

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

Thursday, August 18, 2022

5:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Mayor Rob Dahle
Paul Fotheringham
Drew Quinn
Matt Durham
Ty Brewer
Dan Gibbons

City Staff:

Gina Chamness, City Manager
Holly Smith, Assistant City Manager
Todd Godfrey, City Attorney
Stephanie Carlson, City Recorder

I. *Welcome* – Mayor Dahle.

Mayor Rob Dahle called the meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

II. *Introduction of UFA Chief Dominic Burchett.*

Once Chief Petersen made his announcement to retire, the UFA Board met and determined that there would be an internal hire for the position. The Board Members felt some internal candidates were ready to take on this leadership role. There were three applicants for the position. The subcommittee unanimously selected Dominic Burchett as the New UFA Chief.

Chief Burchett shared a 100-Day Plan with the subcommittee during the application process. One aspect of the plan was to meet with all of the UFA partners. He wanted to introduce himself and share information about his vision for UFA moving forward. Chief Burchett reported that he was appointed as the New Fire Chief in April 2022. He shared information about his professional background and stated that he was hired in 1997 as a Seasonal Wildland Firefighter. In 2001, he was hired full-time. He had spent his career as a Firefighter, Paramedic, Station Captain, Division Chief, and Assistant Chief. Chief Burchett spent one year in the City of Holladay as a Station Captain and knows the area very well. It is a wonderful place and he enjoys working in the City. He is the father of five children and his wife is a full-time Veterinarian. His family enjoys outdoor activities.

The 100-Day Plan was created as a way to hear from all UFA partners. In total, over 100 meetings were conducted over the last several months. The intention was to have a better understanding of the organization and what is desired. It was an effective way to hear from others, prioritize needs, and take action. Chief Burchett noted that he has worked in UFA for a long time and assumed that he would have a good understanding of the existing issues. However, it is easy to be out of touch when in administration instead of on the streets handling calls. His plan moving forward was to prioritize the issues and plan for the years to come. There were three critical areas he wanted to focus on including:

- The health and wellbeing of personnel;
- Remaining relevant in communities; and
- Establishing a continuous improvement model.

Health and well-being for personnel was something that had not been prioritized in the past. There is normally a reactionary type of approach. This issue needs to be approached holistically and proactively for the workforce to be happy and healthy. UFA was looking into initiatives to address that. Chief Burchett noted that UFA is a complex organization that covers a wide and diverse area. The UFA needs to provide communities with excellent service with a local feel. He stressed the importance of looking at best practices moving forward. As for the third area of focus, he explained that continuous improvement is necessary. Due to the work done by Chief Petersen, UFA is in a good place, but that does not mean there is no room for improvement. Small and incremental changes will move the organization into the future.

Council Member Fotheringham congratulated Chief Burchett on his appointment. He noted that the transformation of UFA has been phenomenal. Council Member Fotheringham stated that the City of Holladay is proud to be part of the UFA community. The Council thanked Chief Burchett for his work and presence tonight.

III. *Presentation and Discussion on Stake Park Lighting.*

Mayor Dahle reported that there were previous discussions regarding whether lighting at the Skate Park was necessary. He explained that those conversations were ongoing. Jack Parker from the Utah Skatepark Advocacy Group was present to share information about skate park lighting with the Council.

Mr. Parker stated that it is important for skate park lighting to be installed immediately because according to the 2021 Utah Skatepark Survey, 89.2% of respondents indicated that lights are preferred. Many individuals want to skate later in the day but do not have the opportunity to do so due to a lack of lighting. For instance, in the City of Holladay, families in the community want to use the Skate Park, but when it is dark, it becomes dangerous. There are many reasons lights are necessary. For instance, they extend the use, maximize investment efficiency, increase security, and allow the park to reach a larger demographic. Mr. Parker noted that more skate parks are pushing for solar lights. Many different types of solar lights could provide free lighting every day throughout the year. This would remove the financial burden from the City.

There was discussion about when lights should be on. Mr. Parker noted that more and more communities have skate park lights on all the time because it keeps the area lit and increases security. It also allows individuals to utilize the Skate Park after the sun goes down. If the Council wants to stick to normal lighting hours, the lights could begin to dim at 10:00 p.m. Sandy City has signs posted informing residents that the lights will begin to dim at a certain time. Lighting will improve safety in the area, which he felt was important to consider.

In terms of funding, there had already been some discussions related to that. Mr. Parker informed the Council that the community is very willing to find ways to raise money for the lights. He suggested that the City pay for a portion of the lights and the community could fundraise for the remainder. There were a lot of different options. He asked what the City needs from the community. Mr. Parker noted that many committed young people have been cleaning the park regularly.

Council Member Fotheringham asked if skating is a year-round activity. Mr. Parker stated that 90% of users skate year-round. Last year, the Skate Park was dug out to allow for use during the winter months. Efforts would be made to continue skating throughout the year. Council Member Brewer asked if the Skate Park lights will bother residents if they are on after 10:00 p.m. Council Member Brewer liked the work that the Utah Skatepark Advocacy Group was doing and the mentoring that was taking place, he liked seeing the youth engagement. Shortly after the Skate Park went in, he had several constituents reach out because there was offensive language coming from the Skate Park. However, he had not heard those complaints in some time and hoped that meant that the issues had been self-managed.

Council Member Brewer asked if there were estimated costs for the Skate Park lights. Mr. Parker believed that when Spohn Ranch originally built the ramp, it was estimated to cost \$60,000 to \$80,000 for the lights. Steve Richards shared information about lighting. He believed the work could cost much less than that. He did not have the figures worked out at the current time but estimated that the total cost would be approximately half of the Spohn Ranch estimate. If the Council was interested in doing solar instead of powered lights, that would shift the price as well. Council Member Brewer loved the idea of fundraising for the lights. To the extent possible, he wanted to see the full amount fundraised by the community. It would be a wonderful way to bring people together.

Council Member Durham liked that the Skate Park had engaged an entirely different segment of the community. He was interested in hearing more about the solar power option. Additionally, he wondered if the Utah Skatepark Advocacy Group had looked into dark sky issues and light pollution. It was noted that the light would not shine out far enough to impact residents. Mayor Dahle believed the timing of the lights could be discussed in the future. The most pressing issue at the moment was whether the Council was supportive of the Skate Park light installation.

IV. Discussion on Bike Lane Parking Restrictions (Chapter 11).

Ms. Chamness reported that a constituent of Council Member Durham's identified an issue where vehicles were parked in bicycle lanes on 3900 South. When the Council went through the design process for 3900 South a few years ago, the priorities included bicycle lanes, sidewalks, and then parking. At that time, the Council knew there would be some areas where on-street parking would no longer be available. However, there was no State Statute prohibiting parking in a bicycle lane and it is currently not prohibited by City Ordinance either.

Ms. Chamness explained that there were a couple of options for the Council to consider. The first was to leave things as they are. In that instance, the City could reeducate residents. She noted that the current Ordinance allows 'No Parking' signs to be posted, which would allow the Police Department to ticket individuals parking within the 'No Parking' signs. Alternatively, the City could change the Ordinance to make it clear to residents that parking is not permitted in bicycle lanes.

Council Member Durham asked what the education piece would entail. Ms. Chamness explained that there could be discussions with residents related to voluntary compliance. Council Member Durham wondered if there were criteria in place to allow the placement of No Parking signs. Ms. Chamness reported that Chapter 11 includes an existing set of guidelines. One of the criteria specified that those signs could be placed anywhere designated by the City's Traffic Engineer. With direction from the Council, the 'No Parking' signs could be placed in bicycle lanes. Council Member Durham asked

how the bicycle lanes will be identified and placed throughout the City. Ms. Chamness explained that over the 18 months, the City has been updating the City's Bicycle Route Plan. It was to be presented to the Council in the near future. She noted that some routes were currently identified in the General Plan.

Council Member Quinn asked about the seriousness of the problem. Ms. Chamness reported that the City heard from three different constituents about the issue. It is not necessarily a huge problem but something that residents have contacted the City about. Mayor Dahle believed it would be possible to post 'No Parking' signs on the 3900 South stretch, which was likely the only real problem area for bicycle lanes. If an Ordinance is created, it would apply to all bicycle lanes in the City. Ms. Chamness clarified that an Ordinance could be restricted to major roads or arterial roads. Alternatively, it could apply to all bicycle lanes in the City.

Mayor Dahle asked if Chief Justin Hoyal had noticed anything in particular about the area. Chief Hoyal reported that there had been a few complaints about the parking on that road. Mayor Dahle wondered if flyers could be distributed to residents on that street asking that vehicles not be parked in the bicycle lane. He felt that would be an appropriate first step. If there were one or two specific areas, the 'No Parking' signs could be placed there specifically. Mayor Dahle did not want to place 'No Parking' signs all along 3900 South if it was not a major issue. He also did not want to pass an unnecessary Ordinance in the City. Ms. Chamness stated that the City could start with the education piece. If there was some resistance, the 'No Parking' signs could be further contemplated by the City Council.

V. *Sustainability Action Plan Priorities.*

Samantha DeSeelhorst, Sustainability Analyst reported that in 2021, the City Council adopted the Interlocal Sustainability Action Plan ("ISAP"). This was a planning effort outlining sustainability initiatives for the tri-city region of Cottonwood Heights, the City of Holladay, and Millcreek. It outlined sustainability initiatives in five different categories. It included a high-level scope so that the information applied to all three communities.

A recommendation was made in the ISAP that sustainability staff would provide regular or annual priorities for each community. Ms. DeSeelhorst reported that there had been discussions with Millcreek already and there would be a conversation with Cottonwood Heights in a few weeks. She noted that the Holladay City Council had done a lot to focus on sustainability. Ms. DeSeelhorst stated that she would share recommendations in two general categories including existing projects that she recommended the City continue to work on and new goals that would be shared for consideration. In terms of timing, they were feasibly fairly short-term.

- Continue Engaging with the Community Renewable Energy Program:
- Continue Providing Sustainability Outreach and Education:
- Continue Protecting and Enhancing the Tree Canopy:
- Update the City-Owned Properties with Sustainable Landscaping:
- Implement Telecommuting Policy to Encourage Remote Work on Poor Air Quality Days:
- Host a Community Recycling Event Which Targets Hard-to-Recycle Materials:
- Make Energy Efficient Upgrades to City Hall:
- Institute Additional Electric Vehicle Charging Stations Throughout the Community:

- Offer Waterwise Landscaping Rebates to Community Members:
- Work Toward a More Robust Active Transportation Network:

Ms. DeSeelhorst asked for Council feedback about the projects on the priorities list. If there were other projects the City wanted to look into, they could be explored and added. She wanted to research a shorter version of the list and bring that information back to the City. Council Member Gibbons believed the third and fourth priorities were important. He had a question related to the waterwise landscaping and noted that there had been a presentation a few months earlier from the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District and Salt Lake City Public Utilities. He wondered if it was possible to partner with their existing programs. Ms. DeSeelhorst confirmed this and shared information about Waterwise Conservation Ordinances that had been passed elsewhere.

Mayor Dahle discussed the Flip Your Strip program. Ms. DeSeelhorst noted that it was a good incentive. The interested individual would apply on the Utah Water Savers website and automatically funnel into the appropriate water district. If the application met eligibility, the appropriate water district would pay out the rebate. The role of the City was to promote the program.

Council Member Fotheringham asked about xeriscaping City properties. This had been discussed with respect to the monument corners. Ms. Chamness reported that the Council allocated \$50,000 in the current year's budget for this purpose. There is a deadline of September 30, 2022, to have that work complete. Council Member Fotheringham noted that once that project is complete, the impact could be evaluated and water conservation promoted. This could result in future xeriscaping projects on City property.

Council Member Fotheringham asked about the energy-efficient upgrades to City Hall. Ms. Chamness reported that there are solar panels on the building and there have been discussions about how to add them to the Fire Station as well. There was new technology the City could look at adding if it was of interest to the Council.

Mayor Dahle noted that xeriscaped areas still need to be maintained to look aesthetically pleasing. He added that there are pocket parks and public areas that are not used often. Those could be looked into for conversion. If there were grants for that type of work, it would be beneficial. Mayor Dahle acknowledged that the sustainability work could not be done all at once. However, as the City considers upgrades, sustainability would continue to be part of the considerations.

There was discussion regarding streetlights. Mayor Dahle wondered if there had been any conversations about converting to LED lights. Ms. DeSeelhorst stated that she could look into the matter. She noted that it was important to determine the ownership of the lights because, in Cottonwood Heights, a lot of the streetlights are owned by PacifiCorp, so it is PacifiCorp's decision to make the switch to LED. Ms. Chamness believed ownership issues would be similar in the City of Holladay. She also believed there was a cap on savings. Rocky Mountain Power indicated that their long-term plan was to get out of the street light business.

Council Member Quinn felt that the recycling event would be worthwhile but noted that it may be difficult to find a suitable location. She wondered if Cottonwood Heights would want to partner with the City of Holladay for that type of event. Ms. DeSeelhorst stated that there was potential to do a regional collaboration. There was even the potential to partner with the Wasatch Front Waste and

Recycling District. The event did not need to take place in the City of Holladay necessarily, but it was something that the City could support and advertise. Mayor Dahle pointed out that something similar had been done with electronics in the past. Ms. Chamness explained that the Health Department used to do those types of events, but that had stopped during the COVID-19 pandemic and had not started again. The Council discussed a two-part event that focused on hazardous materials and recyclable materials.

Council Member Durham asked Ms. DeSeelhorst to identify two of the highest impact recommendations on the list. She believed water use was extremely topical due to the drought conditions. Looking at anything water or landscape related would be worthwhile. Additionally, she was partial to the recommendations related to energy efficiency. However, all of the priorities listed were important to consider. She offered to follow up with more information about the costs, potential timelines, and grant opportunities. That way, as the City Council made sustainability decisions, that information would be available to refer to.

VI. *Review of Canal Study Presentation.*

Mayor Dahle reported that the City of Holladay was awarded a Transportation and Land Use Connection (“TLC”) grant from the Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”). The grant was intended to study potential canal trails identified in the City of Holladay General Plan. When the City was working with the Citizen Advisory Group during the Holladay@20 process, some survey work was done. The results of that survey found that trails were at the top of the priority list for residents. While looking at how to meet those goals, one of the ideas that came forward was looking at the spaces along the existing Jordan and Salt Lake Canal and the East Jordan Canal. There was no conclusive documentation about the property rights.

Information about the Canal Trails Study was shared. Ms. Smith reiterated that the City was able to secure a WFRC TLC grant for the study. The budget for the work was \$75,000 (\$69,922 grant and \$5,078 local cost match). This allowed the City to engage consultants to assist with the research. MGB+A and ECI had been hired for this work. There were three main goals for the study including documenting property ownership, gathering general community feedback and input from neighbors adjacent to the canals, and understanding what the potential trail system will cost to construct. Based on the information from the study, the Council would be able to decide if the work should continue or if the canal trail discussions should be tabled. The goals for the current City Council Work Meeting were to share the study findings and obtain City Council direction on the next steps.

Ms. Smith overviewed the study limits. The study area focused on limited sections of the Jordan and Salt Lake Canal as well as the East Jordan Canal. It did not include the Upper Canal or other waterways in the City. A map of the study area was shared with the Council. Ms. Smith provided information about property ownership. She explained that the consultant team looked at all of the parcels along both canal corridors. There were 218 parcels in total. ECI specializes in public utility research and their expertise had been extremely helpful during this process. ECI researched all 218 parcels. The Jordan and Salt Lake Canal is mostly fee simple and Salt Lake City Public Utilities owns the right-of-way for the corridor.

The East Jordan Canal was established primarily by easement across private property for the conveyance of water and maintenance. There were a few properties toward the southern end that were fee simple. Mostly that canal was an easement. There was one parcel without a chain of title.

This information was critical because if the Council wants to proceed further, that information would determine the path forward. Where it was fee simple, the discussions would need to be had with Salt Lake City Public Utilities. Where there is an easement, discussions would need to take place with Salt Lake City Public Utilities and the individual property owner. Mayor Dahle wondered if the fee simple ownership width was standard. City Attorney, Todd Godfrey, reported that the deeds he reviewed indicated that it was generally fairly uniform.

Ms. Smith discussed public outreach and feedback. She explained that three tools had been used including the Canal Trails Concept Survey, Design Preferences Survey, and Walking Tours. Several Council Members also received feedback directly from residents. Those were included in the public record. The Canal Trails Concept Survey went out from September to October 2020 and there were 264 participants. The general survey indicated that most respondents liked the idea and would use a canal trail.

In addition to the general survey, there was also the focused neighborhood study, which was sent to homes adjacent to the canals. 63 individuals participated. Most of the nearby residents were strongly opposed to the idea of adding the trails. There were some benefits listed as well as concerns about crime, decreased property values, and loss of privacy. There was a sentiment that residents in these neighborhoods had invested in their properties and had a certain level of privacy. The respondents did not want to lose that expectation of privacy. Ms. Smith compared the general survey results to the more focused surveys. The residents near the canal were largely opposed to the concept.

The Design Survey was reviewed. Ms. Smith explained that even though everything was very preliminary and conceptual, there was a desire to understand what residents want the trail to look like. For instance, the materials and overall look and feel. She reported that there was a preference for wood and wood-like materials, stone, and earthy materials. These materials were consistent with the overall look and feel of Holladay. Rather than having an open house, the consultant team hosted in-person walking tours. There was a total of eight walking tours and there were 133 participants. There were many concerns expressed during the walking tours. Opportunities and ideas were also shared. Ms. Smith shared the conceptual design and cost estimate. She clarified that the conceptual design was created to obtain the cost estimate. There was no detailed design in place.

The consultants divided the canal trail system into sections and color-coded the sections of trails based on the ease of development. Ms. Smith shared a map with the Council. The color coding made it easier to identify the sections of the trail that may be more difficult to develop based on current physical conditions. Cost estimates for each of the sections were shared. The sections that were longer or had more difficult conditions would be more expensive. Between the two corridors, there were approximately three miles of potential canal trail. The estimate was between \$2 to \$3 million to develop those areas as trails. This estimate was on par with what was seen elsewhere. Ms. Smith noted that the cost estimate was only for construction and not property owner negotiation.

State Law does not permit the use of eminent domain for the acquisition of property to support a public trail. Negotiations would be critical and would likely require a lot of resources. Ms. Smith discussed the public feedback that was received. There were a lot of ideas and concerns that the Council would likely want to look into further if the canal trail concept were to move forward. Staff asked the Council to determine whether the canal trails should continue to be explored.

Council Member Gibbons stated that the study area impacts his district as well as Council Members Brewer and Fotheringham. He was strongly opposed to moving forward with this concept and shared several reasons with the Council. Council Member Gibbons informed the Council that there was strong opposition from neighbors and directly impacts landowners. Additionally, there is existing access for those who want to walk on the trail. There was also a likelihood of significant legal challenges. Last, there were costs to consider. Council Member Gibbons reported that he had heard from approximately 100 different constituents in his district who were adamantly opposed to the canal trails. He noted that two separate grassroots organizations were vocally opposed to the project. It did not make sense for the City to move forward with this concept due to the legal constraints and the opposition.

Mayor Dahle noted that the pieces that are fee simple do not require negotiating a purchase. Council Member Gibbons explained that there could be prescriptive easements. Mayor Dahle wondered if Council Member Gibbons opposed the entire canal trail concept. It was important to determine whether he wanted the item tabled or if it was something he did not want the Council to pursue. Council Member Gibbons clarified that he did not want the Council to pursue the canal trails. There were potential legal challenges for both canals, particularly the East Jordan Canal.

Council Member Fotheringham sympathized with many of the points expressed by Council Member Gibbons. However, he did not believe this was an all-or-nothing proposition, where trails need to be on both canals or no canals. He did not feel there was a good reason to pursue trails along the East Jordan Canal at the current time, given the problems that had been outlined. He believed there were opportunities to be pursued on the Jordan and Salt Lake Canal because of the ownership structure where it would be possible to partner with Salt Lake City Public Utilities. Council Member Fotheringham felt that the Jordan and Salt Lake Canal merited further examination.

Council Member Brewer explained that the canal trails received a lot of attention. There was a lot of opposition from residents in his district. The nearby residents used the area to the extent possible and did not want there to be formal trails. It was important to consider the privacy and safety of residents living there. Many considered the canals to be pristine open natural settings. Putting in pavement or road base would detract from the natural setting rather than of benefit. He was not in support of the Council moving forward with the canal trail discussions.

Council Member Fotheringham pointed out that it was not a given that this trail would look like the Jordan River Trail, which was all paved. It was possible to design something that was far more natural and fit in with the aesthetic of the City. There was an opportunity to enhance what was already there and provide additional connectivity. This did not necessarily need to be invasive.

Council Member Gibbons noted that grant money could be used to experiment with the section of trail west of Highland Drive. It sounded as if the residents in Council Member Fotheringham's district were not as opposed to the canal trail proposal. Council Member Fotheringham explained that there was a section of the trail there that a lot of children use to walk to school. There is also one section that is essentially fenced off. There may be opportunities to create connections. Council Member Gibbons was opposed to anything east of Highland Drive at the current time.

Mayor Dahle asked about next steps. He wanted to know what would happen if the Council chose to explore the section from Van Winkle to 5600 South. Ms. Smith believed that Mr. Godfrey would

need to conduct a more in-depth legal analysis of the documentation received. After that, there would need to be a discussion with Salt Lake City Public Utilities. Once those steps have been completed, there could be a presentation to Council about those processes. She explained that canal trails are not projects that are several years in the making. They are more often several decades in the making. It is not a short process and there was no rush to reach a decision.

Council Member Durham wondered if it was possible to have a prescriptive easement on public property. Mr. Godfrey explained that there was a fair amount of common law that suggested that it was possible to acquire a prescriptive right against a public entity, but there were some unknowns with canals and railroads. Council Member Durham believed some Council Members did not want to pursue the canal trails while others wanted to consider a phased implementation. He was in favor of looking into a more phased implementation. There was an opportunity here for active transportation, which was an important part of developing a livable and sustainable community.

Mayor Dahle suggested that the City further explore the legal issues involved with the piece from Van Winkle to 5600 South. That would likely be the easiest to look at. If the Council felt comfortable with the legal side of things, it may be possible to look into the engineering or additional connections. Council Member Gibbons wondered if the item should be tabled for the time being until there was further legal insight. He made it clear to the Council that he would vote against any proposed canal trail that was east of Highland Drive.

Council Member Quinn reported that she attended one of the walking tours on the east side of Highland Drive. She wondered if there were individual notes from each walk. It may be interesting to look at the feedback from neighbors on the east side of Highland Drive compared to the feedback from neighbors west of Highland Drive. Ms. Smith reported that there were individual notes from each walking tour that could be shared with Council. Council Member Quinn asked about the removal of the encroachments. She wanted to understand if that could be covered by a grant. Ms. Smith did not believe that work could be covered by a grant.

Council Member Fotheringham liked the suggestion that legal counsel look further into the canal trails. He was not supportive of completely tabling the canal trail concept. While he was aware of the challenges that faced the East Jordan Canal area, there was an opportunity to make progress on the Jordan and Salt Lake Canal area. This could be a real amenity for the City and the current users. Additionally, this could create additional connectivity and prioritize active transportation.

Mayor Dahle reiterated that the current focus would be on the section from Van Winkle to 5600 South. He did not want to commit resources until there was more clarity from a legal perspective. The East Jordan Canal was not being pursued currently and the Jordan and Salt Lake Canal discussion was tabled while the small stretch was explored further. There could be discussions about moving forward based on the feedback from legal counsel. The Council was in favor of that approach. Ms. Smith asked if there was a timeline in mind for that next step. Mayor Dahle suggested a two-year timeframe for the legal analysis and the discussions with Salt Lake City Public Utilities.

VII. Council Reports.

Council Member Brewer reported that a constituent reached out to him and took him to the area next to the Sequoia development on Murray Holladay Road. He was concerned about the quality of the repair work. Also on Murray Holladay Road, there is a stop in one westbound lane rather than cones

to funnel people over. Ms. Chamness believed the latter was likely a Millcreek project, but City Staff would look into it. As for the road work, she noted that there had been some challenges with the subcontractor who was responsible for the concrete collars around manholes. A temporary inspector was hired and was charged with inspecting the quality of that work. She thought that everything east of Holladay Boulevard had been deemed satisfactory but she would follow up.

Council Member Fotheringham reported that there was an excellent concert on Saturday at City Hall Park. There was to be another concert the following Saturday with the Blue Moon Festival the week after.

Council Member Durham continued to hear about the issue of “20 is plenty” in the City of Holladay. He wondered if the Council was interested in pursuing that. He asked if it was possible to obtain data from Salt Lake City about their efforts in that regard.

Council Member Gibbons noted that a few residents raised issues with the Code Enforcement Officer. There were code enforcement issues related to vehicles on the streets and RVs parked in front yards. One resident outlined approximately 20 issues in the area of 6200 South and 2300 East. There were commercial trucks with flat tires as well as campers and boats in front yards.

Mayor Dahle noted that Ms. Chamness sent an email about the front steps. He wondered if it would be possible to clean them up a little bit. While he understood not wanting to redo them but stated that it would be nice to make them look more presentable. Ms. Chamness reported that the City was looking at two different options. One was an epoxy surface that would be tested in the next few days on the north side of the steps in an inconspicuous location. The other was a thin layer of plaster or concrete to make things look better at a fairly low cost. She noted that City Staff had looked at the existing Master Plan for the building. The Master Plan contemplated a more circular plaza-like area for the front entrance. There would be a discussion early in the fall about what was in the plan.

Mayor Dahle reported on a recent Council of Governments (“COG”) Meeting. There is an overflow homeless issue in the County that the State has been working to address. A short-term site in Millcreek was identified for homeless overflow. It can accommodate 100 beds but the need is 400. The problem was still not fully addressed, but it was a start. In the Legislation, Mayors had the option of denying the use but Millcreek Mayor Jeff Silvestrini was supportive. Mayor Dahle did not know what the long-term solution would be but this was a short-term option.

VIII. *Other Business.*

No additional business was discussed.

IX. *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).*

Council Member Fotheringham moved that the Council go into 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 Brewer seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gibbons-Aye; Council Member Brewer-Aye; Mayor Dahle-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

The Council convened in a closed session at 8:13 p.m. Those in attendance in the Closed Session included Council Members Durham, Fotheringham, Quinn, Gibbons, Brewer and Mayor Dahle. Others present included Gina Chamness, Todd Godfrey, Stephanie Carlson 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 Quinn seconded the motion. The Council roll call vote was as follows: Council Members Durham, Fotheringham, Quinn, Gibbon, Brewer and Mayor Dahle in favor. The motion to go out of closed session at 8:20 p.m. passed with a unanimous vote.

X. Adjourn.

Council Member Fotheringham moved to adjourn. Council Member Durham seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:22 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Holladay City Council Work Meeting held Thursday, August 18, 2022.

Stephanie N. Carlson, MMC
Holladay City Recorder

Robert Dahle, Mayor

Minutes approved: **October 6, 2022**