

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

**Thursday, June 16, 2022
6:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
4580 South 2300 East
Holladay, Utah**

ATTENDANCE:

Mayor Rob Dahle
Paul Fotheringham – *via Zoom*
Drew Quinn
Matt Durham
Dan Gibbons
Ty Brewer - *excused*

City Staff:
Gina Chamness, City Manager
Stephanie Carlson, City Recorder
Jonathan Teerlink, Community Dev. Director
Todd Godfrey, City Attorney

I. *Welcome* – Mayor Dahle.

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

II. *Pledge of Allegiance.*

Mayor Dahle led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. *Public Comments.*

There were no public comments.

IV. *Consideration of Ordinance 2022-11 – Amending the Budget for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2021, and Ending June 30, 2022.*

City Manager, Gina Chamness explained that the amendments will recognize \$10 million in bond proceeds within the Storm Water Fund. This was not planned for as part of the original budget. Additionally, an item approved by the Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) Board earlier in the year was added which resulted in an additional \$66,000.

Mayor Dahle wondered if the \$10 million bond proceeds would move out of the budget for Fiscal Year 2022-2023. Ms. Chamness explained that it was anticipated as revenue next year as well. However, since the bond closed earlier that day, the proceeds would fund the current year. The City anticipated that the Fiscal Year 2021-2022 budget would recognize the \$8 million in the Capital Projects Fund, but not the \$10 million in the Storm Water Fund. It would come in as revenue, but would not be spent until the 2022-2023 budget. She clarified that the money would be in both the current budget and the next budget. This had to do with the timing of the bond.

Council Member Fotheringham noted that for the ARPA Funds, there was a line item for \$66,504, but then it flipped to \$66,000 even. He wondered whether that was a typo. Ms. Chamness explained that the correction would be made.

Council Member Durham moved to ADOPT Ordinance 2022-11 – amending the budget for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2021, and ending June 30, 2022. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gibbons-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Ordinance 2022-11 was adopted by a unanimous vote.

V. Consideration of Ordinance 2022-12 – Determining the Rate of Tax for 2022 Tax Year and Levying Taxes Upon all Real and Personal Property Within the City of Holladay.

Ms. Chamness explained that the rate is based on the revenue discussed previously by the Council. The certified rate from the State Auditor is 0.001330, which was a reduction from the current rate, based on the 22% increase in value.

Council Member Quinn moved to ADOPT Ordinance 2022-12 – Determining the rate of tax for the 2022 Tax Year and levying taxes upon all real and personal property within the City of Holladay. Council Member Durham seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gibbons-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Ordinance 2022-12 was adopted by a unanimous vote.

VI. Consideration of Ordinance 2022-13 – Adopting a Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2022-2023.

Mayor Dahle reported that the above item related to the adoption of the Final Budget for the Fiscal Year 2022-2023. He noted that Section 2-B of the Ordinance should read 35% rather than 25%. That correction would need to be added to the motion language. This language would account for the ARPA Funds. It would likely be a temporary increase to handle the level of the Fund Balance in the General Fund until those funds were expended. He felt the Council was wise to protect some of the Fund Balance until there was more information about what would happen with the economy and inflation levels.

Council Member Fotheringham stated that the Council previously discussed the Unified Police Department's ("UPD") portion of the budget. He wondered if there were any updates about that. Mayor Dahle reported that there was a \$50,000 increase overall in the Shared Services budget and the City received a pro-rata share of that. There was a \$550,000 reduction in the overall request. Anything that was not absolutely necessary had been removed from the Shared Services budget. Mayor Dahle reported that the Crossing Guard and Mental Health items were considered important and resulted in the increase.

Mayor Dahle read a letter into the record from Council Member Brewer, who represents District

Council Member Brewer regretted that he was unable to be present at tonight's meeting. Approving the budget was one of the most important responsibilities of an elected official. Since this was his first involvement in the City budget process, he wanted to thank Ms. Chamness and other City Staff Members who were involved. Council Member Brewer also thanked his fellow City Council Members for striving to be good stewards. He appreciated the experience, diligence, and patience that fellow Council Members had shown throughout the budgeting process. Though Council Member Brewer would be absent for the vote, he wanted to publicly voice his support for the City of Holladay Fiscal Year 2022-2023 budget, as presented. He thanked everyone for their hard work and support.

Council Member Durham moved to ADOPT Ordinance 2022-14 – Adopting a Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2022-2023, with the amendment to Section 2-B, noting the surplus in excess of 35% rather than 25%. Council Member Gibbons seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gibbons-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Ordinance 2022-13 was adopted by a unanimous vote.

Council Member Fotheringham commented that he had been fairly vocal about the UPD budget during the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 budget process. He believes that it was the responsibility of the Council to look critically at the numbers. Throughout the process, he had a lot of difficulties reconciling the significant UPD increases but recognized that the cost of policing was increasing throughout the nation. He does not believe that UPD was being poorly managed, but that the nature of society as well as market forces, had created a higher demand for police services.

Council Member Gibbons appreciated the pushback that took place during the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 process. He believed it was an important part of the process and it was not disruptive or counterproductive. The Council needs to question to achieve the best results. He appreciated the willingness of the Council Members to ask questions and request additional information. Mayor Dahle echoed those comments. He thanked City Staff for their hard work and participation.

VII. *Consideration of Ordinance 2022-14 – Amending Various Sections of Title 13 Relating to Waterwise Landscaping Requirements.*

Mayor Dahle reported that this would align the City Code with the new State requirements. If someone wanted to focus on water-wise landscaping, the amended language would allow that and create added flexibility.

Council Member Gibbons moved to ADOPT Ordinance 2022-14 – Amending various Sections of Title 13 relating to Waterwise Landscaping Requirements. Council Member Durham seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gibbons-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Ordinance 2022-14 was adopted by a unanimous vote.

VIII. *Consideration of Ordinance 2022-15 – Amending Title 13.45 and Table 13.100 of the City Code Relating to Multi-Family Land Uses in the ORD Zone.*

Council Member Gibbons moved to ADOPT Ordinance 2022-15 – Amending Title 13.45 and Table 13.100 of the City Code relating to multi-family land uses in the ORD Zone. Council Member Durham seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gibbons-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Ordinance 2022-15 was adopted by a unanimous vote.

IX. *Consideration of Ordinance 2022-16 – Amending Title 13.05.070 of the City Code Relating to Eligibility Requirements for the Design Review Board.*

Mayor Dahle reported that the above item relates to amendments to the eligibility requirements for the Design Review Board. He explained that the adjustment would accommodate the Holladay Crossroads Zone. It would also add an additional member to the Design Review Board.

Council Member Durham moved to ADOPT Ordinance 2022-16 – Amending Title 13.05.070 of the City Code relating to eligibility requirements for the Design Review Board. Council Member

Gibbons seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gibbons-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Ordinance 2022-16 was adopted by a unanimous vote.

X. *Consideration of Resolution 2022-17 – Approving an Agreement with Millcreek City for Utility Boxes and Covers and the Installation of Concrete Collars on Murray Holladay Road.*

Ms. Chamness stated that a portion of Murray Holladay Road was being paved and rather than trying to separate utility boxes and concrete collars by municipality, it was agreed that the City of Holladay would incur that expense and Millcreek would reimburse the City for their portion.

Council Member Gibbons moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-17 – Approving an agreement with Millcreek City for utility boxes and covers and the installation of concrete collars on Murray Holladay Road. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gibbons-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Resolution 2022-17 was approved by a unanimous vote..

XI. *Consent Agenda.*

a. *Approval of Minutes – April 21, May 5, 12, and 19, 2022.*

Council Member Quinn moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from April 21, May 5, 12, and 19, 2022. Council Member Gibbons seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the City Council.

XII. *City Manager Report – Gina Chamness.*

a. *Financial Report.*

Ms. Chamness reported on the Financial Report as of 5/31/2022. It outlined the revenues and expenses by fund. She stated that the City was in good shape overall. For property tax revenues, the budget was exceeded by approximately 2%. Three months were remaining for sales tax revenue. The City was close to the budget goal and it was assumed that the goal would be exceeded by at least \$500,000. Two months were remaining for Franchise Taxes and it was also expected that the goal would be exceeded. There were only a few areas where the City was under budget in terms of revenue. For instance, under the Other Licenses and Permits Section. The City was slightly behind what had been anticipated for road cut permits. That was based on the Google Fiber network rollout in the City. She noted that the Justice Court revenues were also trending below budget.

Ms. Chamness explained that the expenses side was also looking good. She referenced the Transfer to Capital and Debt service line. Many of those transfers had not occurred yet, which is why it appeared that the City was under budget. Once the transfers occur, the line item would be in alignment with the budget. Council Member Matt Durham wondered if the timing was normal for those types of transfers. Ms. Chamness confirmed that it was.

Ms. Chamness reported that the City had been approached with some possibilities for the Skate Park and invited feedback from the Council. A group was interested in hosting skate classes on Saturday mornings. The group provided a similar service in other jurisdictions throughout the County. City Staff had contacted other municipalities, such as Cottonwood Heights and West Jordan, who were satisfied with the service provided. One challenge was the fact that the municipality was asked to handle the registration and this is not something that the City had the

capacity to do. In Cottonwood Heights, Salt Lake County provides that service for them. The City would likely do the same thing if the Council was supportive of the park being closed for classes.

Council Member Quinn asked if there would be a cost for the County to handle the registration. Ms. Chamness believed the cost for participants would be shared between the County and the group that sponsors the classes. It was similar to the arrangement for baseball uses, where the City does not receive any of the fees that a baseball player would pay to participate in a league. Council Member Gibbons did not see that this was different from a baseball or soccer league. As a result, he would not have a problem with the use. Ms. Chamness reported that the Skate Park would be used for this purpose once a week for an hour or two. Council Member Durham asked about liability issues. Ms. Chamness explained that there would be an agreement with the County so the use would be covered from a liability standpoint. The Council was supportive of the concept.

Mayor Dahle wondered if there had been contact with the band about the 4th of July celebration. He also wanted to know how the celebration would be handled. Ms. Chamness noted that there could be discussions about the National Anthem. There had been a request that the music used during the fireworks display include something patriotic. Mayor Dahle asked that Juneteenth be recognized on the City's social media accounts.

XIII. Council Reports and District Issues

Council Member Durham reported that there was a lot of road work taking place in his district. It was wonderful to see the work being done. Residents were mostly happy, but some were wondering why the newly paved street was being torn up again. He believed this had to do with the manhole covers. Ms. Chamness explained that there had been three water line breaks in the last 10 days.

Council Member Fotheringham explained that there had been a report of street sweeper efforts taking place the same day as garbage day. All of the cans were out and the street sweeping was less effective as a result. He had spoken to Ms. Chamness about this, but there was uncertainty about whether this was a regular street sweeping or if it was done by a third-party contractor. It was important to remind third-party contractors about the garbage pickup schedule. Ms. Chamness stated that the City had not determined exactly who had done the street sweeping. However, Public Services Director, Jared Bunch reached out to both Salt Lake County and road work contractors to remind them about the existing garbage pickup schedule.

Mayor Dahle stated that there was a Ukraine Panel discussion the previous night where Council Member Gibbons participated as a panelist. Approximately 40 people attended the event and there were four panelists in total. The event lasted for approximately 90 minutes.

XIV. Recess City Council and Convene in an RDA Meeting.

Council Member Durham moved to recess the City Council Meeting and reconvene in an RDA Meeting. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council. The Council meeting recessed at approximately 6:40 pm.

XV. Reconvene City Council in a Work Meeting.

The Council reconvened in a work meeting at 6:45 pm

a. Highland Drive Study Update – Horrocks Engineers.

Alexis Verson - Transportation Planner with Horrocks Engineers. She reported that previously, five potential cross-sections were presented to the City Council and it was narrowed down to two cross-section concepts, and the public was surveyed on the two concepts. Data collection and traffic modeling were conducted. Findings were then presented to the City Council in November 2021. Horrocks Engineers had since focused on cost estimation and prepared some grant documents.

Ms. Verson reported that the two concepts that were shared with the public included Alternative 1: Complete Street and Alternative 2: Five Lane Cross Section with Multi-Use Pathway. Both alternatives were received favorably with 42% of survey respondents preferring Alternative 1 and 52% of survey respondents preferring Alternative 2. Some of the survey results were shared with the Council. She informed the Council that all of the survey data was available on the project website for further review. A lot of educational materials had been provided based on some of the comments received from the public. Information related to traffic calming was added to the website, including street design benefits and road narrowing benefits. There were also several case studies provided for review.

Council Member Gibbons asked about Nickerson Road. He noticed that in the photograph, there were resident vehicles parked on the side of the road. That was an issue from time to time on Highland Drive as well. Although he liked Alternative 1, he worried that with only two lanes, residents would park in the bicycle lanes. He wondered how that issue could be alleviated. Ms. Verson explained that when protected bicycle lanes were a fairly new concept, there had been confusion in some areas. Flyer programs had been an effective way to keep the public informed. The striping design on Highland Drive could also make it clear that bicycle lanes were not appropriate for parking.

Modeling was done for the roadway cross sections. Horrocks Engineers wanted to understand the effects of a three-lane cross section on traffic flow. Some data collection was done to determine vehicle counts and AM and PM peak times. The modeling team used the Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) Travel Demand Model and looked at current conditions and assumed conditions for 2050. The three-lane cross section was modeled based on that data. Ms. Verson reported that the model predicted that traffic volumes would increase by 10% in 2050. That was fairly minimal. The reason for that was because the land uses would not change significantly. The volumes had been bumped up to an assumed increase of 25% to capture any potential new development or unexpected densification. Count locations included: Murray Holladay Road, Meadowmoor Road, Spring Lane, Walker Lane, 5600 South, Vine & Van Winkle, and Vine & Highland Drive. Based on preliminary model results, the three-lane cross section could maintain acceptable traffic flows. It would add 10 to 15-second delays at intersections, which could be impactful for drivers.

Example images and modeling maps were shared with the Council. Mayor Dahle believed there were still pieces of right-of-way that needed to be acquired to make the design work. Included in the budget numbers were some remaining right-of-way acquisition projections. Ms. Verson overviewed the cost estimates. The design team had put together preliminary cost estimates of the

preferred concept in preparation for the WFRC grant. That application would start in September with a Letter of Intent, which would be followed up with a fairly technical application. There needed to be an understanding of preliminary costs.

Ms. Verson explained that work had been done UDOT on the cost estimates to account for the cost and type of materials, inflation, and a 10% contingency for any unknowns or risks. The estimated total project cost for the construction year, which was 9-10 years in the future, was \$21.5 million. That included a 30% contingency, which was higher than average. This was done to be conservative in the assumptions.

Council Member Gibbons asked about the WFRC grant and wanted to know whether it would cover the underground utility burial. Ms. Verson stated that it would not and the City would need to find that money independently. That cost was approximately \$8 million. Ms. Chamness noted that it was anticipated that a single grant would not cover the entirety of the costs. Council Member Fotheringham noted that even if the utilities were not buried, there were still several poles that were close to the edge of the street that would need to be moved. Ms. Verson reported that there were some cost assumptions for moving utility poles. Further discussions were had about the assumed conditions for 2050.

Council Member Quinn asked if it would be less expensive to move the poles rather than bury them. This was confirmed. Council Member Gibbons felt that burying the utility poles may not be as necessary as the three-lane option. Trees were lining the area and the power poles could be interspersed with trees. It was possible that all the lines did not need to be buried. Ms. Chamness explained that if the Council was interested in burying the utilities, it would impact the road design. It was important to make a decision before the design process was underway.

Mayor Dahle could not imagine spending \$8 million to bury power lines on Highland Drive. It would be wonderful if the visual eyesore of the power lines could be addressed, but if there was not some other way to obtain the money, it may not be worthwhile. Ms. Verson reported that it would cost \$280,000 to relocate utilities versus the \$8 million to bury them. Council Member Durham asked if there was data about a possible increase in the use of mass transportation or active transportation. Ms. Verson explained that it was difficult to estimate that but there were case studies that looked at a mode split. She stated that there was a way to calculate emission savings by assuming some mode split goals.

If a decision needed to be made about the design relatively soon, the Council did not believe it would be possible to bury the utilities. The money was not available and it would be difficult to justify the high costs compared to the relocation costs. Ms. Verson reported that the WFRC grant submittal would take place in fall 2022. If funding was awarded, that funding would become available in 2029. The next steps would include environmental clearances and the final design. The status of the funding would be shared approximately six months to a year after submission of the application.

XVI. *Adjourn.*

Council Member Durham moved to ADJOURN the City Council Meeting. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:20 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Holladay City Council Meeting held Thursday, June 16, 2022.

Stephanie N. Carlson, MMC
Holladay City Recorder

Robert Dahle, Mayor

Minutes approved: **August 11, 2022**