

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

Thursday, November 3, 2022

6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

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

City Staff:
Gina Chamness, City Manager
Jonathan Teerlink, Community Dev. Director
Todd Godfrey, City Attorney
Holly Smith, Assistant City Manager

I. *Welcome* – Mayor Dahle.

Mayor Pro Tem Drew Quinn called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

II. *Pledge of Allegiance.*

Mayor Pro Tem Quinn led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. *Public Comments.*

Trudy Jorgensen-Price shared updates related to the Library. On November 12, 2022, there will be a program called “Guide Dogs for the Blind: Pups in Training.” This was for the whole family and residents can meet guide dogs in training. There will also be a special winter celebration-themed Storytime on November 29, 2022.

IV. *Public Hearing on Proposed Text Amendment to Title 13.72.030 – Lot and Density Standards within the FCOZ Overlay Zone.*

Community Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink reported that the application was a request to amend the FCOZ Ordinance. The FCOZ pertained to development and aesthetic protections on the foothills and canyons throughout Salt Lake County. The Overlay Zone was established in the mid-1990s. The applicants previously requested a rezone of their property but decided to withdraw that application. The intention was to address their concerns through a text amendment instead.

Mr. Teerlink explained that the text amendment would create a provision in the Ordinance that would allow new development to be less than the required one-acre minimum lot size. Regardless of the underlying zone, if a property was within the FCOZ, a new lot would need to be at least one acre in size as the language is currently written. The applicants requested a text amendment to remove the minimum lot size standard so that only the minimum lot size of the underlying zone is followed. He reported that the subject property is in the R-1-21 Zone. Normally, the zone would require a one-half-acre lot but the FCOZ required a one-acre lot size minimum for new lots.

The Planning Commission reviewed the request early last month and denied it 4-1. The text that was drafted for the Council to review had not been prepared by the applicant, but by Staff to help the applicant address the intent of their request through the Ordinance.

Council Member Gibbons noted that the request would apply to the subject property as well as the entire FCOZ. He wondered what the result would be City-wide if there was an amendment. Mr. Teerlink explained the map highlighted some of the parcels that would be impacted by the amendment. Most of the parcels were located along Wasatch Boulevard. Three or four parcels could be affected and there could be additional units on their existing property. Mr. Teerlink clarified that the amendment pertained to lot size. Slope protection standards may also further limit development.

Council Member Brewer wondered if a variance had been considered for the subject property. He noted that the property is 1.97 acres in size. It is very close to the two acres needed to develop as the applicant was proposing. Mr. Teerlink explained that a variance is not necessarily applicable to the lot size requirements of the zone. Variances are for setbacks, height, and lot coverage, rather than a standard of the zoning ordinance. The property owners have owned the property since prior to the creation of the FCOZ. Council Member Brewer wanted to know how many potential lots the amendment could create. Mr. Teerlink stated that it could result in one subdivision for each of the applicable three or four lots.

Council Member Durham asked if the one-acre minimum requirement was a consistent standard across the FCOZ for all jurisdictions and municipalities. This was confirmed. Most municipalities still retained the one-acre lot size minimum. No one had deviated downward from the standard but in some cases, the FCOZ had been completely removed. Council Member Fotheringham noted that some lots were under the one-acre minimum within the FCOZ because they had been grandfathered in. The one-acre standard applied to any land that was not existing as either a defined subdivision or existing home. There would have been a window of opportunity when the FCOZ was first proposed to address the issue. Mr. Teerlink explained that if the subdivision had been recorded previously, the subject property would have been excluded from the applicability of the FCOZ.

Council Member Brewer asked if the three to four lots are below Wasatch Boulevard. Mr. Teerlink reported that they are all below Wasatch Boulevard on the west side. Council Member Brewer wondered why Commissioner Banks had not supported the denial. It was noted that Commissioner Banks pointed out the development standards in place. If the slope was too steep or there were topographical issues, the property would not be able to be subdivided

Mayor Pro Tem Quinn opened the public hearing.

Connie and Robert Jensen - applicants. Mr. Jensen explained that the parcel is 1.97 acres in size. A topographical map was created and there were two buildable areas. That meant that the areas are under the 30% grade. He wanted to respect the FCOZ but was lacking a very small amount of lot size. As a result, he requested a text amendment. Most of the lots with homes in the area were on one-half-acre lots.

Mayor Pro Tem Quinn wondered if it would be possible to purchase a small piece of the neighboring property to reach the two-acre minimum. Mr. Jensen explained that the neighboring home was owned by a corporation. He was not sure if a purchase was possible but he could reach out. In the past, he

had asked to purchase a small piece of property from an adjacent property owner, but that neighbor was unwilling to sell. Mr. Jensen wondered if the City would be willing to sell a portion of its right-of-way. Mayor Pro Tem Quinn was uncertain that the City would want to move forward with that option but wondered whether private property owners might be willing. The Council further reviewed the impacted parcels map.

There were no further comments. **The public hearing would remain open.**

V. *Public Hearing on Proposed Text Amendment to Title 13.80 Off-Street Parking Requirements.*

Mr. Teerlink shared information related to a proposed text amendment to Title 13.80 – Off-Street Parking Requirements. It involved a request from the Planning Commission and Staff and had been discussed for several months. The amendment would address outstanding issues with existing off-street parking standards.

Holladay Village, the Holladay Crossroads Zone, and the Site Development Master Plan (“SDMP”) for the new Cottonwood Mall area all had updated parking ratios. However, the ratios had not been changed for the rest of the City, specifically in commercial zones. There was a desire to review the parking standards to create a strategy addressing moderate-income housing. Another reason for the amendment was to have clarity when an application comes in for a new business to be housed in an existing retail space or office building. In that instance, the parking lot was static and had not changed in several years. There were different ways to address the parking concerns. For instance, maintaining off-street parking ratios and creating strict standards for the number of stalls per type of proposed use. Alternatively, the property owner or developer could propose the number of stalls that would be needed for a particular use.

Staff proposed a method by which an applicant could share ways to reduce the number of stalls and the number of vehicles coming to their building. For example, the property owner could provide Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) passes for employees or have extensive bicycle parking available. A menu of items had been proposed. The applicant could come to the Planning Commission and request a reduction in the parking ratio standards based on the menu items. It was not a given and or something that would be entitled, especially for new construction. There was no timeline in place for the proposed text amendment. The intention was to have a discussion.

Mayor Pro Tem Quinn opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

VI. *City Manager Report.*

Manager Chamess shared updates with the Council. She reported that in early September, during a routine inspection of the pedestrian bridge linking the City of Holladay with Millcreek, the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) identified structural issues that needed immediate repair. Large braces were placed on the pedestrian bridge with the immediate cost of the repairs being approximately \$250,000. UDOT informed both the City of Holladay and Millcreek that they believe the pedestrian bridge was the responsibility of the two communities. The City of Holladay sent UDOT a letter asking them to show when the transfer of assets takes place. To date, UDOT had not responded.

Ms. Chamness's understanding was that UDOT would move ahead with the immediate structural repairs and sort out the ownership and costs in the future. This was a significant issue for the City. Not only do the immediate repairs need to take place but the bridge will eventually need to be replaced. The cost of the bridge replacement was estimated at \$7 million. She reported that in the letter to UDOT, the City requested a meeting with Legislators and the School District so that all parties can discuss a long-term plan for the bridge replacement. She would continue to share updates with the Council as they become available.

Salt Lake County has given Notice of their Intent to Dissolve the Justice Court. Ms. Chamness explained that it was a long process that was laid out in Statute and take up to two years. Millcreek was looking for an option for Justice Court services and has approached the City of Holladay. She noted that Holladay currently shares services with Cottonwood Heights. Based on Millcreek's numbers, she believed the Justice Court would have the capacity. A Clerk may need to be added but that was still to be determined. It seemed like a win for all of the communities as caseloads are declining.

Council Members Gibbons and Fotheringham asked that the Millcreek numbers be examined. There was support if the shared services would be financially beneficial to the City. Council Member Gibbons wondered if the Interlocal Agreement could include an annual review. It was important to protect the City of Holladay fiscally. Ms. Chamness offered to look into that further.

Ms. Chamness reported that the Food Pantries at Olympus and Cottonwood High Schools had seen an increase in demand for food and other supplies. Recognizing that increased demand, there was a desire for the City Council to engage in a good-spirited competition with partners at the Unified Fire Authority ("UFA") and the Unified Police Department ("UPD"). The intention was to generate support for the food pantries with a competitive Food Drive, which was to commence on November 14, 2022, and end at the Tree Lighting on November 28, 2022.

VII. Council Reports and District Issues.

Council Member Brewer reported that he had had no constituents reach out since the last meeting. However, he had recently met with the Holladay Foundation. Council Member Brewer had also been involved in some of the website redesign discussions.

Council Member Gibbons planned to share information about Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling during the Work Session.

Mayor Dahle reminded those present that the Interfaith Service will take place on November 13, 2022. There would be a speaker and musical performances. It would be a good way to kick off the holiday season.

Council Member Fotheringham reported that since the Holladay Arts Council selected the sculptor for the Plaza Art Exhibit, there had been a subsequent meeting. The project was moving forward and the Holladay Arts Council was excited about the project.

Council Member Durham reported that the Tree Committee distributed 48 vouchers that year for tree plantings. Additionally, there were some exciting ideas about possible collaborations with the

Holladay Library. There could be tree-related events with schools and other entities in the community.

Mayor Pro Tem Quinn attended the Active Shooter Training hosted by the UPD. In connection with the Holladay Youth Council, there was a Halloween Spook Lot. She expressed her appreciation for UPD and UFA for being there. Several hundred people attended the event. She was grateful for all of the work that was done to organize it. Mayor Pro Tem Quinn reported that she also attended recent Community Council Meetings.

VIII. *Recess City Council in a Work Meeting.*

Council Member Fotheringham moved to recess the City Council Meeting and reconvene in a Work Meeting. Council Member Gibbons seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

There was discussion regarding the Work Meeting agenda. Council Member Gibbons suggested that Item A be discussed after Item D to accommodate the . City Attorney, Todd Godfrey clarified that no motion would be needed to amend the Work Meeting agenda in this instance.

a. Discussion on Previous Public Hearings.

The Council discussed the first public hearing, which was related to a proposed text amendment to Title 13.72.030 – Lot and Density Standards within the FCOZ Overlay Zone. Mr. Teerlink shared the first section of the proposed amendment. When the underlying zone permitted any lot size smaller than an acre, there were certain requirements. The language essentially stated that the minimum lot size needed to be an acre. In the proposed text amendment, that had been removed and it stated that for new lots, there needed to be compliance with the underlying zone. The one-acre requirement had been removed.

Council Member Fotheringham asked about past developments. Mr. Teerlink reported that two lots to the south of the subject property, a smaller home was placed due to the steep slope. However, had the amendment been adopted previously, it would have been possible for those property owners to split their lots. Other than that, there had been development under the FCOZ but no subdividing that he was aware of. Mayor Dahle believed there had been some public comment on the prior application. He wondered if there had been opposition to the current application. It was noted that there had not been any negative feedback received thus far.

Mr. Godfrey asked if the text amendment had been noticed specifically to neighbors. Mr. Teerlink denied this. He reported that it had been noticed in the newspaper and online. Mayor Dahle stated that the amendment will affect the three lots shown on the map below Wasatch Boulevard. It would effectively allow there to be six lots rather than the currently permitted three lots. The lots would still need to meet the slope restrictions to develop. Only a few properties would be impacted by the change. Mr. Teerlink discussed the property south of the subject property. The lot further south was fairly large at nearly 2.5 acres. He believed the slope was more toward Whitewater Drive, which was a private road. There could potentially be a lot split there if the amendment was approved.

Council Member Fotheringham reported that the applicants did not take action on the property when one-half-acre lots were being grandfathered in. During the FCOZ process, there would have been noticing and opportunities to appeal and challenge the overlay. He was concerned that 25 years later, the Council was considering making a change to something that had long been established. Though

he understood the amount of property needed for the subdivision was minimal, there may be acquisition opportunities that could be further explored. At the current time, he was leaning toward supporting the Planning Commission decision and denying the text amendment.

Council Member Gibbons agreed with the comments shared by Council Member Fotheringham. The length of time since the FCOZ had been implemented needed to be considered. He understood that the owners were trying to determine how to best utilize their property but this was a text amendment that will impact other properties as well. Trying to fix one issue with a broad amendment to the FCOZ was a concern. He was also leaning toward denying the application. Although he respected the owners and their position, he was not certain that the text amendment was right for the City.

Council Member Brewer understood the comments from other Council Members. He acknowledged that other owners had lived within the FCOZ requirements for the last 25 years. However, other owners had the same opportunity to request a text amendment. The intention of the FCOZ was to curb development in certain areas. This was a far less aggressive approach than what had been done in some other municipalities. As for the 25 years that had passed since the FCOZ was implemented, the applicants may not have known what they wanted to do with their property at that time. He did not want to see value lost because of a regulation that was imposed after the purchase of the property. Council Member Brewer stated that he was inclined to support the application.

Mayor Dahle explained that the text amendment would impact more than one lot. Three impacted lots may not be that significant in the grand scheme of things, but there was still a broader impact to consider. There would be further discussion on November 17, 2022.

The second public hearing item was not discussed further.

b. Wasatch Boulevard Presentation – Tim Baird – Fehr and Peers.

Assistant City Manager, Holly Smith reported that Tim Baird from Fehr & Peers was present. He had been the project lead on the consulting team. Ms. Smith reported that approximately one year ago, a Wasatch Boulevard Study began in collaboration with Millcreek. The study looked at Wasatch Boulevard from 3300 South to 6200 South. The intention was to plan for the future from a multi-modal standpoint. It was important to look at automobile traffic needs as well as transit, bicycle needs, and pedestrian needs. Ms. Smith noted that there was a development going in on the border in Cottonwood Heights. As a result, there was a desire to look at transportation needs at that intersection. Millcreek also had some developments that were forthcoming to the north of the City.

Mr. Baird provided an overview of the information. He reported that the Wasatch Boulevard study was funded by the Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) and conducted collaboratively between the City of Holladay and Millcreek. The purpose of the study was to address the variety of uses, modes, and purposes that Wasatch Boulevard provides to users. The study area went from 3300 South to 6200 South.

An extensive analysis of the existing transportation mobility conditions was also done. Mr. Baird explained that traffic volumes, crash data, and statistics from police reporting were examined. In addition, data related to the routes that cyclists used in the area were contemplated. Future plans for the corridor were also considered. One project that was on the WFRC Regional Transportation Plan that was relevant to both communities within the corridor was the 4500/5000 South planned I-215

full interchange. It was slated as a 2050 project within the WFRC Plan. Considerations and constraints related to the possible project were included in a narrative. Mr. Baird reported that the direction received from the Working Group was to move forward with a design for Wasatch Boulevard that did not assume or take into account that long-term potential project.

There had been a lot of community outreach and stakeholder outreach during the study process. Mr. Baird reported that a community-based discussion session was held. During that session, there were a lot of comments related to safety. There was a desire to decrease speeds on Wasatch Boulevard. In addition, there was a desire for more comfortable walking and bicycling spaces. There was no desire for Wasatch Boulevard to be widened. Many residents did not want to add lanes or capacity.

Once a few candidate designs had been determined, a public Open House was held. The Open House allowed the public to look at the research that was done. Some members of the public weighed in at the open house and online. There were over 100 comments received. Those comments made it possible to refine and improve the design that was ultimately developed.

Mr. Baird shared some of the highlights of the concept design with the Council. At 6200 South, the design showed a tightening up of the southeast corner of the intersection to remove the current slip lane that allowed fast-moving traffic on the southern part of Wasatch Boulevard to make free right turns onto the northern part of Wasatch Boulevard. With the planned access to the Gravel Pit development nearby, preserving that free right was a potential safety issue, especially if there were queued vehicles around the access.

To the north, the design was intended to accommodate pedestrian traffic to the park and ride lot. It showed a walkway and a crossing with a HAWK signal. There would also be a connection up to Gun Club Road to enhance pedestrian access. The proposed design showed a buffered bicycle lane covering the large majority of Wasatch Boulevard through the City of Holladay segment. A few bicycle facilities had been explored, but ultimately, the buffered bicycle lane was selected. It would widen the existing bicycle lane and add a two-foot buffer zone. There would be a better definition of that space for cyclists and a little more separation between adjacent vehicular traffic.

Continuing north, the proposed design showed an additional pedestrian-marked crossing into a subdivision. Mr. Baird noted that there would be some improved signage as well. Past the golf course and toward Mount Olympus Trailhead, the proposal was that the current 50 MPH speed limit through the less developed segment be dropped to 40 MPH. This would better protect active transportation users. To encourage compliance with that, there was a proposal to add speed feedback signs. He explained that those were electronic signs that showed the posted speed limit and used radar to detect the speed of the approaching vehicles.

There were minor reconfigurations proposed at the intersection at Fortuna Way. The buffered bicycle lane would continue past 4500 South. There would then be a transition over to a shared-use path that would be on the west side of Wasatch Boulevard. Due to the topographic constraints and other factors, the shared use path through the City of Holladay had not been selected.

Council Member Gibbons noted that this was within his district. Residents in Canyon Cove were interested in what would happen. There had been a lot of interaction with the developers of the Gravel

Pit and Cottonwood Heights City regarding access. He wondered if the presentation materials would be available online because he wanted to share them with his constituents. Anyone with comments could fill out the comment form. Mayor Dahle referenced the buffer bicycle lane. He asked if this would be in the existing right-of-way. This was confirmed. Mr. Baird explained that moving around existing striping could accommodate the buffer in many areas and other segments would potentially require widening.

c. Discussion on Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling Proposed Rate Increase – Pam Roberts.

Council Member Gibbons introduced Pam Roberts, Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling General Manager, and Finance Director, Paul Korth. Council Member Gibbons serves on the Board of Trustees. The proposal was for a conservative rate increase in conjunction with the 2023 budget.

Ms. Roberts shared a slideshow presentation with the Council. The mission of Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling is to provide sustainable waste and recycling collection services for the health and safety of the community. The organization provides a variety of services including waste, glass, recycling, bulky waste, and the scrap program. The third year of the seasonal container reservation had recently finished. There were some likes and dislikes associated with the program, so there would be Board discussions early next year to improve the system. Ms. Roberts reported that the organization had a can repair and replacement that was part of the monthly fee. She overviewed some of the other services that were included in the \$17 per month fee. Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling bills quarterly. This billing process began in 2015.

The Board discussed a possible fee increase for 2023. The Board unanimously decided that it was important to keep all of the services intact. Ms. Roberts explained that there would be a \$2.50 per month increase. That was an increase of \$7.50 on a quarterly bill. There would be a letter in the bill to explain the reasons for the increase.

Ms. Roberts reported that the trailer rental fee would increase. The bulky waste trailer could be parked on a residential property for four days. Currently, it is \$175 and would increase to \$190. The green waste cost would also increase. There were other fee increases associated with the glass subscription programs. It had been five years since Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling had raised rates. With costs increasing in many different areas, such as fuel and employee wages, it was now necessary to increase the rates to cover those increased costs. There were currently six driver vacancies needing to be filled. That was the reason the area cleanup had been changed to a reservation system. In 2019, 10 full-time driving positions were not filled. The organization was also short 10 part-time drivers at that time. In 2020, the reservation system was proposed as a way to address employee shortages. The Board had allowed that change.

The Board asked what the organization had done to manage the cost increases. Ms. Roberts reported that the fleet runs on Compressed Natural Gas (“CNG”). That transition began in 2013 and there was a full fleet of CNG trucks in 2018. This allowed Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling to save approximately \$1 million per year on fuel costs. That level of savings was also projected in 2023. Mr. Korth shared additional information with the Council. He overviewed a chart with the major expense categories, which included wages and overtime, fuel, maintenance, disposal fees, and recycling costs. There had been cost increases over the last several years. As for recycling, it was based on commodities markets that are extremely volatile and can change rapidly. There was a lot of

variation there. The cost per ton for recycling was shown on the chart. Council Member Gibbons noted that the value of the recyclables on the commodities market varies depending on the contamination rate in the recycle bin. Even with education, there was a high contamination rate due to residents putting pizza boxes and items fouled by food into their recycling bins. There was information on the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling website about how to recycle effectively.

Adding up the amounts from the cost categories from 2018 to 2022, there was a total projected increase of \$3.6 million just based on those categories. The projected per-home increase was \$3.45 per month. Those numbers verified the need for a future increase. Mr. Korth looked at the budget and what was historically spent. The organization typically under expends and that was accounted for in the calculations. Council Member Fotheringham wondered if the rates were the sole source of funding. Mr. Korth confirmed that the organization was fee-based. The fee was the sole source of funding. Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling received a grant several years ago, but there were no grants at the current time.

Ms. Chamness asked if the increase in wages and overtime was completely associated with wage changes. Mr. Korth stated that the number of full-time employees also increased. Two positions were added for 2023 and an additional three full-time drivers were added to assist with the scrap program. He noted that the budgeted number was not necessarily the amount that would be paid out. A lot depended on whether all employee positions remained filled. Ms. Chamness wondered if the district had any ownership in the landfill. This was denied.

The Council discussed the impacts of inflation. Mr. Korth noted that a fee increase was a year-long process. From the time the Board discussions began to the time the money actually came in, it was at least a year. As a result, the organization needed to plan ahead. Council Member Fotheringham asked if there were debt issues. This was denied. Ms. Roberts informed those present that the Board tentatively adopted the budget on October 24, 2022. The next step would be a public hearing to allow public comment on the tentative budget. That was scheduled for November 14, 2022, at 6:00 p.m. Those interested could participate either in person or online. Ms. Roberts shared information about the organization structure and thanked Council Member Gibbons for his support.

d. Discussion on REVEL Marathon for 2023 – Gina Chamness.

Ms. Chamness shared information about the REVEL Big Cottonwood Marathon for 2023. Earlier in the year, data was presented to the Council about the growth in special events over the last several years. The direction received to limit the number of large special events to three per year. Traditionally, there is the Salt Lake City Marathon, which has come through the City of Holladay for the last 14 years. During the summer, organizers of the REVEL Big Cottonwood Marathon informed the City that there was a planned reroute for their marathon and half-marathon. The intention was to have the majority of the marathon take place within the City of Holladay. Since this would impact four different Council districts and take up one of the three available slots for large-scale special events, Council direction was needed.

The organizers of the marathon met with UPD Police Chief, Justin Hoyal, and the Holladay Special Events Permit Manager and took an initial look at the scale of the event. The cost of the 70 officers would be assumed by the marathon organizers. It would be possible to accommodate the marathon without closing Holladay Boulevard or Highland Drive. There was a small portion of Arbor Lane that would need to be closed entirely for a portion of the marathon. There were technically two

separate events, the marathon and half-marathon, but those events would occur at the same time and on the same day. The proposed date was September 9, 2023. Additional information about the event was shared. The plan was to have officers at various intersections to assist with traffic control. The organizers were working with UDOT on the current route. It was noted that the race has been occurring for 10 years. Runners come from all over the country to participate. All of the volunteer groups that come to the event are paid and charitable donations are made to communities.

Mayor Dahle wondered if the Salt Lake City Marathon was considered one of the three large special events. Ms. Chamness confirmed that it runs through the special event process. Mayor Pro Tem Quinn asked about the Bicycle Criterium. Ms. Chamness explained that it could possibly be the third special event. It was noted that the event cannot conflict with one of the City's special events, which created some difficulty for the organizers. The organizers may have found another location for the year. Council Member Brewer believed there was a desire to have a further discussion about that. There might be a way to make sure the event happened in the City of Holladay.

Darrel Phippen was present on behalf of Brooksee, which is based in Pleasant Grove. The company has been putting on marathons and half-marathons since the Big Cottonwood Marathon first began in 2012. The company likes to send out mailers to make sure that citizens know the event will be taking place ahead of time. Brooksee also likes to work with businesses within the City. There are charitable donations that will go back into the community. Mr. Phippen reported that the race typically has 4,000 to 4,500 participants. 2,500 of those are with the half-marathon, making it the largest half-marathon in the State of Utah.

Mayor Dahle noted that there had been discussions with Murray City about the last piece of the route. Mr. Phippen was optimistic about that. They were waiting on permission from Cottonwood High School so the race could end there. The high school would provide ample parking for runners. Based on the short distance the race would actually be in that city, he was not overly concerned.

Council Member Brewer wanted to minimize inconveniences to Holladay residents. He wondered if Google Maps and other directional services were updated on event days to show road closures. Mr. Phippen explained that communication is shared via the direct mailer. That mailer would be sent to all impacted residents within the City. The mailer would be reviewed by the City beforehand and list all of the impacted intersections. A link to the marathon website would be added. Council Member Brewer believed that certain navigation apps could be updated as well.

Council Member Gibbons expressed support for the event. However, the issues he saw pertained to road closures. Mr. Phippen explained that the first runner of the half-marathon will exit Knudson Park at approximately 7:45 a.m. On that road, it would only be eastbound traffic from 2300 East and then both ways of traffic would be allowed from 2300 East over to Van Winkle. Council Member Gibbons pointed out that there are no through roads in the block off Holladay Boulevard or Highland Drive. He wanted residents to have access. Mr. Phippen confirmed that it would be possible to move throughout the community. Chief Hoyal explained that for the REVEL event, there would be soft closures. There will be officers at many of the intersections so vehicles can move through when there is a gap in runners. Council Member Gibbons voiced his support for the marathon. Council Member Durham was supportive of the marathon as long as there are no hard closures. Mayor Dahle stated that his biggest concern was the Arbor Lane area.

Ms. Chamness reported that there will not be a fiscal impact on the City if the REVEL Big Cottonwood Marathon takes place. Mayor Dahle hoped there would be some economic benefit. Mr. Phippen asked for input from the Council and Staff to identify non-profit organizations within the City that could benefit from the event. Ms. Chamness noted that no formal action on the part of the Council was needed now.

e. Overview of iWorQ App – Holly Smith.

Ms. Smith explained that the intent was to provide an overview of the iWorQ app that the City currently uses. There are six different apps in the iWorQ suite that the City of Holladay utilizes. This includes citizen engagement, Rental Permits, Code Enforcement, permit management, land use management, and business license.

Highlights from the Citizen Engagement section were shared. It was implemented in 2018 and provided the City with a database so it was possible to track and manage service requests. Some examples of service requests included roadway potholes, storm drain issues, and code enforcement issues. Residents could submit requests that Staff could then manage. Citizens could make their requests through the City mobile app, the City website, an email to Staff, a phone call to Staff, or a Staff site visit. 1,311 requests had been received since the 2018 public launch.

After a request is created, the system automatically generates a confirmation email to the resident, if the email address is provided. Each request type is assigned to a specific member of Staff. For instance, if an Animal Control request is submitted, Stephanie Carlson automatically receives that email as she was the responsible Staff member. This system was determined to be far more efficient than what had been done in the past. Staff was asked to update the request status by the 15th of each month.

Ms. Smith shared some of the data related to citizen engagement. Four project types made up 64% of the requests including Code Enforcement, roads, streetlights, water, drainage, and irrigation. She noted that Code Enforcement requests are on an upward trend. Roads and pothole requests had increased but likely reflect the work that had taken place during the construction season. The number of street light requests was down but the lights are owned by Rocky Mountain Power.

Highlights from the Rental Permits section were shared. This was a newer program that was implemented one year ago. The intention was to provide an online application and credit card payment process for room and park facility rentals. Ms. Smith explained that the applicant submitted the application, it was reviewed by Staff, an invoice was issued and paid, and the event was held. If there was a deposit, that would be returned after the event. The process was fairly streamlined.

There had been 561 rental requests through the system since it launched. Ms. Smith noted that 52% of the program revenue was from the Big Cottonwood Room. The Knudson Park Picnic Pavilion was the second most popular rental in the City. Ms. Smith explained that it was a huge step forward. There may be other tools down the road that the City may want to consider but this was getting the job done currently. Council Member Brewer asked about banners. Ms. Smith stated that there was a new approach to banners that seemed to be working well. It was not something that was managed through the system.

The Code Enforcement information was shared with the Council. Mr. Teerlink explained that one of the main modules through iWorQ was the Code Enforcement app that had been extremely beneficial to the City. It allowed Code Enforcement Officers to open, review, and close cases promptly. e. Since 2014, there had been 2,054 code enforcement issues reported. Some of the common complaints related to short-term rentals, illegal parking, snow removal, noise, graffiti, and illegal signage.

Mr. Teerlink reviewed the Permit Management information. He reported that there was an online application and credit card payment process for Building Permit applications. The credit card payment process was integrated in May 2020. As of 2022, 85% of permit applications were submitted online through the portal and 99% of permit applicants were paying by credit card. The Council discussed the review process. Permit activity data for 2022 was shared as well as the application status for the year.

The Land Use Management information was overviewed. Mr. Teerlink explained that it was a tracking tool for projects that were going through the Planning Commission. It was also a way to distribute subdivision plans to individual members of the Technical Review Committee. Business License information was reviewed. Mr. Teerlink reported that the Business License app was launched in 2021 and was extremely popular. It provided online applications and credit card payments so Holladay businesses could apply for and renew Business Licenses. 85% of Business Licenses were paid for with a credit card. He explained how residents could access application information.

Council Member Durham asked about the citizen engagement app and wondered if the citizen receives a notification when the matter is resolved. Ms. Smith explained that a citizen can create an account when the request is submitted. If there is a registered account, it would be possible to log back in and check the status. Ms. Chamness reported that iWorQ is a fairly low-cost software. However, some features were not available, like a dashboard for residents and more automated responses. In future years, the Council may want to consider whether a more robust type of software is needed to offer further transparency to residents. The City was using iWorQ to the extent possible. There were additional features that may come in the future. Staff was also looking at an AI texting tool that would provide information to citizens. There may be ways to complement what was already in place so the technology worked better for all involved.

f. Discussion on Potential Fundraising Contract for the City – Gina Chamness.

The Council previously expressed interest in looking at the future of the Holladay Foundation as well as other fundraising opportunities. As part of that Council goal, Staff reached out to Pathway Associates, who specializes in fundraising and have done fundraising work for other municipalities. The proposal was for the City to essentially enter into a relationship with Pathway Associates for contract development services at a cost of approximately \$3,000 per month.

Two fundraising opportunities would be proposed upfront. The first was related to lighting for the Skate Park. The second was related to a match for the museum grant that the City was anticipated to receive from Salt Lake County at the end of the year. Ms. Chamness wondered if the Council was supportive of a future budget amendment to contract for this type of development service.

Mayor Dahle explained that there was a desire to get the Holladay Foundation up and running. If there was the right marketing, messaging, and management, it would be possible to raise money in the community. The foundation was not active and running as a 501(c)(3), but there was still an

opportunity to do things in the community with private fundraising. It may be possible to bring that work in-house. For instance, the Council could establish priorities and a contractor could assist in the fundraising process. This would be a City function as opposed to a 501(c)(3). Mayor Dahle clarified that the 501(c)(3) had not been functioning for three or four years. While the City may be giving up on the commitment to the 501(c)(3) foundation, the underlying mission remained.

Ms. Chamness clarified that the City was looking at a contract with Pathway Associates. The City Council would make an appropriation to hire a development director to fundraise. That revenue would come into the City earmarked for the selected purpose. Mr. Godfrey did not have any concerns about the initial structure, but there were more details to be worked out in the future.

Council Member Fotheringham expressed concerns about the proposal. He did not want to spend \$36,000 a year to raise slightly more than that. It might make more sense to just spend the \$36,000 on the projects themselves. Ms. Chamness noted that something could be built into the contract that was a trigger point. For instance, there could be an evaluation after six months to determine whether the process was beneficial to the City. She believed Pathway Associates would accept that.

Mayor Pro Tem Quinn was surprised that the cost would be \$3,000 per month. She wondered whether that was normal in the industry. Ms. Chamness explained that it was standard for that type of individual with that skill set. Council Member Fotheringham asked for additional details about the deliverables. Ms. Chamness explained that the intention was for Pathway Associates to do the work. They would find the donors, make the ask, and provide the revenue to the City. Additionally, the company would provide marketing materials that could be shared with others.

Council Member Brewer supported a presentation from Pathway Associates. Council Member Gibbons thought it was worth exploring but felt additional details needed to be shared. He was not sure that he would recommend the immediate dissolution of the 501(c)(3) because it could do things that government could not do. Mr. Godfrey suggested that it remain intact while the Council explored the idea of the Pathway Associates contract.

Council Member Brewer noted that a lot of interested youth want to start fundraising for the Skate Park. He wondered if the Council could engage with Pathway Associates so donations could be accepted. Ms. Chamness was not sure it would be best to move forward without a contract in place. Additional details still needed to be worked out and finalized. The Council still had outstanding questions about the Pathway Associates contract. It was determined that the item would be discussed further at either the November 17 or December 8 City Council Meetings.

- g. Calendar.***
 - Council Meetings – November 17, December 8.***
 - November 13 – Interfaith Service***
 - November 28 – Tree Lighting***

The calendar items were reviewed and 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 Durham moved that the City 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 Fotheringham seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Brewer-Aye; Council Member Durham-Aye; Council Member Fotheringham-Aye; Council Member Quinn-Aye; Council Member Gibbons-Aye; Chair Dahle-Aye. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The Council convened in a closed session at 9:45 p.m. Those in attendance in the Closed Session included Council Members Durham, Fotheringham, Quinn, Gibbons, Brewer, Gibbons and Mayor Dahle. Others present included Gina Chamness, Todd Godfrey, Jared Bunch and Jon Teerlink.

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

Council Member Fotheringham moved to adjourn the Closed Session. Council Member Gibbons seconded the motion. The Council roll call vote was as follows: Council Members Durham, Fotheringham, Quinn, Gibbons, Brewer and Mayor Dahle in favor. The motion to go out of closed session at 10:01 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 10:05 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Holladay City Council Meeting held Thursday, November 3, 2022.

Stephanie N. Carlson, MMC
Holladay City Recorder

Robert Dahle, Mayor

Minutes approved: **December 8, 2022**