

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF HOLLADAY
CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, June 3, 2021

6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

ATTENDANCE:

Mayor Rob Dahle
Paul Fotheringham
Daniel Gibbons
Drew Quinn
Matt Durham
Sabrina Petersen - *excused*

City Staff:

Gina Chamness, City Manager
Stephanie Carlson, City Recorder
Holly Smith, Assistant to the City Manager
Todd Godfrey, City Attorney
Jared Bunch, City Engineer
LaNiece Davenport, Community and Economic
Development Director

I. *Welcome* – Mayor Dahle.

Mayor Dahle called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Council Member Petersen was excused.

II. *Pledge of Allegiance.*

Mayor Dahle led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. *Public Comments.*

Clark Richards - 2470 Kentucky Ave. He and his wife, Holly, thanked the Council for their service over the last several months. He appreciated that the City Council had been able to guide the City of Holladay through difficult times. Mr. Richards commented that it felt wonderful to be a citizen of the community and to feel respected, understood, heard, and represented.

Mayor Dahle acknowledged the efforts of City staff over the past several months as well as the Police and Fire Departments. He serves on the Board of Health as a representative of the Council of Governments. They had met earlier in the day and introduced Dr. Angela Dunn, who will serve as the New Director of the County Health Department. The Mayor acknowledged the efforts of those on the front lines who are charged with protecting those at risk. He stated that it was an unbelievable task that was also incredibly stressful. Typically, the negative was heard but Mayor Dahle wanted to recognize the frontline workers for managing the pandemic so well. He appreciated the comments made by Mr. Richards during the public comment period.

Scott Francom - 6320 S Cobblecrest Road. He shared comments related to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (“ADU”) issue in the City. Mr. Francom was appreciative of the thoughtful deliberation that had taken place on the ADU’s. He strongly supports the City allowing ADUs, including interior and exterior units, such as casitas, mother-in-law apartments, and garage apartments.

Mr. Francom explained that the State and Salt Lake County had been trying to address the urgent need for affordable housing. He considered it to be a valiant cause. Between the housing market and the uncertainty of an inflationary economy, the need was extremely urgent. In response to the requirements under SB 34, the City of Holladay committed to allowing people with various incomes to benefit from and participate in various aspects of neighborhood and community life. The City also set a goal to accommodate new dwellings by focusing on appropriate additional dwellings within existing and redeveloping neighborhoods. It was also stated that the City intends to study and adopt a new ADU ordinance in 2021 to comply with the required third strategy per SB 34.

There had been several concerns raised during the last several Council Meetings. In discussions related to the implementation of HB 82, there was concern about creating winners and losers by excluding some neighborhoods. Mr. Francom understood that excluding small lot sizes, such as R-1-4, but felt that the current Code could handle that through setbacks and the percentage of the dwelling footprint. He did not believe it was fair to create a 25% exclusion area by any other means. Additionally, there were concerns about there being too many adults in rental units. However, a study conducted in Portland, Oregon found that 94% of ADUs were rented to two or fewer adults and 50% were rented to a friend or family member. Mr. Francom also understood the concerns related to parking. He was in support of requiring an off-street parking space. Additionally, he was in support of charging a fee for adding an ADU but suggested that it be a one-time fee rather than an ongoing fee.

Mr. Francom wanted to see the City of Holladay do more than less when in terms of ADUs. He did not believe that allowing external ADUs would cause overcrowding in neighborhoods. It was important to address the shortage of affordable housing as growth continued to take place in the City. Multiple studies showed that allowing ADUs had a nominal effect on density but organically increased affordable housing.

When speaking with neighbors and other City residents, a large majority believed that a garage apartment or backyard casita should be allowed. Mr. Francom noted that ADUs would allow homeowners to invest in their properties and increase property values. People could subsidize their house payments or provide additional income for those in need. It would be possible to preserve the character of a single-family neighborhood while still providing additional housing. He made note of the high rent costs in the City and reported that one study showed that 50% of ADUs were below market value rents. That same study found that 70% of ADU renters had only one car and 90% had zero children. Mr. Francom stressed the importance of affordable housing.

ADU growth was slow and organic. Cities that had encouraged ADUs only had 1% to 5% of homes with an ADU. Mr. Francom commented that he and others in his neighborhood would like the City Council to consider doing more than just interior ADU requirements. There could be more lenient height requirements for garage apartments and a code that allowed external detached rental units.

IV. *Public Hearing on Proposed Amendments to the 2020-2021 Budgets.*

Mayor Dahle noted that City Manager, Gina Chamness presented the 2020-2021 budget information at the last City Council Meeting.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearing at 6:17 pm. *There were no comments.* Mayor Dahle closed the public hearing at 6:18 pm.

V. *Public Hearing on Proposed 2021-2022 Fiscal Year Budgets.*

Mayor Dahle noted that the information was available on the City's website.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearing at 6:18:30 pm.

Clark Richards hoped that the 2021-2022 fiscal year budget included a pay increase for City employees. Mayor Dahle noted that there were Cost of Living Adjustments ("COLA") proposed as well as strategic market adjustments proposed for various positions.

There were no further comments. The public hearing remained open.

VI. *City Manager Report – Manager Chamness.*

Ms. Chamness had nothing to report.

VII. *District Issues and Board Reports.*

Council Member Durham reported that he attended the Skyline High School awards assembly. Several outstanding young people were recognized, including two who received the City of Holladay scholarship. Council Member Durham also noted that his oldest constituent, Leola Nielsen, who lived on Lincoln Lane, passed away at the age of 104.

Council Member Quinn reported that she had been able to give away two Holladay City scholarships to deserving students at Churchill Junior High School. She also thanked Ms. Chamness for hiring a full-time Code Enforcement Officer.

Council Member Gibbons expressed gratitude to Chief Hoyal for responding to several requests around the City related to speed enforcement. A couple of residents in his district had concerns about high speeds on Holladay Boulevard in the southern section where the speed limit was still 40 miles per hour. Council Member Gibbons also thanked Ms. Chamness for continuing to represent the City's interests in discussions related to the development near Canyon Cove. There had been numerous meetings with city leaders in Cottonwood Heights and Ms. Chamness had represented the position of the City of Holladay well. He was grateful for that and all of the hard work done by staff.

Mayor Dahle discussed the Day of Service event that took place on May 22, 2021. He noted that it had been a wonderful event and thanked Council Members Quinn and Fotheringham for being there. Mayor Dahle noted that it was nice to see the community come together. Additionally, he reported that the Granite Education Foundation, a non-profit that supported the district, was hosting the Backpack and School Supplies Drive. The City volunteered to get behind that effort as a City. While he and Ms. Chamness had not yet determined the specifics, the month of July would be focused on the event. Mayor Dahle felt it was important to determine how Holladay could participate as a community in the collection effort.

Mayor Dahle asked the Council Members to think about what could be done in the City center and in other public areas to celebrate the Fourth of July. He noted that the Council had decided not to move forward with a concert or breakfast. Those decisions needed to be made six weeks ago and at that time, future restrictions, and safety requirements were unclear. Mayor Dahle hoped the next City Council Meeting could include discussions about possible Fourth of July decorations and promotion.

VIII. *Recess City Council in an RDA Meeting.*

Council Member Fotheringham moved to recess the Council Meeting and reconvene in a Redevelopment Agency (“RDA”) Board Meeting. Council Member Durham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council and the Council meeting recessed at 6:27pm.

IX. *Mayor Dahle Reconvene City Council in a Work Meeting.*

a. *Discussion on Tax Relief Programs – Wayne Cushing, Salt Lake County Treasurer.*

Ms. Chamness reported that Salt Lake County Treasurer, Wayne Cushing, was present to discuss the tax relief programs offered through Salt Lake County. He noted that some might apply to those in the City of Holladay. The two ways to obtain tax relief were described as follows:

- Reduce the value of the home that taxes are being paid on; and
- Obtain a tax credit (deduct the credit from the amount owed on the property tax).

The most popular tax relief program currently was for veterans. Mr. Cushing explained that any veteran who has served and received a disability during that service is eligible to receive tax relief through a reduction of the value of their home. That reduction was based on the percentage of the disability received while in the service. He reported that in the City of Holladay, 104 veterans participated in the program.

Mr. Cushing also discussed the Circuit Breaker program, which is a State program the County has joined. The intention was to help senior citizens who are making very little money and provide them with a break on expenses. Anyone over the age of 65 with an income of less than \$34,600 can obtain relief. Renters can apply to the State of Utah through the Utah State Tax Commission. Alternatively, the County would administer relief to homeowners and reduce the amount of property tax owed. Mr. Cushing explained that the credit received was on a gradual scale. The lower the income, the higher the credit. He noted that for homeowners, the credit would come from the State but the County administered it. At the end of the year, the State would reimburse the County for that expense.

In 2020, 2,400 residents in the County qualified for the Circuit Breaker program, and between \$1.3 million and \$1.4 million worth of taxes were deducted from that group. Mr. Cushing commented that the Circuit Breaker program was able to assist a lot of elderly residents. However, there were not a lot of people that qualified due to the \$34,600 limit. In the City of Holladay, only 86 residents applied and qualified. Mr. Cushing reported that the Circuit Breaker program included an income test that was based on household income. Mr. Cushing noted that there had been a decrease over the last four years of residents who qualified for the Circuit Breaker program.

Mr. Cushing explained that for the last 10 years, the County had done everything possible to find those who qualified for the program. That included attending senior expos and annual visits to senior centers to inform residents about the Circuit Breaker program. Despite those efforts, he felt there were thousands of residents throughout the County that would qualify if they knew about the program. He believed the \$34,600 income level was not keeping pace with the needs of residents. They were working with the Legislature to try to address that issue.

Mr. Cushing noted that the Legislature had a theory that they were looking into. Rather than a tax relief program, a deferral program was being considered where residents would not need to pay the

taxes currently but would need to pay the taxes when the home is sold. Mr. Cushing was concerned about that approach as many in the program needed to leave their home to move to a care facility. Some seniors need the money from the sale of the home to pay for the facility. He saw potential issues but noted that there were certain advantages of a properly run deferral program.

Salt Lake County did not want someone removed from their home for failure to pay property taxes. If a household reaches five years of non-payment and qualifies for a tax sale, the County would work with the homeowner to put them on a deferral program. That would involve paying a certain amount per month. Mr. Cushing noted that the interest rate was low and as long as that program was followed, the homeowner would not be in fear of losing their home to a tax sale. He reported that there were only 21 residents on that deferral program in Salt Lake County.

Council Member Fotheringham asked about the impact on the municipal entities. He believed the entities would feel no impact from the State program but may be impacted by the reduction of taxable value. Mr. Cushing discussed the collection rate. It was previously at 96% but they had been able to increase it to 98%. That meant significantly less needed to be billed in the future. He did not believe that the abatement program would affect an entity's budget.

Council Member Fotheringham referenced an earlier comment by Mr. Cushing where a resident would be able to reduce the taxable value of their home. He presumed that was after the mill levy was set to reduce the home value relative to the neighbors in their taxing district. Mr. Cushing explained that in a neighborhood, most people pay 55% of the assessed value from the Assessor. Those with property tax relief would pay on 35% of that value. It would be a reduction in assessed value and not a reduction in the actual home value. He added that an increase in property value does not increase property tax. It would be a budget increase from an entity in their tax district.

Council Member Gibbons noted that the ADU statute would allow Internal Accessory Dwelling Units ("IADU") in any single-family residential property, assuming there was no exclusion area. He wondered whether an ADU would impact the household income that was considered for Circuit Breaker program eligibility. Mr. Cushing explained that the rental income would be included as part of the household income but the income of the renter living there would not count.

Mayor Dahle commented that there were specific programs that could be communicated to residents. There are 86 Holladay residents currently taking advantage of the Circuit Breaker program but he wondered if there were more that would qualify. He thought the number seemed low. Mr. Cushing agreed it was a low number. He reported that Salt Lake County had been unable to reach out to senior centers last year due to COVID-19 concerns. However, they would reinstate that type of outreach in 2021.

Council Member Fotheringham asked for more information about how the program applied to renters. Mr. Cushing explained that for renters, the Circuit Breaker relief was applied directly through the Utah State Tax Commission. He clarified that the Circuit Breaker program was not a property tax relief program.

Mayor Dahle commented that the City Council was sensitive to the fact that there were people on fixed incomes that the property tax increase would disproportionately affect. He noted that there were programs in place and it was important to communicate those as much as possible. Mr. Cushing

explained that it was important to share information about the programs to a range of age groups. Children of senior citizens may realize that their parents would benefit from some sort of relief. Mayor Dahle thanked Mr. Cushing for his time and for sharing information with the City Council.

b. Continued Discussion on Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADU”).

Mayor Dahle reported that the goal for this item was to determine a recommended direction for IADUs. That recommendation would be forwarded to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission would then pursue their own independent review of the IADU materials presented. There would be discussions and a public hearing at the Planning Commission level. The Planning Commission would then pass their recommendation to the City Council. The Council would take the Planning Commission recommendation into consideration and there would be another public hearing at the City Council level. Mayor Dahle noted that the goal was to have something completed by the end of August.

Previous discussions had taken place related to IADUs. Much of the debate centered around the possible 25% exclusion area that was permitted in single-family residential zones. Council Member Gibbons noted that his view of the 25% exclusion area had changed since the last City Council Meeting. The main reason had to do with older residents on fixed incomes who may need alternative sources of income. A lot of residents with that need lived in smaller lots. If an exclusion area was applied to smaller lots, it would be difficult for certain residents to have an alternate source of income. Council Member Gibbons noted that he did support an exclusion in areas where additional on-street parking or congestion would create public safety issues.

Mayor Dahle reported that Council Member Peterson initially showed support for the 25% exclusion area but after further discussions, came to the same conclusion as Council Member Gibbons. She did not want to support the exclusion area because it would create winners and losers. There were also enforceability issues to consider. Mayor Dahle felt it was important to consider the intention of the State Legislation and the issues related to affordable housing. He was aligned with Council Member Gibbons and suggested passing along a recommendation to the Planning Commission that stated:

- If there are specific areas within the City where allowing IADUs in the neighborhood would create physical safety issues, an exclusion would be appropriate. Otherwise, an exclusion would not be appropriate.

Council Member Durham wondered if the 25% exclusion area was inclusive of lots under 6,000 square feet or whether that was a separate exception. City Attorney, Todd Godfrey, commented that the law was not specific on that. It simply mentioned “25% of the primarily single-family residential zones.” However, there was a provision in the statute that allowed the City not to permit IADUs on lots of 6,000 square feet or less.

Council Member Fotheringham commented that there had been discussions about ADUs prior to HB 82. Those discussions had been put on hold until the City knew what would be required from the Legislature. During the previous discussions, there had been conversations about external ADUs. The City of Holladay currently has an ordinance on the books related to guest houses. There could be a guest house or casita but there was a rule that it needed to be on property that was half an acre or more. When looking at the ADU ordinance, he felt it was important to address external ADUs as well.

Council Member Fotheringham noted that one of his constituents wanted to put an external ADU on his property but had a property with 0.48 acres he would not qualify based on Council direction for one-half acre lots. However, within the R-1-10 Zone, that constituent could split his lot in half and build another house. Council Member Fotheringham believed that the one-half acre requirement may need to be looked at further. If there was enough acreage relative to the zone to subdivide the lot, it would make sense to allow an external ADU. He felt that an external ADU would be less impactful to the neighborhood. Council Member Quinn supported the suggestion made by Council Member Fotheringham.

Mayor Dahle provided further direction to Ms. Davenport and answered questions related to IADUs:

- The City Council recommends that the City shall not exclude IADUs in certain areas.
- The City Council recommends that the City not exclude smaller units. However, the Council would like to recommend the exclusion of specific areas within single-family residential zones where there may be safety considerations.

Further discussions were had about the recommendation made by Council Member Fotheringham. Ms. Davenport felt it made sense to discuss external ADUs as well as IADUs. Council Member Gibbons supported the recommendation made by Council Member Fotheringham. He noted that the IADU statute had changed a lot and it was important to revisit ADUs. Holladay needed to make sure all ordinances were consistent with the new mandate from the State Legislature. Mayor Dahle thanked Ms. Davenport for her work related to the IADU discussions.

c. Continued Discussion on 2021-22 Tentative Budgets.

i. Historical Committee – Sandy Meadows.

The Holladay Historical Commission Chair, Sandy Meadows and Vice-Chair, Robert Falck to discuss the Historical Commissions budget requests. Mr. Falck explained that the Commission sent a letter to Ms. Chamness with some requests. The Holladay Historical Commission would like to:

- Rename the Holladay Historical Commission to the Holladay-Cottonwood Historical Preservation Commission;
- Activate the Cottonwood Historical District that was created by the City Council in 2012;
- See the installation of signs at entrances to the south part of the City that would welcome people to, “Historic Cottonwood: Settled 1849,” similar to what was seen when driving into Cottonwood Heights southbound from the City of Holladay; and
- Consider adding Cottonwood to the names of Knudson Park (Knudson Cottonwood Park) and the Meadows (Meadows Cottonwood Cabin).

Ms. Meadows discussed the Meadows Cabin. Two men that had worked previously with historical buildings and cabins had examined the logs. They both felt the Meadows Cabin was worth restoring. While some of the logs were not usable, there were various options to consider. Ms. Meadows noted that money had been collected when the cabin was taken down. There was \$3,100 in an account. Additionally, the Commission was selling books for \$10 each. There was currently almost \$600 from the book sales. That money could be put towards the cabin restoration project. She noted that residents were very interested in the history of Holladay. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission had been unable to hold their annual History Night. However, she noted that they would

like to host a modified History Night at either City Hall or a theater and share DVDs related to the early history of the City of Holladay.

Ms. Chamness reported that the budget included \$1,000 for the Holladay Historical Commission. That was what was generally allocated. She believed the outstanding questions for City Council to consider were whether there should be additional funds for the Meadows Cabin and where the reconstructed cabin would be located. Ms. Chamness noted that the estimated costs for reconstruction were \$40 per hour but there was no indication of the number of hours the work would take. Ms. Meadows felt that Knudson Park would not be a suitable location for the cabin. The Commission would prefer either a museum in City Hall or for the cabin to be at the Historic Casto Home.

Council Member Gibbons noted that if City Hall had a room downstairs that could be transformed into a museum, a portion of the cabin could be constructed there with the original logs. He knew the Commission was working towards a full estimate for the possible reconstruction costs. Council Member Gibbons thanked the members of the Holladay Historical Commission for all of their work and dedication. He shared some history about Holladay and explained that at the time of incorporation, the name was Holladay-Cottonwood. It had been shortened during incorporation. Council Member Gibbons felt some of the ideas shared by the Commission were worth considering. He suggested that they continue to work on a more detailed financial proposal.

Mayor Dahle noted that his concern with the cabin was that it would be reconstructed and would then sit doing nothing like the Historic Casto Home. He was more interested in reengaging the museum discussions. Ms. Meadows liked the idea of a wall made of the cabin logs in a museum with other historical artifacts. Council Member Gibbons suggested that the Commission look into an estimate for reconstruction costs and create an inventory of museum-worthy items along with short descriptions to outline the significance of those items. Ms. Meadows commented that she would begin that process. Mayor Dahle explained that there could be smaller group meetings to discuss things in more detail. Those meetings could help to refine ideas before this item was brought back to the City Council in a Work Meeting. Mayor Dahle thanked Ms. Meadows and Mr. Falck.

ii. Skate Park Schedule and Update – Holly Smith, Assistant to the City Manager.

Ms. Smith explained that staff had been working with Spohn Ranch to get the construction documents ready for the Skatepark. As part of that process, a few items had been identified for City Council consideration that would impact the project cost and timeline. Ms. Smith outlined the following items:

- Sports Lighting: During public outreach in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, sports lighting was identified as a priority for the skate and business communities. They felt it was necessary to make the project successful. A special contractor for sports lighting would be needed, which would require a couple of weeks for design and a couple of weeks to do the required work. Ms. Smith explained that the most economical option for sports lighting would be to provide directional illumination by using three, 30-foot poles for a total cost of \$108,000:
 - Phase I would require \$38,000 for the installation of underground conduit, pole bases, and miscellaneous preparation work; and
 - Phase II would require \$70,000 for the installation of poles and fixtures (paid as part of a suggested community fundraising project).

- **Dry Well Installation:** There was an existing dry well and water drainage sump on the site that would need to be cleaned out from time to time. Due to the location, a truck would need to be brought into the skate park to access the dry well. Ms. Smith noted that the proposal was to construct a separate dry well that could be accessed on Holladay Boulevard. It would provide all of the drainage and address all of the issues but would not bring equipment onto the site. The work would require a specialized contractor who would be available in early July. It would take 1 to 2 weeks to complete the work.

The total project cost estimate as of early March 2021 was \$419,200. However, that had increased to \$491,300 as a result of the proposed sports lighting, dry well, and other adjustments for landscaping. Material costs had also increased. The Council had originally approved \$400,000 for the project in December 2020 with \$100,000 allocated from the Village RDA Fund and \$300,000 from the Capital Projects Fund. The current proposal was to amend the fiscal year 2020-2021 budget to include \$200,000 for the skate park project with \$100,000 from the Village RDA Fund and \$100,000 from the Capital Projects Fund. In the proposed fiscal year 2021-2022 budget, the Skate Park Project would require approximately \$300,000 from the Capital Project Fund.

Council Member Fotheringham questioned the idea that sports lighting was critical for the success of the Skate Park. He made note of the limited number of hours that the lighting would be used. Peak skating season was during the summer months when it was light out for much longer. While he was in full support of the skate park, he was unsure about the lights. He felt that the dry well installation would be necessary. Ms. Smith noted that staff felt that the dry well installation was important as it would protect the investment in the skatepark. She reported that it had a cost of approximately \$20,000.

Council Member Quinn wondered what the lighted hours would be. Ms. Smith explained that it would be up to the City Council to decide. The park hours were currently sunrise to sunset and there would need to be a specific modification to that for the Skate Park facility. Mayor Dahle believed the City Council was okay with the dry well installation and the lighting infrastructure. However, they wanted to give the skating community and business community the opportunity to fundraise for the \$70,000 installation piece of the project. Ms. Smith noted that staff would proceed and would look into getting the skating community and business community involved further.

iii. Capital Fund and Stormwater – Jared Bunch, City Engineer.

City Engineer, Jared Bunch provided an overview of the road pavement program for 2022. He shared the Historical Pavement Maintenance Map with Council Members. The map included all of the road work that had been done between 2015 and 2020. It outlined areas with slurry seal, crack seal, chip seal, and overlays.

Mr. Bunch also shared the 2021 Pavement Maintenance Map, which included the work that would be done over the summer. It included some overlays and micro-surfacing. The micro-surfacing would be done on 3900 South and Highland Drive. Mr. Bunch explained that it was important to keep the arterials and collector roadways in good operating condition because they had higher speeds and higher traffic volumes.

Mr. Bunch reported that \$7.2 million was budgeted for the pavement and overlay program. Staff had looked at the worst roadway conditions in the City and selected different residential roads, which had

been added to a list. The total amount of overlay expenditures was \$6.5 million. An additional \$700,000 was included in the budget for Council Members to add roads they felt needed attention. Mr. Bunch reported that the overlay program would address 16.5% of all the road square footage in the City. The program would focus on residential streets rather than collector or arterial roadways. The collector and arterial roadways would be addressed in 2023-2024.

Mayor Dahle asked about the paved condition index ("PCI"). He noted that the goal was to reach 71 PCI and he was interested to know how the plan, as proposed, would impact the current number. Mr. Bunch noted that the PCI was currently in the 50s and the plan would increase the number to the mid-70s. It was a significant increase. However, the mid-70s number would eventually start to drop down again, so it was not a long-term number. Mr. Bunch explained that his main objective was to make sure no roads moved into the failed category. There were many roads on the verge of failure within the next three to five years and it cost five times as much to repair a failed road.

Discussions were had about specific districts. Mayor Dahle noted that it did not seem that there was a lot of improvement happening in District 5. Council Member Gibbons believed that was because there were roads with higher needs in other districts. Fardown Avenue would be on his list to consider, but he trusted Mr. Bunch's judgment. Mr. Bunch expected that Council Members would bring forward additional areas of concern. He would take a closer look at those areas and determine whether they could be added to the list. Council Member Durham asked about District 2. Mr. Bunch noted that District 2 had some areas with greater needs. Council Member Durham wondered if that was because the roads were older. Ms. Chamness explained that it likely was due to the maintenance pattern of Salt Lake County rather than City Council decisions.

Mr. Bunch shared a slide related to storm drain cleaning, video inspection, and mapping. \$250,000 was proposed to handle those needs. He explained that the City had been reactive with respect to repairs rather than proactive. Emergency repairs were usually far more expensive. If City Staff knew in advance what the potential issues were, a plan could be put together to fix those issues rather than react to them on an emergency basis. Mr. Bunch stated that it was important to understand where all of the catch basins were draining to, what size pipes there were, what types of pipe materials there were and what condition the pipes were in. The \$250,000 would help to address a lot of important areas but would not necessarily complete the entire City.

Mapping the stormwater system was a requirement of the State in order to be compliant with the MS4 permit. Mr. Bunch explained that the mapping would be incorporated into the GIS system. Once the conditions of the pipes were known, staff could start to put together the list of necessary projects. There was approximately \$200,000 in the budget for project work to rehabilitate some of the storm drain pipes, either through trenching or a trenchless method.

Mr. Bunch discussed curb and gutter. \$100,000 was proposed to address some of the curb and gutters in Holladay, especially along the roads where there would be overlays. He explained that they would not be able to repair all of the curbs and gutters where there would be overlays, but a good portion of them could be looked at. Mayor Dahle commented that \$100,000 did not seem like a lot of money for curb and gutter work. Mr. Bunch stated that \$100,000 would address some of the curb and gutters in the most need. With the stormwater fee, there would likely be an annual budget for curb repairs. Mayor Dahle reported that the plan was to do an inventory, assess the scope of the issues, do the bond and then prioritize the work that needed to be done.

iv. Debt Fund – Gina Chamness, City Manager.

Ms. Chamness reported that the road bond from 2008 as well as the bond used to acquire land for Knudson Park and handle infrastructure improvements had both been retired. In the next year, there was approximately \$600,000 in debt service for City Hall and the Fire Station. That would continue through 2032. The budget included an estimated \$1 million debt service payment for the previously discussed road bond. That money would be transferred out of the General Fund to the Debt Service Fund. She anticipated that it would be a 10-year bond. Mayor Dahle explained that the intention was to align the bond length with the improvement length.

v. Parks and Public Works – Gina Chamness, City Manager.

Ms. Chamness reported that the budget included a \$242,000 increase for the Salt Lake County Public Works contract. The largest portion of that was due to a change in how the City budgeted for slurry seal. It had been budgeted separately in the Capital Budget last year but had been moved back into the contract. City Staff had anticipated that they would be able to contract for the slurry seal independently at a lesser cost, however, that did not happen. As a result, that cost was being assumed into the Salt Lake County Public Works contract again.

Ms. Chamness explained that Salt Lake County had also reclassified many of its employees. That resulted in an increase of \$80,000 to the overall budget. That increase was reflected in the \$242,000 number. She noted that the maps reviewed by Mr. Bunch earlier in the meeting did not include maintenance costs that would be paid as part of the contract. There would likely be other road improvements, which would increase the 16.5% number across the City. There were some other small changes being made in Public Works. For instance, there was some double counting of waste container expenses and some funding had been added for street sign replacement.

In parks, there had been some reductions in both equipment costs as well as building and ground maintenance costs to better reflect the actuals. Ms. Chamness noted that there had been money in the budget for the last several years that was set aside for a clean-up event that used to happen at City Hall. That event had not happened for the last several years due to the constraints of the site. Since that event would not take place on a regular basis, the funding had been removed from the budget.

Council Member Fotheringham further discussed the clean-up event. He noted that the event had been discontinued but then there had been dumpsters delivered in neighborhoods by Wasatch Front Waste & Recycling. The latter was recently changed and a reservation needed to be made in order to obtain a dumpster. He wondered whether that could be looked at again. Council Member Gibbons explained that the change from Wasatch Front Waste & Recycling had been due to COVID-19. It had continued this year partly because decisions had to be made ahead of time and partly as an experiment to determine whether or not that system should continue.

Council Member Durham asked about maintenance on the Lynne Lane Walkway. He wanted to try to meet with the residents in that area over the summer but felt it was important to get a sense of what could be done for them. Ms. Chamness commented that there was some flexibility in terms of funding. Included in the Capital Projects Fund was an unrestricted Capital Projects line item. If the maintenance was under the \$10,000 range, it would be possible to accommodate that from a budget perspective. However, there were several other pathways in the City. It was important to consider whether that would create an obligation to improve the other pathways as well. Council Member

Durham wondered how many pathways there were. Ms. Chamness believed there were at least four additional pathways. She would circulate the complete list.

d. Calendar.

Council Meetings – June 10 and 17, 2021.

The next City Council Meetings would take place on June 10 and June 17, 2021. Ms. Chamness overviewed the agenda for the next City Council Meeting. Council Members would hear from the Tree Committee to discuss an arborist position. The Council would also go through the budget line by line to ensure that everyone felt comfortable with the budget. Ms. Chamness noted that the new growth number would be ready at that time. She believed there would be some additional money to spend based on the new growth number. The Council could make changes based on that.

Mayor Dahle mentioned the raccoon program. He felt that the City could spend \$75,000 and still not solve the raccoon issue. Most people with a raccoon issue saw it as a private property owners' responsibility to deal with. He did not believe that the program would actually solve the problem. Council Member Durham noted that the City Council previously discussed the possibility of a reimbursement or voucher program. Ms. Chamness reported that she and Ms. Smith looked into that idea. Unfortunately, they had not been able to determine a streamlined way to do that without the creation of a lot of additional administrative work. They would continue to explore that possibility.

Further discussions were had about the raccoon program. Ms. Chamness believed that Salt Lake County Animal Services contracted with the United States Department of Agriculture ("USDA") as a separate contract. The City of Holladay participated in the raccoon program for five years. All other Salt Lake County cities were still participating in the raccoon contract. Ms. Smith explained that USDA did not keep great data so it was difficult to fully understand the numbers. While there were numbers per year, there was no information about whether those calls had come from within Holladay. She added that the program was quite expensive when the numbers were broken down per animal.

X. Closed Session Pursuant to Utah Code Section 52-4-204 and 205 to Discuss Personnel Issues, Potential Litigation, and Property Acquisition and Disposition.

Council Member Fotheringham moved to adjourn the Work Meeting and reconvene in a Closed Session pursuant to Utah Code Section 52-4-204 and 205 to discuss personnel issues, potential litigation, and property acquisition and disposition. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. The Council roll call vote was as follows: Council Members Quinn, Gibbons, Durham, Fotheringham and Mayor Dahle in favor. The Council convened in a closed session at 8:41 p.m.

Those in attendance in the Closed Session included Council Members Durham, Fotheringham, Quinn, Gibbons and Mayor Dahle. Others present included Gina Chamness, Todd Godfrey, Stephanie Carlson, LaNiece Davenport and Jared Bunch.

The minutes of the Closed Session were taken and are on file as a Protected Record.

Council Member Fotheringham moved to adjourn the Closed Session. Council Member Gibbons seconded the motion. The Council roll call vote was as follows: Council Members Durham, Fotheringham, Quinn, Gibbons and Mayor Dahle in favor. The motion to go out of closed session at 9:09 p.m. passed with a unanimous vote.

XI. Adjourn.

Council Member Durham moved to adjourn the Council Meeting. Council Member Gibbons seconded the motion. The City Council Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:10 pm.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Holladay City Council Meeting held Thursday, June 3, 2021.

Stephanie N. Carlson, MMC
Holladay City Recorder

Robert Dahle, Mayor

Minutes approved: **August 5, 2021**