

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

**Thursday, June 2, 2022
6:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
4580 South 2300 East
Holladay, Utah**

ATTENDANCE:

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

City Staff:
Gina Chamness, City Manager
Stephanie Carlson, City Recorder
Jayme Blakesley, City Attorney
Jonathan Teerlink, Community Dev. Director
Jared Bunch, Public Services Director

I. Welcome – Mayor Dahle.

Mayor Rob Dahle called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Dahle led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Public Comments.

Trudy Jorgensen-Price - Holladay Library. She reported that Summer Reading began on June 1, 2022 and encouraged everyone to sign up for Summer Reading, and noted that there were several activities associated with the program. One of the kickoff parties would take place at the Holladay Branch on June 11, 2022, from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. On June 13, 2022, there would be a Blood Drive at the Library. Ms. Jorgensen-Price stated that story time was still taking place on Tuesday mornings. Additionally, the yoga program would continue every Saturday morning during the summer months. This was because the program had become very popular.

Jeff Lund - 3916 S Feramorz Dr. He shared comments related to short-term rentals. He emailed comments to both Mayor Dahle and Council Member Durham. The Short-Term Rental Section of the City Code, 13.76.735, mentioned duplexes and single-family residences. He asked that the Code be reexamined so it was similar to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (“ADU”) information. If there was a duplex, it made sense for the owner to live on one side and the short-term renter to stay on the other side. Mr. Lund explained that there is a short-term rental across the street from him. He heard there may be short-term rentals on both sides of the unit. Short-term rentals brought parking issues and noise issues into neighborhoods. He wondered if the Council could address those concerns by ensuring that property owners lived on one side of the duplex.

Mayor Dahle believed the question from Mr. Lund was whether short-term rentals were permitted in duplexes. They were as long as they were registered and were in the correct zone. Mr. Lund noted that the short-term rental that was near him was at 3915 South Feramorz Drive. It faced into Feramorz Drive and did not face 3900 South. There was previously a hearing about changing that property to

a short-term rental. The Council stated at that time that both sides could not be rented out. With the property now being sold, he was concerned that the next owner would not honor that agreement. Mayor Dahle offered to forward the email to Community Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink and look into the issue further. He would contact Mr. Lund with any additional information.

IV. *Public Hearing on Proposed Budget Amendments for the Fiscal Year 2021-2022.*

Mayor Dahle reported that the above item was related to the proposed budget amendments for the current fiscal year. Information was included in the packet for review.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearing at 6:04 pm. There were no comments. Mayor Dahle closed the public hearing.

V. *Public Hearing on Proposed 2022-2023 Budgets.*

Mayor Dahle reported that the above item was related to the proposed 2022-2023 budgets. He noted that the City Council had been working on this since the Tentative Budget was passed in early May 2022. The Council would continue to work on the budget during City Council Meetings. The intention was to vote on the 2022-2023 budget at the June 16, 2022, City Council Meeting.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearing at 6:05 pm. There were no comments. Mayor Dahle closed the public hearing.

VI. *Public Hearing on Proposed Text Amendments to Title 13 Regarding:*

- a. *Clarifying Waterwise Landscaping Requirements***
- b. *Multi-Family Land Uses in the ORD (Office Research and Development)***
- c. *Eligibility Requirements for Members of the Design Review Board.***

Mayor Dahle reported that the above items were related to proposed text amendments to Title 13. Mr. Teerlink provided a staff report on the Waterwise Landscaping requirements and stated that language was added to allow more flexibility for water-wise landscaping. The amendments would also ensure that there were no hindrances for property owners or business owners who wanted to add water-wise landscaping. The City definition of landscaping stated that different types of landscaping could be used. The proposed amendments would add clarity and ensure that Title 13 was in line with the State Code and statutory requirements. In addition, the amendments would meet the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District requirements for programs such as Flip Your Strip. Council Member Brewer believed the proposed amendments would remove barriers to water-wise landscaping but would not create mandates in the City of Holladay. This was confirmed.

Mayor Dahle noted that the Office Research and Development (“ORD”) portion of the text amendment had been discussed previously. There was a desire to add a multi-family use to that particular zone. Mr. Teerlink added that when there was a residential use added to a zone, it was important to consider the accessory uses that go with it. For instance, short-term rentals. Those accessory uses had been added into Title 13 and there was a table that clarified which uses were permitted and which were considered conditional uses.

Council Member Fotheringham asked about short-term rentals in the ORD Zone. That was where the City was planning more affordable housing and he was concerned that an apartment unit that was designated as affordable housing could end up as a short-term rental property. Mr. Teerlink explained that deed-restricted units would ensure that did not happen. For a specific complex, it may be an

option to determine that only a certain percentage of units in the building could be available for short-term rentals. Council Member Fotheringham noted that a short-term rental in that type of unit would defeat the entire purpose of adding more affordable housing in the City. He asked if the deed restriction could specifically state that short-term rentals could not occur. It was noted that the deed restriction for that type of building could be crafted in a way that prohibited short-term rentals. If a deed restriction was not followed, Code enforcement would become necessary.

Council Member Brewer noted that in the redline version of Title 13, in 13.77.020, it stated: “Policy change – recommendation discussion needed.” He wondered what that referred to. Mr. Teerlink clarified that whenever a Site Plan went through the entitlement process, a Landscaping Plan was required for developments such as office buildings, retail spaces, and multi-family developments. Single-family homes did not require a Landscaping Plan. Planning Staff was asking whether the Council felt single-family homes should also be reviewed. Mr. Teerlink explained that the Planning Commission did not feel strongly either way. If the Technical Review Committee were to review that type of Landscaping Plan in the future, the Committee would determine whether the front yard minimum landscaping requirements were met. The review process would not create a lot of extra work for the Planning Staff, but it would be extra work for the property owner. Council Member Quinn wanted to know if other cities had the single-family requirement in place for Landscaping Plans. This was confirmed. Mr. Teerlink noted that no amendments were proposed for single-family home Landscaping Plans. It was simply highlighted as a possible future discussion item for the City Council. Mayor Dahle asked that the Council consider the possibility and reach a decision about whether single-family homes should be included.

Council Member Brewer did not believe single-family homes should require a Landscaping Plan unless it was necessary. His inclination was to continue to exclude single-family homes. Mayor Dahle agreed. It did not make sense to add the requirement if there was no reason to do so. Council Member Quinn echoed the comments. It was determined that no change would be made.

Mayor Dahle asked about the eligibility requirements for members of the Design Review Board. Council Member Fotheringham believed the added requirement was a preference for someone who lived or owned a business within the area being reviewed. He wondered if this would create potential conflicts of interest. Mr. Teerlink noted that sometimes it did create conflicts. However, when property owners or business owners interact with an applicant, there is a sense of ownership and a desire to work together. When the Holladay Crossroads Zone was adopted, the City also adopted the Design Review and Architectural standards. It was determined that the Design Review Board would oversee those standards and make recommendations to the Planning Commission. All of the requirements for the Design Review Board Member were Holladay Village-centered. No one was representing the area down on 6200 South and Van Winkel. This amendment would change that.

Council Member Brewer noted that there could be conflicts of interest or biases. It might be better to have a more impartial representative on the Design Review Board. While he understood the idea of having members with a vested interest in the area, it was important to consider the drawbacks as well. It was noted that if there were any conflicts of interest, Board Members could disclose that beforehand. City Manager, Gina Chamness clarified that the proposed changes to the Design Review Board language were to expand membership numbers from five to six and require ownership within and near the Holladay Crossroads Master Planned Area. This was because the Design Review Board

would no longer only weigh in on the Holladay Village Zone, but also on the Holladay Crossroads Zone.

Mayor Dahle opened the public hearings at 6:33 pm.. There were no comments. **The public hearing was closed.**

VII. *Consideration of Ordinance 2022-10 – Amending Provisions of Chapter 17 of the City Code Relating to Storm Water Management.*

Public Services Director, Jared Bunch clarified that the Stormwater Management Program was a separate document that had been created to be compliant with the MS4 Permit. Mr. Bunch stated that after feedback from the Council, certain changes had been made. He shared some of the proposed language from City Attorney, Todd Godfrey, which was as follows:

- Property owners of private property where a public storm drain manhole has been buried, shall not be responsible to uncover the manhole and raise the grade of the manhole unless:
 - The manhole is located within an easement of record; or
 - It can be demonstrated that the property owner was responsible for burying the manhole.
- It shall be unlawful and a violation of this Chapter to bury any manhole within the City without the permission of the City’s Public Works Director.

Mayor Dahle reported that this issue had previously been mentioned by Council Members Brewer and Quinn. He noted that if the manhole was located within an easement of record, it would be the responsibility of the purchaser to address the issue. Mr. Bunch clarified that the easement would indicate that there was a manhole, but would not necessarily guarantee there was a manhole there. Further investigation could be done with the City at that time. The Council was in support of the proposed language. Mr. Bunch reported that another change had to do with the Stormwater Management Program. There would be an information booth at the Blue Moon Festival.

Ms. Chamness informed the Council that prior to 2017, there was a spring cleanup event that took place at City Hall. There was no space to do that kind of cleanup event now due to the development of the playground and skate park. As a result, the funding for that event had been removed from the budget in 2020. Mayor Dahle felt it would be wonderful to have a City-wide day of service in the future.

Council Member Brewer asked about Ordinance 17.29.020 – Maintenance Easements. Mr. Bunch explained that Section C would be changed to clarify some of the structures. Discussions were had about maintenance easement sizes. Mr. Bunch noted that the Ordinance currently stated there must be a minimum of 15 feet. Some had been grandfathered in that were less than that. Council Member Quinn asked for clarification about the additions to Table 5 and read from Section 5.5. Mr. Brunch noted that there were some grammatical errors in that section and offered to make corrections.

Council Member Fotheringham moved to adopt Ordinance 2022-10 – Amending Provisions of Chapter 17 of the City Code Relating to Storm Water Management. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Brewer-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Ordinance 2022-10 was adopted by a unanimous vote.

VIII. *Consideration of Resolution 2022-16 – Amending the Stormwater Management Program.*
Council Member Quinn moved to approve Resolution 2022-16 – Amending the Stormwater Management Program. Council Member Fotheringham seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Brewer-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. Resolution 2022-16 was approved by a unanimous vote.

IX. *City Manager Report – Gina Chamness.*

Ms. Chamness shared updates with the Council related to the bond sale. She reported that a rating was received the previous week in preparation for the bond sale that had taken place earlier that day. The City was rated AA+, which was the highest rating the City of Holladay could hope for given the size of the City. It spoke to the fiscal management of the Staff and the City Council. Ms. Chamness informed the Council that they were able to sell the entirety of the bonds that morning, with a very small portion underwritten by the underwriter. The bonds were sold at a true interest cost of 3.15%. This was half a percentage better than previously anticipated, which was good news for the City.

Mayor Dahle thanked all of the prior City Council Members for how they had managed the budget. The current City Council continued to be responsible stewards of taxpayer monies. He believed all of that hard work was reflected in the rating. The final budget would be adjusted slightly as a result of the bond sale. Ms. Chamness hoped to have those numbers to the Council next week. Mayor Dahle asked when the funds would start to flow into the City. Ms. Chamness explained that closing was scheduled for June 16, 2022.

X. *Council Reports and District Issues.*

Council Member Fotheringham reported that he had attended the awards assembly at Bonneville Junior High School. He thanked the Precinct Chief, School Resource Officer, and Detective who were at the ceremony to present awards. It was an excellent event.

Council Member Quinn stated that she went to Churchill Junior High School to present two awards. It was wonderful to see the students receive them. She also stated that her neighborhood, which has had numerous water main breaks over the past few years, was currently undergoing work. Council Member Quinn was thrilled that work was being done to address the water main breaks that had occurred.

Council Member Fotheringham noted that there had been an issue in Council Member Quinn's district. He had spoken to Ms. Chamness and Mr. Bunch about the conflict between Salt Lake City Public Utilities and Google Fiber. Mr. Bunch reported that in the streets where Salt Lake City is rehabilitating the water main, Google was relocating their fiberoptics outside of the asphalt area and behind the curb. That would be done through a boring process to minimize disturbance to front lawns. Council Member Fotheringham wondered if there would be similar problems in other parts of the City when water pipes needed to be replaced. Mr. Bunch was not certain as it would be a case-by-case scenario. He did not know how extensively the water mains would be replaced.

Council Member Brewer stated that he received continued inquiries regarding the proposed park on Murray Holladay Road. The proposed park would be in his district, but he did not see that involvement from the City was justified. If more Council Members were interested, it could be pursued, but he was not currently interested. Council Member Brewer also noted that he had spoken

to a constituent about street repaving. The constituent had lived in their home for 36 years and the street had never been repaved. He wondered whether it would be possible to make records more accessible so residents could understand why certain areas were being repaved and others were not. Posting the Pavement Condition Index (“PCI”) may be beneficial. Mayor Dahle asked that it be discussed during a Work Meeting. He pointed out that Council Member Brewer could also suggest adding or reprioritizing items on the Capital Improvement Prioritization list next year if he felt that a specific road needed to be repaved.

Mayor Dahle reported that he spoke to a resident earlier in the day about Holladay Boulevard by the Cotton Bottom. He drove there to look at the area and spoke further with the resident. The City is very data-driven in terms of how the roads are prioritized. Mayor Dahle also stated that he had done a ribbon cutting at Granato’s that morning. There is a food court concept inside, where there is a taco kiosk and a barbecue kiosk, which are run by independent operators. There is also a coffee and pastry kiosk. He encouraged the Council Members to visit it for themselves.

XI. Recess to RDA Meeting.

Council Member Fotheringham moved to recess the City Council Meeting and reconvene in an RDA Meeting. Council Member Quinn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously and the council meeting recessed at 7:06 pm..

XII. Reconvene City Council in a Work Meeting.

Mayor Dahle reconvened the City Council in a work meeting at 7:10 pm

a. Highland Drive Study Update – Horrocks Engineers.

Due to the absence of Council Members Gibbons and Durham, it was determined that the item would be moved to a future City Council Meeting.

b. Continued Discussion on 2022-2023 Tentative Budgets:

i. Justice Court – Judge Chin.

The above item was to be discussed at a future City Council Meeting.

ii. Historical Commission – Robert Falck.

Robert Falck - Chair of the Holladay Historical Commission. He explained that the purpose of the Commission is to advise the City Manager on local historic resources, continue to educate citizens about community history, research and preserve the history of the area and historical figures in Holladay, sponsor events, and research and preserve photographs and other related media. The Holladay Historical Commission planned a Speaker Series. On May 16, 2022, the Speaker Series launched with Liane Stillman, the first Mayor of the City of Holladay with approximately 50 people in attendance. On July 18, 2022, Allen Roberts, a renowned architect, writer, and historian, was scheduled to take part in the Speaker Series. On September 19, 2022, Cory Jensen and Amber Anderson from the Utah State Historic Preservation Office would speak about the purpose of identifying and protecting local historic resources.

The funding request from the Holladay Historical Commission was \$4,000, which would cover a modest honorarium for speakers, marketing, and refreshments. Mr. Falck explained that the Speaker Series would provide residents an opportunity to learn more about local history. Ms. Chamness explained that the \$4,000 is currently included in the budget. If approved by the Council, this would

take the funding for the Commission from \$1,000 to \$5,000. She thanked Mr. Falck for his leadership of the Holladay Historical Commission over the last year. He had brought new life and enthusiasm into the Commission and there were exciting announcements that would be shared in the future.

iii. Unified Fire Authority.

Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) Captain, Daniel Brown presented the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 Tentative Budget. The City of Holladay has four stations, which include Stations 104, 110, 112, and 116. He reviewed the Service Demand Proportioning Chart.

Chief Brown overviewed the breakdown of the UFA Member Fees for Fiscal Year 2022-2023. The section related to Engines/Trucks was reviewed. Some of the larger stations had a four-handed apparatus and some of the smaller stations had a three-handed apparatus. The Service Delivery section is related to regional assets, such as ambulances, as well as support, such as the Battalion Chief, administrative staff, and human resources. The section also showed the Capital Fund Transfer. The total costs were listed for each station as well. The percentage adjustment from Fiscal Year 2021-2022 for the City of Holladay was a 4.24% increase. Chief Brown explained that the increase accounted for a 6% Cost of Living Adjustment (“COLA”) for all sworn personnel and a 3% market adjustment for paramedics. The market adjustment was intended to attract medics from other departments. An additional \$170,000 was budgeted for fuel to accommodate the increased fuel prices.

Chief Brown noted that the 4.24% percent increase for Holladay was a pretty good number, especially compared to other cities that were served through UFA. A chart was shared that overviewed the division budgets. He noted that it included items such as operations, special operations, Camp Williams, fire prevention, fire training, and emergency management. The total member fee for the City of Holladay was listed as \$2,732,063.

Mayor Dahle noted that the increase accounted for the 6% COLA. With COLA and some minor market adjustments, he believed UFA would remain competitive. The aim was to retain or increase the UFA standing in the market.

Ms. Chamness reported that the City’s contract with UFA for emergency services would increase by approximately 25%. It would move from \$40,000 to a cost of just over \$50,000. Part of that increase was related to the fact that there was a person in an Emergency Manager role who was a Fire Fighter rather than a civilian. When that Emergency Manager was selected, the Council understood that it would result in a cost increase. It was also noted that the Emergency Manager was eligible for a merit increase as well. That was included in the increased amount.

iv. Unified Police Department. (Continued Discussion).

Unified Police Department (“UPD”) Precinct Chief, Justin Hoyal explained that the item was a continued discussion related to the UPD budget. He reported that the precinct requested a new full-time Detective position. The Council previously asked what other precincts in UPD had as far as the number of Detectives. Chief Hoyal shared a chart that highlighted different UPD precincts, the number of comparable Detectives, the community population, and the five-year average number of similar cases. He explained that the City of Holladay had 2.4 Detectives listed on the chart. The 0.4 accounted for the portion of the Bailiff. Part of his time was spent in the court and the other part of his time was spent focused on cases. The other two Detectives listed investigated property crimes. The two precincts that were most comparable to the City of Holladay were Kearns and Magna. For

comparison, Kearns has six Detectives and one Sergeant and Magna has seven Detectives and one Sergeant. Mayor Dahle noted that the budget that the Council was considering included the additional Detective position.

Ms. Chamness reported that she sent out some other information earlier in the afternoon. It was not included in the packet. However, the information looked at the increases over time at the precinct level and increases related to shared service. There was a chart that looked from Fiscal Year 2018 through to the proposed budget. It included a breakdown of the precinct levels and shared service levels. Additionally, it showed where the growth had been in terms of percentages. Mayor Dahle asked about the mid-year adjustment that was made. Ms. Chamness explained that it could be seen in the section, Fiscal Year 2021-2022 Budget Amended. There was some growth between the 2022 actual and the budget for the current year. Ms. Chamness stated that it was an increase of almost 7%. That included an additional officer. The amended budget included the additional Bailiff position and the mid-year increase. Mayor Dahle explained that there had been a number of adjustments over the years to bring the structure more in line.

Mayor Dahle expressed concern with the growth in shared service costs over time. There was no question that economies had been lost when Herriman, Riverton, and Taylorsville left UPD. It was hard to lose that kind of quantity without it increasing the ratio for the remaining cities. Council Member Fotheringham pointed out that services had been shifted from regional to the precinct level, but there were still significant increases within the shared services. Mayor Dahle believed that the shared services component of UPD, which was approximately 30%, still had the 5% regulatory minimum Fund Balance that needed to be maintained. When the Fund Balance shifted to the precincts, UPD lost the ability to accumulate Fund Balance and use that as a budgeting item. That increased the shared services component. Ms. Chamness explained that for the percentage growth shown on the chart, she had removed that amount. If she had included that as a reduction, the growth would be more significant in shared services. She offered to share the numbers with Council.

Chief Hoyal stated that the City of Holladay's share of the overall shared services budget was only 8.61%. Council Member Fotheringham noted that regardless of the share that the City was responsible for, there was still a 21% increase from the prior year's budget and an 18% increase over the prior year's amended budget. Chief Hoyal pointed out that Detectives and Officers in positions related to violent crimes, special victims, major investigations, and K-9 all received a significant pay increase in November and would receive an increase in the next fiscal year. There was a lot of civilian staff that worked in the Records Department and there was a 10% increase proposed to meet the market.

Mayor Dahle overviewed data related to wages and benefits. Unless cuts were made to personnel in shared services, there would be some increases to accommodate COLA, market rates, health insurance, and Utah Retirement Systems. Discussions were had about the Public Order Unit. Chief Hoyal explained that it had been created, but there was no budget. There was no way for them to purchase gear or equipment. Chief Hoyal noted that in the past, the Training Unit had been cut to accommodate the departures of Herriman, Riverton, and Taylorsville. However, there had been too many cuts since there were a lot of training requirements from the Legislature. Council Member Fotheringham asked if any full-time employees were reduced as a result of having fewer cities participating in UPD. He wanted to understand if the shared services staffing levels had been right-sized. Chief Hoyal reported that significant cuts were made in shared services whenever a city left.

Mayor Dahle noted that at the next Finance Committee Meeting, the UPD wish list would be prioritized to determine which items are Legislatively required. Chief Hoyal noted that the wish list that was shared with the Council was not the most up-to-date document. The most up-to-date list included additional items and was prioritized. Mayor Dahle believed that anything that was not absolutely necessary should not remain on the list. Chief Hoyal noted that there were several items that needed to remain, such as the Valley Emergency Communications Center (“VECC”) Dispatch contract increase. Dispatch was necessary and VECC had some salary increases. The body camera contract was also essential as were handheld radios, car radios, and computers. The priority list would go before the Finance Committee on June 7, 2022. Mayor Dahle hoped there would be a more normal budgeting cycle in the future. That was typically between 3.5% and 5% per year, but based on inflation, he was not certain what would happen.

Ms. Chamness reported that nearly \$500,000 of Precinct Fund Balance would be used. Given the fact that the level of Fund Balance had accumulated over two or three years, not everything that had been accumulated would be used. Mayor Dahle noted that there was more than \$490,000 in Fund Balance available to bring down the costs in the current year. However, with the unpredictability of the market and inflation, it made sense to reserve some of that in the current year. This would allow the funds to be available next year. Once things are more stable, he did not believe it would be necessary to accumulate Precinct Fund Balance to smooth out personnel and inflationary costs.

Council Member Fotheringham pointed out that the City had not neglected UPD in previous years in terms of the budget. He was concerned about the significant increases. While he was a fan of the UPD model and wanted to see it succeed, he was worried about other cities leaving. It may be necessary to start thinking about contingency plans. If Midvale left the UPD, it would be difficult. Council Member Fotheringham suggested that wish list items that were not necessary to be removed for the time being. If the costs of the shared services became too high, another member city may leave. Mayor Dahle stated that the realities of the increased costs would not go away. For example, the increased wages. He believed the costs of the shared services should be carefully examined because out of the \$22 million City budget, the police portion of that was approximately \$7 million. It was the role of the Council to look at the numbers, question them, and make sure there was a certain comfort level.

Mayor Dahle asked that the discussions continue at the next City Council Work Session. He expressed his support for the additional Detective position that was suggested. Based on the comparison numbers shown earlier in the meeting, increased staffing was necessary. He agreed that the shared services should include only what was necessary and nothing else at the current time. Discussions were had about the way the portion of the shared services was calculated. Chief Hoyal stated that a formula was created several years ago. The way that the City of Holladay’s share was calculated was based on a formula of a 70/20/10 percent split. 70% of that formula came out of the cases that were handled, 20% was based on population, and 10% was based on the taxable value in the City.

Council Member Brewer felt the shared services needed to remain competitively priced. He wondered how that message could be delivered to those who influenced shared services. Mayor Dahle believed this had to do with the UPD Board as well as the Benefits and Compensation Committee and Finance Committee, which were subcommittees of the UPD Board. Additional

details about how shared services were organized could be shared with the Council in the future. Chief Hoyal explained that shared services had been cut back over the last several years due to Herriman, Riverton, and Taylorsville leaving UPD. The services had been cut back to remain competitive. It had since been discovered that some of those services had been cut back too far. That was the reason that some of those services had been added back into the budget.

Mayor Dahle was on the UPD Board. He reported that there was one representative per member city and the County had two representatives. There was one vote per member, but there was also a provision in the Interlocal Agreement that stated a weighted vote could be triggered if it affected budgeting issues. He had never seen that triggered but it was an option if necessary. Mayor Dahle noted that the line items would be discussed in detail at the next Finance Committee Meeting.

Ms. Chamness noted that the full UPD budget rather than the summary document could be shared with the Council. This would allow Council Members to see details related to shared services. Mayor Dahle believed there was a document inside the UPD budget that showed the breakdown of shared services, including the components and total costs. This would give Council Members a better idea of what Holladay received from shared services and what the actual costs were. Chief Hoyal stated that there were a lot of components to shared services and he was happy to share more of that information. Council Member Fotheringham reiterated his concerns that the economy of scale could be lost.

c. Discussion on Previous Public Hearings.

The Council discussed the previous hearing items, which included the budget amendments and proposed budgets. Council Member Fotheringham asked about the playground surface. He believed it was intended to be all American Rescue Plan Act (“ARPA”) funds. Ms. Chamness explained that the Council decided not to reserve ARPA funds for that need and to use Fund Balance instead. That was reflected in the budget amendment. The Council had previously directed that half of the ARPA funds received would go towards the Stormwater Fund and the remainder would be reserved. As a result, the playground surface would be paid for using the Fund Balance. Council Member Quinn and Council Member Fotheringham believed the decision had been made to use ARPA funds to cover the playground surface costs that were above what had already been budgeted for. Ms. Chamness offered to read over previous Meeting Minutes for clarification

Mayor Dahle noted that the ability to use ARPA funds for the playground surface had shifted the perspective of some of the Council Members. When the initial decision was made, it was driven by the fact that the ARPA guidelines at that point were more restrictive in nature. Ms. Chamness clarified that the ARPA funds are now unrestricted. Council Member Brewer wondered what the outcome would be if he did not support the amendment change. Ms. Chamness explained that he could vote against the budget amendment. He had been the only one to object to the playground surface previously.

Council Member Brewer noted that when voting on the entire budget, it is not possible to vote yes with the exception of one aspect of the budget. City Attorney, Jayme Blakesley confirmed that it needs to be a yes or no vote. Ms. Chamness reported that the Council had already adopted a Tentative Budget. If the Council was unable to reach a decision about the budget amendments, the Tentative Budget would take effect. She did not believe the Council would ever be in that situation.

d. Calendar.

June 9 and 16, July 14 – City Council Meetings

June 10 – Children’s Theatre (11:30 a.m.)

June 15 – Ukraine Panel Discussion (7:00 p.m.)

The calendar items were reviewed and discussed. Mayor Dahle noted that the Ukraine Panel Discussion would be held in the City Council Chambers. The announcement was previously shared with the Council Members. He felt it would be a worthwhile event.

XIII. *Closed Session Pursuant to Utah Code Section 52-4-204 and 205 to Discuss Personnel Issues, Potential Litigation, and Property Acquisition and Disposition (if needed).*

There was no Closed Session.

XIV. *Adjourn.*

Council Member Fotheringham 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 8:25 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Holladay City Council Meeting held Thursday, June 2, 2022.

Stephanie N. Carlson, MMC
Holladay City Recorder

Robert Dahle, Mayor

Minutes approved: August 11, 2022