request for Council Action*.

Councilmember Anderson questioned whether setting Mayor compensation with adoption of the budget each year made sense, considering it would be the Mayor who would present the budget document to the City Council. Mr. Wall responded that the Council would need to include Mayor compensation in the adopted budget so that funds would be available. He agreed there might be a better process. Mr. Wall emphasized that the Ethics Commission would only be involved if the Council chose to increase the Mayor compensation.

Councilmember Jacob said he approved of the proposed process since the Council would have ultimate control of the budget. He said he would include a cost of living adjustment (COLA) for the Mayor, but not for the City Council.

Mayor Riding opened the public hearing.

Amy Martz, West Jordan resident, said she felt the Mayor's responsibilities were changing significantly, and said she was in favor of a higher salary for the Mayor. Ms. Martz expressed the desire to attract highly qualified individuals with appropriate training and education.

Steve Jones, West Jordan resident, said he saw no reason to pay the Mayor an amount that was not somehow tied to what the Mayor provided to the City. He said he did not feel the Mayor should need additional staff to help him make decisions. Mr. Jones commented that corruption had a way of weaseling in as salaries increased.

Mayor Riding closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Jacob spoke in favor of approving the annual compensation amount already included in the budget document (\$120,000).

**and including altered language suggested by Mr. Wall. Councilmember Lamb seconded the motion.**

A roll call vote was taken

<b>Councilmember Anderson</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Burton</b>	<b>Recused</b>
<b>Councilmember Jacob</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Lamb</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember McConnehey</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Councilmember Whitelock</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Mayor Riding</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion passed 5-1.**

David Brickey stated that Councilmember Burton was not in the room during the discussion, did not participate, and was not present in the room during the vote. Following the vote, Councilmember Burton returned to the meeting.

**V. COMMUNICATIONS**  
**CITY MANAGER AND STAFF COMMENTS/REPORTS**

Tauni Barker-

- Reported that over 2,100 guests attended the recent holiday event at City Hall. She expressed appreciation to the Councilmembers who attended and helped, and thanked the Facilities Staff for their help.

Korban Lee-

- Stated a meeting was scheduled to get feedback from the business community regarding water rates on December 10, 2019, and asked if the Council would want to schedule a presentation and potential decision on the December 11 Council meeting agenda. Councilmember Jacob said he believed a decision would not be made by the Council until January at the earliest. Councilmembers McConnehey and Anderson said they would prefer to take time to consider and make the right decision.
- A Council retreat was scheduled for December 18, 2019.

Brian Clegg-

- A Public Open House regarding design of the Maple Hills Park was scheduled for Dec 10, 2019.

Danyce Steck-

- Reported that financial statements from October were emailed to the Council.

**CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS/REPORTS**

Councilmember Anderson-

- Said he appreciated receiving financial reports from Ms. Steck.

- f. Approve Resolution 19-206, declaring Maples East Park no longer surplus
- g. Adopt Ordinance 19-47, amending the 2009 West Jordan Municipal Code Title 4 (Business and License Regulations) regarding the change to the Council-Mayor form of municipal government

The City Council pulled Consent Item 6d for discussion.

**MOTION: Councilmember Anderson moved to approve all Consent Items except 6d.  
The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnehey.**

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Yes
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 7-0

#### ***VII. CONSENT ITEMS DISCUSSION***

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING 19-204, TO AWARD A CONTRACT WITH CN CONCRETE, LLC FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A 4-FOOT HIGH BLACK POLYMER COATED STEEL CHAIN LINK FENCE TO SURROUND THE WILD WEST JORDAN PLAYGROUND IN VETERANS MEMORIAL PARK IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$34,632,00.**

At the request of the City Council, Staff advertised a bid for a four-foot high fence to be installed around the new Wild West Jordan Playground at Veterans Memorial Park. The initial request for bids was advertised in the summer, and no bids were received. Feedback received from the contractors recommended bidding in the fall when they would be available for work.

The City advertised a second time on the Utah Public Procurement Place website with bids due November 7. The City received one responsive bid from CN Concrete LLC. The City was able to negotiate a decrease in the submitted cost of the 12-foot wide mow strip, reducing the cost of the project by \$5,980.00.

Responding to a question from Councilmember Burton, Brian Clegg showed on a map where the fence would be located. Councilmember Burton said he was not sure a fence was needed around the entire Playground area, and suggested eliminating the fence on all but the side nearest a parking area.

Councilmember Anderson disagreed with Councilmember Burton, stating that a fence around the entire perimeter would allow the playground to be for all ability levels.

- so as to reduce potential conflict with Pioneer Day
- There was a suggestion to have a Council meeting **every** Wednesday—workshop one week, regular meeting the next, etc.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Jacob moved to approve Resolution 19-208, approving the 2020 annual meeting schedule for the City of West Jordan. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McConnehey seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken

Councilmember Anderson	Yes
Councilmember Burton	Yes
Councilmember Jacob	Yes
Councilmember Lamb	Yes
Councilmember McConnehey	Yes
Councilmember Whitelock	Yes
Mayor Riding	Yes

The motion passed 7-0.

***IX. REMARKS***

No remarks were made.

At 9:25 p.m., the Council took a break and reconvened at 9:31 p.m. in Workshop format.

***X. WORKSHOP***

**DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLES 12-15, PERTAINING TO THE CHANGE TO THE COUNCIL-MAYOR FORM OF GOVERNMENT**

Mr. Murray explained proposed changes to Titles 12-15 of the Municipal Code, and answered questions from the Council. Councilmember McConnehey expressed concern regarding the change in Council land-use authority. Staff agreed that Council control would be different.

**DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 2, CHAPTERS 3-18 (ALL OTHER CITY COMMITTEES), PERTAINING TO THE CHANGE TO THE COUNCIL-MAYOR FORM OF GOVERNMENT**

Mr. Murray and other staff members discussed proposed changes to Municipal Code Title 2, Chapters 3-18 with the City Council.

**DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2009 WEST JORDAN MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 3, CHAPTERS 3-9 INCLUSIVE (REVENUE, FINANCE AND TAXATION) REGARDING THE CHANGE TO THE COUNCIL-MAYOR FORM OF GOVERNMENT**