SALT LAKE COUNTY

2001 So. State Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
(385) 468-7500   TTY 711

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, October 21, 2025

10:00 AM

Council Chambers, Room N1-110

County Council

1. CALL TO ORDER

Invocation - Reading or Thought - Pledge of Allegiance

Present:

Council Member Laurie Stringham
Council Member Suzanne Harrison
Council Member Natalie Pinkney
Council Member Jiro Johnson
Council Member Carlos Moreno
Council Member Aimee Winder Newton
Council Member Ross Romero
Council Chair Dea Theodore

Excused:

Council Member Sheldon Stewart

Mr. Richard Jaussi, Chief Deputy Auditor, led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

2. BUDGET PRESENTATION

2.1 Mayor's 2026 Budget Presentation 25-648

Presenter: Jenny Wilson, Salt Lake County Mayor; Darrin Casper, Deputy Mayor of Finance and Administration
(Approx. 10:00 AM, 60 minutes)

Informational

Attachments:
1. SaltLakeCountyMayorJennyWilson-2026BudgetProposalSpeech-21OCT25

Mayor Jennifer Wilson delivered her 2026 Budget Proposal, stating today’s budget presentation represents hundreds of hours of effort by County staff and elected officials who made it possible to present a responsible, forward-looking balanced budget that is compliant with new state regulations. The budget provides residents with essential services, while keeping taxes as low as possible.

One of the County's focuses will be public safety and criminal justice reform. While some individuals must face jail time to ensure public safety and accountability, there are also ways to improve outcomes for people and cut costs. The County will continue to invest in alternatives to jail, i.e. jail diversion programs, treatment, and reentry efforts, as well as housing and support services. The Mayor's Office has also engaged Judge Steven Leifman of Miami-Dade County, a national leader in justice reform, to help the County design a model that will transform its broader system.

The budget includes significant projects that will position Salt Lake County for the future: a new County headquarters in Midvale; the Larry H. & Gail Miller Arts Center in South Jordan; and a reimagined downtown district. The budget also invests in staff, equipment, and systems for the Elections Division to guarantee that every eligible voter can cast their ballot safely; stormwater systems to protect the community and property, and safeguard critical infrastructure; playgrounds; cybersecurity to ensure County systems are safe; delayed infrastructure; solutions to housing affordability through partnerships; and employees by absorbing some of the insurance cost increases and providing a 3.25 percent salary increase for non-sworn staff.

It has been six years since Salt Lake County last increased property taxes. During that time, County leaders worked hard to absorb growing expenses and rising demand for services within their operations. Rising costs have outpaced revenue growth, creating a structural gap that can no longer be ignored. At the same time, demand for services has grown, federal pandemic recovery funds are ending, inflation has eroded the County's buying power, and the County has unfunded State mandates. After exhausting every other option, a property tax increase of 19.63 percent is necessary this year. This equates to about $7.28 per household per month, on average. This will enable the County to meet critical public safety needs, invest in infrastructure, and maintain essential services, all while protecting the County's AAA bond rating.

Mr. Darrin Casper, Deputy Mayor of Finance and Administration, delivered a PowerPoint presentation entitled the Salt Lake County 2026 Proposed Budget. He reviewed the budget goals; budget direction; facilities legislative intent; committees and boards; economic highlights; a 2026 new growth summary for key funds compared to the 2025 adjusted budget; tax revenue growth in context; major revenues in the General Fund; purchasing power erosion due to inflation; inflation impact on the cost of living and County operating costs; transfers to the Tax Administration Fund; the declining trend in property tax rates countywide and assessing and collecting; the County and the population growth trend.

Mr. Casper also went over the Truth in Taxation process, whereby on or before October 1, 2025, the County had to notify the Auditor and the Tax Commission of the date, time, and place of the public hearing. This is scheduled for December 9, 2025, at 6:00 PM, at the Salt Lake County Government Center, 2001 S State Street, Room N1-110m the Council Chambers, Salt Lake City, Utah 84190. Notice was sent by Council staff on September 24, 2025. Then, 14 days or more before the election, on an agenda, the County must supply a statement that it was its intent to levy a rate exceeding the Certified Tax Rate, with the amount and purpose on it, and the approximate percent increase.

The statement of the tax increase would include the countywide rate increase of 0.000249 (from 0.001270 to 0.001519); the percentage increase of 19.63 percent; the total dollar increase of $48,900,000, and the impact on an average home / business with a value of $638,000 - $87.37 / $158.86 per year, and $7.28 / $13.24 per month.

The purpose of the tax increase statement reads: *The purpose of this increase is to address inflationary pressures and rising operational costs associated with essential County services, including tax administration, information technology, data security, and general government operations. The additional revenue will also support investments in public safety to meet increased caseloads and growing demands on the county jail, the District Attorney's Office, and programs that provide alternatives to incarceration. Furthermore, the County must fund several new state-mandated programs that are currently unfunded. Finally, a portion of the increase will be allocated to debt service on bonds issued for the new government center campus, as well as a small share of the debt service related to the renovation of the Salt Palace Convention Center.*

The truth in taxation process also requires that seven or more days before the election, notice be mailed to each property owner in the County, with the notice details specified in Statute, and information technology files sent to the printer on October 17, 2025. Advertising requirements required that 14 days prior to the public hearing, details had to be posted on the County website, in Utah Legals, on the Utah Public Notice website, and in a public location within the County that is reasonably likely to be seen by residents of the County.

The County will hold a public hearing on December 9, 2025, at 6:00 PM in the Council Chambers. Pursuant to Utah Code 59-2-919 (9)(b), a calendar year taxing entity may not adopt a final budget that budgets an amount of additional ad valorem tax revenue that exceeds the largest amount of additional ad valorem tax revenue stated at a public meeting.

Mr. Casper continued the presentation reviewing the distribution of the $48.9 million increase; ending unassigned fund balance in the General Fund; a General Fund structure analysis and reconciling the draw down; fund transfers for significant items in 2026; the proposed 2026 budget compensation and benefits package; compensation and benefits costs; health insurance; prior year true-ups; Tourism, Recreation, Cultural and

Convention (TRCC) select highlights; TRCC contributions for parks, recreation, and trails; new TRCC capital projects; proprietary funds in the proposed 2025 budget; the 2026 proposed budgets for the Community Services Department, the Human Services Department, the Office of Regional Development, the Public Works and Municipal Services Department, Administrative Services Department, Information Technology Division, the Mayor's Administrative organizations, Convention and Visitor Services; the District Attorney's Office, the Sheriff's Office, and other elected offices; new capital project funding; the Parks and Recreation Division funding sources; the 2025 year-end adjusted budget and FTE changes; FTE changes; a fund summary of the General Fund and related funds; financing plans; Salt Lake County continuing its AAA rate, staying among the financially elite; a 2026 budget recap of all funds; and that the Mayor's proposed budget book, including this presentation is available online at https://slco.org/finance/budget/budget-documents/.

3. NOTICE OF SALT LAKE COUNTY MAYOR'S INTENT TO MAKE A STATEMENT AT A PUBLIC MEETING PROPOSING 2026 TAX INCREASES IN COMFORMANCE WITH UTAH CODE ANN. § 59-2-919(3)(A)

The Salt Lake County Mayor intends to make a statement containing each of the following items:

3.1 Salt Lake County intends to levy a tax rate that exceeds Salt Lake County's certified tax rate.

3.2 The dollar amount of additional ad valorem tax revenue that would be generated by the proposed increase in Salt Lake County's certified tax rate is <u>$48,900,000.00</u>. The purpose for additional ad valorem tax revenue that would be generated by the proposed increase in Salt Lake County's certified tax is to address inflationary pressures and rising operational costs associated with essential county services, including tax administration, information technology, data security, and general government operations. The additional revenue will also support investments in public safety to meet increased caseloads and growing demands on the county jail, the District Attorney's Office, and programs that provide alternatives to incarceration. Furthermore, the County must fund several new state-mandated programs that are currently unfunded. Finally, a portion of the increase will be allocated to debt service on bonds issued for the new government center campus, as well as a small share of the debt service related to the renovation of the Salt Palace Convention Center.

3.3 The approximate percentage increase in ad valorem tax revenue for Salt Lake County based on the proposed increase is 19.63%

BREAK FOR LUNCH— RECONVENE AT 12:30 PM FOLLOWING BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Patricia Jones spoke in opposition to the Mayor's proposed tax increase. She stated the Mayor's reasons for the increase included inflation, Information Technology operating costs, government operations costs, new programs, and debt service. Citizens also experienced the same inflation, and they must pay for technology, water, utility, home and car insurance, learning classes for children, mortgages, home repairs, and car costs. In short, citizens must manage household budgets in the same way the County does, but they cannot pass a tax onto their fellow citizens. Sandy City also experienced the same issues, but instead of increasing taxes, the Sandy City Mayor asked for a three percent cut across the board. She asked the County to consider the hardships citizens are facing when considering the tax increase.

Ms. Dawn Bates spoke in opposition to the Mayor's proposed tax increase. She stated what kept her up at night were tax hikes from federal, state, city, and county governments. She was nearly 80 years old and retired on a fixed income. She feared losing her home or her way of life because of taxes. She did not have anyone to ask for financial help from like the Mayor did. Everyone was stretched and doing their best to make ends meet. She asked the Council to respect the residents in the County and vote against a tax increase and more government expansion, and instead reprioritize the budget and cut unnecessary spending, particularly that intended for non-profit and special interest groups.

Ms. Lannie Larkin spoke in opposition to the Mayor's proposed tax increase. She stated it was astounding that the County was proposing a 19.63 percent increase. She did not know how taxpayers were supposed to pay for everything. The County needed to tighten its belt. It should only be paying for statutory responsibilities and for the security, safety, and protection of citizens, not for non-profit organizations. Citizens should be able to choose whether they want to contribute to those organizations.

Mr. Ted Wiggins spoke in opposition to the Mayor's proposed tax increase. He stated today's meeting should have been better publicized, so people knew about the tax increase and could comment on it. There will be more people in attendance at the public hearing on the budget, but by then, the Council will have already made up its mind on the tax increase. He believed in property taxes to pay for things that were essential, but taxpayers should not have to pay for nonessential things. County government has grown and added new programs. It did not matter that the County had not raised taxes in six years; other taxing entities had raised taxes. Taxing entities took from his basket to put into a different basket to help other people. He did not understand why his needs were not as important as those programs. He could lose his home because he could not afford to pay property taxes. He asked the Council to do the right thing and eliminate extra staff and programs that were not essential. People are hurting.

Mr. Russ Peterson spoke in opposition to the Mayor's proposed tax increase. He understood that government needed to grow as population grew, but it should not solely rely on property taxes to pay for this. Since much of the growth was tied to the 2002 Olympics, the great economy, and the jobs, and because job growth and tourism stressed infrastructure and caused crime, he suggested those costs be pushed onto the tourism industry. He recommended the County do a comparison analysis to places like Clark County, Nevada, and San Diego County, California, to see how much higher their hotel room taxes or rental car fees were, as well as impose a tax on visitors driving up the canyons and to the ski resorts.

Ms. Dena Long stated she submitted a letter requesting to be considered as a member for the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District Board of Trustees and asked the Council to vote for her.

Ms. Kim Zacherson stated Rose Canyon residents are concerned about things happening in their community. One of the concerns was teenagers were drinking in Rose Canyon and starting fires where there was no access to water. Fires can turn sideways in a hurry in the canyon, especially with the microbursts of wind that occur there. There had been fires there that resulted in lost property and horses' lives. Another issue was the multi uses for the Yellow Fork Trailhead. Cyclists racing down the trail can spook horses and that can be dangerous for the horse rider and the cyclist. Ms. Zacherson stated she had a friend who broke her back and neck because her horse got spooked. She urged the Council to place restrictions on the trailhead by limiting odd days for cyclists and even days for horses, or vice versa.

5. REPORT OF ELECTED OFFICIALS:

5.1 County Council Members

Council Member Winder Newton explained that there were many taxing entities on the Salt Lake County Property Tax Notice. The Mayor's proposed tax increase would only be on the County's portion of that tax notice, not on the entire property tax. Cities sometimes raise their taxes in years when the County does not raise its taxes. In fact, two years ago, the Sandy City Mayor proposed a thirty percent tax increase, so she may not ask for another tax increase this year.

Salt Lake County's last tax increase was six years ago, but this year, it was at the point it needed to increase taxes to adequately maintain public safety and other things. Property taxes only go into the General Fund, and 75 percent of the General Fund goes toward public safety related costs, i.e., the jail, prosecution, and behavioral health. Quality of life things, such as trails, open space, and cultural arts are funded with tourism taxes. Tourists also spend money in hotels, restaurants, and stores, and the County gets to keep those sales tax dollars, which offsets what property owners pay in property taxes. One study showed that the average taxpayer household was getting the equivalent of about $2,000 in tourism taxes that it would have had to pay in property taxes.

The County is just starting the budget process. The Council will spend the next five to six weeks going through the budget with a fine-toothed comb, figuring out what it could cut or change.

Council Member Winder Newton stated the County has a county-city relationship with Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia, and yesterday, she attended an event with the Ulaanbaatar delegation, getting to know the representatives. Today, Council Member Stringham helped the representatives tour The Other Side Village. Urban planners will also be meeting with them to try to help them better develop their city. This is a great partnership, where each entity can mentor and help each other, and there will not be any tax dollars expended for this process.

Council Member Pinkney stated she would be meeting with other Council Members one additional day during the week to go over the budget. She wanted to make sure the County built a sustainable system and was not throwing money at something without fixing it. One of her priorities would be to look at the root cause of the County's services to understand how to build a fiscal economic budget that did not require so much taxpayer money. She also wanted to communicate to taxpayers why a tax increase was needed to build a sustainable future. Additionally, she wanted to make sure County employees felt valuable.

Council Member Moreno stated when a family is having a tight budget, they review their budget and cut expenses they do not have to have. The County needs to make a change. It cannot spend more of its residents' money. It can find solutions and make things better for its residents. He rejected this 19 percent increase and would try to find solutions that made sense for the community.

Council Member Stringham stated every year since being on the Council, she proposed major cuts to the budget and pushed to find ways for the County to be more effective, efficient, and economically viable. She intended to do that again this year. The Mayor has not even hit what the industry is doing now with her proposed increase, but that does not mean the Council will not do its job. For the next six weeks, Council

Members will be going through the budget line by line, and they will come up with a budget they all agree on.

Council Member Theodore stated she disapproved of a tax increase each year since being on the Council, but she believed the County had pushed as long as it could and now needed to ask for more money. The County is facing a lot of things. Costs have increased, and while inflation has hit families too, families have a smaller group to serve. Besides inflation, the County has some unfunded mandates. She planned to do her due diligence and go through this budget like she always did to ensure there was fiscal responsibility. She asked that if anyone had any recommendations, they email the Council. Email addresses are on the Council's website.

5.2 County Mayor

Mayor Jennifer Wilson made the following announcements:

- Tomorrow, she will be joining the Sheriff, the District Attorney, and others to promote United Against Hate Week. This is a national effort to stop hate crimes and bias, which have increased in this unsettling era.

- The Zoo, Arts and Parks Division has unveiled a newer cleaner logo.

- The Parks and Recreation Division is busy. Junior Jazz enrollment has begun, and recreation centers are buzzing with youth activity.

- The Aging and Adult Services Division is promoting a new pilot program, called Get Empowered: Embrace Your Mental Well-Being. This will be offered in select senior centers beginning in November. The Aging and Adult Services Division is only one of three organizations nationwide selected by the National Council on Aging to pilot the program.

- This Thursday from 4:30 PM to 7:00 PM, the Youth Services Division is hosting a Lights on Afterschool celebration at Matheson Junior High School, in Magna City. This event is part of a national celebration highlighting the critical role after-school programs play in supporting youth families and communities. More than 900 youth participate in afterschool programs in Salt Lake County. These programs are structured, safe, and provide opportunities to help students succeed academically, socially, and emotionally.

5.3 Other Elected County Officials

6. CONSENT ITEMS

A motion was made by Council Member Harrison, seconded by Council Member Johnson, that the Consent Agenda be ratified. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Council Member Moreno was absent for the vote.

6.1 Consideration of a Resolution of the Salt Lake County Council Appointing Members to the Agriculture Protection Area Advisory Board 25-654

Attachments:
1. Resolution_Agriculture Protection Area Advisory Board

RESOLUTION NO. 6332

A RESOLUTION OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL APPOINTING MEMBERS TO THE AGRICULTURE PROTECTION AREA ADVISORY BOARD

WHEREAS, landowners in Emigration Canyon City have filed an application with the Emigration Canyon City Council for the creation of an agricultural protection area, as provided under Utah Code § 17-41-201; and

WHEREAS, Utah Code § 17-41-201(3) provides that an Agricultural Protection Area Advisory Board has the responsibility for evaluating this application for the establishment of an agricultural protection area, and to make recommendations to the Emigration City Council about whether the proposal should be accepted; and

WHEREAS, Utah Code § 17-41-201(1)(a)(i) requires the County Council to appoint no more than five members from the county's conservation district board of supervisors to serve as the Agriculture Protection Area Advisory Board; and

WHEREAS, the Council appoints the Board members, all of whom are members of the county's conservation district board of supervisors, to the Agricultural Protection Area Advisory Board to fulfill duties consistent with Utah Code § 17-41-201(3):

RESOLUTION

NOW, THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the County Council of Salt Lake County:

1. The individuals listed in Attachment A are hereby appointed to serve as the Agriculture Protection Area Advisory Board pursuant to Utah Code § 17-41-201(1)(a)(i).

APPROVED and ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 2025.

SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL

ATTEST (SEAL)

By /s/ DEA THEODORE
Chair

By /s/ LANNIE CHAPMAN
Salt Lake County Clerk

This consent item was approved on October 14, 2025. The vote on this consent agenda was ratified.

7. APPROVAL OF TAX LETTERS

A motion was made by Council Member Harrison, seconded by Council Member Johnson, that the Tax Letters be ratified. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Council Member Moreno was absent for the vote.

7.1 DMV Registration Refunds 25-658

Attachments:
1. MV 0018 Personal Property Tax Refund DMV $136
2. MV 0019 Personal Property Tax Refund DMV VET $9104

This tax letter was approved on October 14, 2025. The vote on this tax letter was ratified.

8. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

8.1 Approval of September 30, 2025, County Council Minutes 25-668

Attachments:
1. 093025 Council Minutes

This set of minutes was approved on October 14, 2025.

A motion was made by Council Member Harrison, seconded by Council Member Johnson, that this agenda item be ratified. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Council Member Moreno was absent for the vote.

8.2 Approval of October 7, 2025, County Council Minutes 25-680

Attachments:
1. 10-07-25 Council Minutes

A motion was made by Council Member Harrison, seconded by Council Member Johnson, that this agenda item be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Council Member Moreno was absent for the vote.

9. WORK SESSION

9.1 Informational Update on the Proposed Hire Report/Incentive Plans - $3000 and Under / Weekly Reclassification Report 25-697

Presenter: Hoa Nguyen, Council Budget and Policy Analyst
(Approx. 12:55 PM, Less than 5 minutes)

Informational

Attachments:
1. Proposed Hire Report - 10-15-2025
2. Incentive Plans - $3,000 and Under 10-15-2025
3. Weekly Reclassification Report 10-15-2025

Ms. Hoa Nguyen, Budget & Policy Analyst, Council Office, reviewed the new hires. There were no reclassifications nor incentive plans.

9.2 Budget Adjustment: Mayor's Finance Requests an $85,000 Appropriation Unit Shift from Operations to Debt Services to Meet SBITA Requirements for the Saba Platform 25-706

Presenter: Hoa Nguyen, Council Budget and Policy Analyst
(Approx. 1:00 PM, Less than 5 minutes)

Discussion - Vote Needed

Attachments:
1. 37537 - ESR - 2025 SBITA increase

Ms. Hoa Nguyen, Budget & Policy Analyst, Council Office, reviewed the budget adjustment.

A motion was made by Council Member Stringham, seconded by Council Member Harrison, that this agenda item be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Council Member Moreno was absent for the vote.

9.3 Consideration of Council Appointments to be Submitted to the Governor's Office Regarding Trustees to the Central Utah Water Conservancy District Board 25-667

Presenter: Aimee Winder Newton, Salt Lake County Council Member; Dea Theodore, Salt Lake County Council Chair
(Approx 1:05 PM, Less than 5 minutes)

Discussion - Vote Needed

Attachments:
1. Jon Bronson Resume 2025_Redacted
2. Kathy Loveless Resume Central Utah Water District Board 2025_Redacted

Council Member Winder Newton explained that every other year, the Council can submit up to three names to the Governor for consideration to water district boards. The Governor will then select a board member, and the Senate will confirm that selection.

Council Member Winder Newton reviewed two applicants, Jon Bronson and Kathy Loveless, who have served one term on the Central Utah Water Conservancy District Board of Trustees and would like to be considered for a second term. The Council did advertise on social media and announced in its public meeting that any interested parties could contact the Council, but there were no other applicants.

A motion was made by Council Member Johnson, seconded by Council Member Stringham, to ask Mitchell Park, Legal Counsel, Council Office, to draft a letter listing Jon Bronson and Cathy Loveless as the nominees to the Central Utah Water Conservancy District Board of Trustees, and stating that the Council had done its due diligence in trying to find others to fill vacancies. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Council Member Moreno was absent for the vote.

9.4 Consideration of Council Appointment to be Submitted to the Governor's Office Regarding Trustee to the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District Board 25-678

Presenter: Aimee Winder Newton, Salt Lake County Council Member; Dea Theodore, Salt Lake County Council Chair
(Approx 1:10 PM, Less than 5 minutes)

Discussion - Vote Needed

Attachments:
1. Dena Long10-10-25 09.34_Redacted
2. Barbara Townsend Resume_Redacted

Council Member Winder Newton reviewed two applicants, Barbara Townsend and Dena Long, for consideration to the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District Board of Trustees. Ms. Townsend is a current member of the board, but she would like to serve a second term.

A motion was made by Council Member Pinkney, seconded by Council Member Johnson, to ask Mitchell Park, Legal Counsel, Council Office, to draft a letter listing Barbara Townsend and Dena Long as the nominees to the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District Board of Trustees. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Council Member Moreno was absent for the vote.

9.5 Informational Presentation: IT Update on AI 25-713

Presenter: Zach Posner, Chief Information Officer; Megan Hillyard, Administrative Services Director; Javaid Lal, Office of Data and Innovation Director; Brad Park, Salt Lake County Surveyor
(Approx. 1:15 PM, 15 minutes)

Informational

Attachments:
1. SLCo_AI Council Overview

Ms. Megan Hillyard, Director, Administrative Services Department, stated artificial intelligence (AI) is dominating national and local conversations, and it is everywhere from private industry to government. AI is not a passing trend; it is transformational technology that is here to stay. It brings both excitement and anxiety about how it will impact jobs, services and decision-making. The key is to approach AI deliberately and responsibly. When used appropriately, AI can enhance efficiency, improve public service delivery, and strengthen data-driven decision-making. AI will not solve every problem; it must be applied thoughtfully with clear oversight and purpose.

Salt Lake County has an internal working group that meets regularly to address issues related to AI. County departments are beginning to explore practical applications. The County’s approach is measured and intentional. It wants to make sure it is using AI to make its operations more efficient and responsive while balancing privacy.

Mr. Bradley Park, County Surveyor, and Chair of the Technology Advisory Board and the GIS Steering Committee, stated he has embraced AI throughout his professional career. As a land surveyor, he prepares legal documents to describe real pieces of property, and those can get complicated. By using software with a built-in AI function to output the data, it eliminated human error. His office was also tasked with looking for a solution for the Public Works and Municipal Services Department to find a better method of doing a pavement crack analysis. The department had been sending someone to analyze the condition of the road, but that system was subject to human error and subjective to whoever looked at the road. The solution was to put aerial photography into an AI model that then generated a report, and that solution proved to be quicker and more accurate.

Mr. Zachary Posner, Chief Information Office, Information Technology Division, delivered a PowerPoint presentation on AI. He reviewed AI's purpose, risk posture, and that the County's use of AI aligned with County values; some programs using AI and that AI could not be ignored; the context of AI and what is was great for and what not to use it for; what AI was and what it did, the risks, and its importance; the governance and risk approach and guiding principles; AI risk levels; AI governance and enablement; what was working; current AI use cases; AI in the County; MIT Sloan School of Management's AI maturity model; four stages of enterprise AI maturity; risk management; and that the County was being cautious while engaging with AI, focused on delivery value to residents while managing risks, and open to input and discussion on priorities from all stakeholders.

9.6 2026 Budget Workshop Under the Direction of David Delquadro, Council Fiscal Manager: 25-693

- **Compensation Recommendations for 2026 — Sharon Roux, Human Resources Director. Darrin Casper, SLCo Deputy Mayor of Finance and Administration CFO**
- **Employee Associations' Response to the Mayor's 2026 Proposed Pay & Benefits.**
- **Countywide Initiatives for 2026**
- **The Following Independent SLCo Elected Offices:**
    - **Assessor: Chris Stavros**
    - **Auditor: Chris Harding**
    - **Surveyor: Brad Park**
    - **Treasurer: Sheila Srivastava**
    - **Recorder: Rashelle Hobbs**

- **Other 2026 Budget-Related Items**

Presenter: David Delquadro, Fiscal Manager, Council
(Approx. 1:30 PM, 120 minutes)

Discussion - Vote Needed

Attachments:
1. 2026 Total Rewards Presentation_Final Council
2. AFSCME Statement for Salt Lake County Council

November Meeting Schedule

Mr. David Delquadro, Chief Financial Manager, Council Office, stated Tuesday, November 11th, is Veterans Day. Since that day is a holiday, he asked if the Council wanted to meet either Monday or Wednesday of that week, or if it wanted to begin the November meetings in the morning. His objective was to have a budget available for the public on November 25, 2025.

A motion was made by Council Member Stringham, seconded by Council Member Harrison, to begin the meetings of November 4th and November 18th in the morning. The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Council Member Pinkney was absent for the vote.

Compensation and Benefits

Ms. Sharon Roux, Director, Human Resources Division, delivered a PowerPoint presentation entitled Total Rewards 2026 Recommendations. She reviewed national salary increase projections of 3 to 3.5 percent; government and local sectors; Wasatch Front cities; base pay 2026 recommendation (1.25 structure adjustment, 2 percent grade progression increase or 1 percent for those at grade maximum, and a grade increase for nine classifications below market for non-sworn merit, time-limited, and appointed employees; 1.25 structure adjustment, 2.75 step or 1 percent for those at grade maximum, and a grade increase for two classifications below market for sworn officers); below market classifications f; and the 2026 benefits package.

Council Member Winder Newton asked if the Human Resources Division knew what the Wasatch Front cities average pay increase was over the last five years. Some cities might have provided a small increase one year and a larger increase another year, whereas the County did a small increase each year.

Ms. Roux stated she could get that information and provide it to the Council.

Council Member Winder Newton asked if pay for performance would be ready to be implemented next year. FTEs were the County's most expensive asset, so she wanted to make sure people who were not successful could move onto something else.

Ms. Roux stated models have been developed that she could present to the Council. However, the Human Resources Division wanted to make sure it had the performance management system in place first and that it was functioning, and based on feedback from employees and managers, that system is not ready yet. Pay is the most important thing to employees, so the performance management system had to be right before employees' pay was dependent on their performance. By the end of year, her office would start to see final annual reviews, and she could do some analyses and have a conversation on how to proceed after that.

Mayor Jennifer Wilson stated before implementing pay for performance, the County's managers had to understand that uniform application. The County would also need to add another 3.5 percent in funding to that bucket every year, which would mean significant cuts or property tax increases. She recommended keeping the status quo today and continuing to work on the performance management system.

Employee Organizations

Mr. Brad Asay, Executive Director, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 1004, read a statement on behalf of AFSCME members. Members are asking that the County show its employees more respect. Employee compensation trails behind Salt Lake City, the State of Utah, and several other municipalities, but the County should be leading the market instead. Employees are struggling and the 3.25 percent increase is not enough. Members are asking for any additional increase to the 3.25 percent increase and that any budget cuts or savings be reinvested into employee compensation. Members were also concerned with the County's current model in determining different wages for the same work, and they had significant concerns with a pay for performance model and wanted to be included in any discussions before pay for performance was implemented. Regarding insurance, the County is not keeping costs down. The 3.5 percent increase in the PPO plan will make it difficult for many employees and families to keep up. While the high-deductible health plan (HDHP) works well for some employees, without a written guarantee that County contributions will continue and that premiums will not be added in the future, employees cannot rely on its long-term stability. AFSCME Local 1004 asked that Council Members arrange a meeting between County decision-makers and employees to align interpretations and actions to honor the ordinance's intent.

Mr. Craig Wyllie, Business Agent, Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3, stated he did not have any response, nor alternative proposal on the pay structure and benefits. However, he proposed a grade increase for five employees who are working at the landfill and transfer station and are in the position of environmental compliance, due to their additional responsibilities.

Council Member Johnson asked how much that increase would cost.

Ms. Roux stated Human Resources could do an analysis on that to see what the cost would be.

Council Member Stringham stated she would like to see a salary survey on those job titles too.

<u>Assessor, Auditor, Surveyor, Treasurer, and Recorder</u>

Mr. David Delquadro, Chief Financial Manager, Council Office, stated the five tax offices were prudent and had reductions in their budgets, despite ongoing workload increases. Some of these offices are funded by both the General Fund and the Tax Administration Fund.

The Assessor is asking for a rebudget request for the Premier Utah Mass Appraisal (PUMA) system, which is going to go live this year. PUMA will be instrumental in making the County more productive and accurate. The Assessor was also able to hire two commercial appraisers, funded by the Tax Administration Fund.

The Auditor asked to turn a time-limited position that was to be eliminated at the end of this year into a merit position, at a cost of $90,000 from the General Fund, including the pay and benefit package.

The Surveyor projected a revenue increase. From the General Fund, he was asking for $4,000 to add to the vehicle replacement charges, and an increase to the billing rate of about $5 to reflect inflation. He is also asking to reclassify a Survey Technician to a Party Chief, a cost of about $40,000, from the Tax Administration Fund.

The Treasurer was extremely thorough in reviewing her budget and made cuts in her operations budget, by reducing personnel. She is asking for $26,000 to cover additional postage costs. The Treasurer's Office is fully funded from the Tax Administration Fund.

The Recorder transferred some personnel between the General Fund and the Tax Administration Fund in response to a review by the Human Resources Division. There is some confusion in the Recorder's budget because it shows the numbers before the benefits were added in and after they were added in. The Recorder increased its revenue from its Data Services access. The Mayor recommended eliminating the Recorder's $46,000 contra, which was an offset against the Recorder's appropriations.

A motion was made by Council Member Winder Newton, seconded by Council member Harrison, to give preliminary approval of the compensation, and the budgets of the Assessor, Auditor, Surveyor, Treasurer, and Recorder. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

9.7 Informational Presentation for the Proposed Ordinance, Amending Title 19, Entitled "Zoning" of the Salt Lake County Code of Ordinances, 2001, by Reclassifying Certain Property Located in Salt Lake County From the A-20 Zone (Agriculture) to the M-2 Zone (Manufacturing) located at 3483 North 3200 West 25-710

Presenter: Curtis Woodward, MSD Senior Planner; Zach Shaw, Salt Lake County Deputy District Attorney; Robert Thompson, Watershed Section Manager
(Approx. 3:30 PM, 20 minutes)

Informational

Attachments:
1. REZ2025-001420 Council PP
2. REZ2025-001420 County Council Staff Report Final
3. Ordinance Rezone 001420

Mr. Curtis Woodward, Senior Planner, Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District, reviewed the following rezone request:

REZ2025-001420- Tom Peterson requesting to reclassify property located at 3843 North 3200 West from an A-20 (agricultural) zone to an M-2 (manufacturing) zone.

Mr. Woodward delivered a PowerPoint presentation, reviewing a site aerial view of the property; the current A-20 zoning and the surrounding property; the proposed M2 zoning; the General Plan and a closeup of the area, which is located within the Shoreline Conservation Area of the adopted West General Plan; the goal in the General Plan and acceptable land uses; and recommendations.

On July 16, 2025, the Salt Lake County Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the zone change to M-2/zc (zoning condition), with the condition to prohibit certain uses, based on the MSD Planning Department staff's approval of the limited M-2/zc. However, the MSD planner who did the initial review of the application mistakenly thought the property was located further south, and not in the West General Plan area. After further review of the location and the West General Plan, as well as an application review from agency subject matter experts, the MSD Planning Department staff is now recommending the application be denied.

Council Member Johnson stated on September 5th, the Petersons responded to the potential zoning change relating to environmental issues. He asked what date the MSD communicated with the applicant letting him know there were some problems with the initial approval.

Mr. Woodward stated the applicant had asked the initial planner when the application was going to be placed on a County Council agenda, and the planner communicated back that some questions had come up about the property as it pertained to the County's Watershed Management Plan and its General Plan. Mr. Woodward did not know the specific date of that communication.

Mr. Robert Thompson, Watershed Section Manager, Flood Control Division, stated he was asked to review this application about a month ago and found inconsistencies with some of the documents. The first inconsistency was with the County's 2015 Integrated Watershed Plan, which summarizes which watersheds in the County are impaired. Sixty-one percent of the drainage going into the Great Salt Lake was impaired. The land uses that are applicable to impaired watersheds, include conservation easements, wildlife habitats, etc. Those uses are also in the General Plan.

Mr. Thompson also reviewed flood control planning documents, including the Title 17 plan, an analysis of drainage for the sewage canal and the city drain. The applicant's property resides next to the sewage canal, and the sewage canal does not allow stormwater or drainage from the applicant's property to intersect with the peak runoff that comes from upstream. When the Great Salt Lake Watershed drains into creeks and canals at the peak of runoff, it moves downhill and intersects with other drainages coming downhill, and that causes flooding. Additionally, the County's storm water permit requires that the County retain up to the 80th percentile storm precipitation. These reviews indicate conflicting issues with the drainage of this property. It did not make sense to go against the West General Plan, best management practices, and the Integrated Watershed Plan, and ignore the potential for flooding from stormwater.

Council Member Stringham asked if the applicant had a mitigation management plan for the stormwater that met those requirements whether there would still be a concern.

Mr. Thompson stated if another planning document existed that would satisfy the concerns of the other two documents, that could potentially alleviate his concerns.

Council Member Theodore asked what uses were allowed in an M2 zone, and what the differences were between equipment allowed on an A-20 zone versus that allowed on an M2 zone.

Mr. Woodward stated the M 2 zone is the heaviest manufacturing/industrial zone, and it allows a variety of manufacturing and industrial uses, including battery manufacturing, automobile repair or reconditioning, a materials sales yard, sand and gravel operations, incinerators, junkyards, automobile impound and towing yards, salvage yards, recycling centers, and landfills. Agriculture has less impervious surface, like paved parking and paved pads, and buildings are generally smaller than what is in a manufacturing or industrial zone. While there may be a certain amount of equipment for agriculture, the site in an agriculture zone is more organic, such as dirt and gravel as opposed to asphalt and concrete. Chemicals used in agriculture are also less toxic than those used in manufacturing.

Council Member Moreno stated if this was zoned M2, this company would be able to do whatever it wanted on the property.

Mr. Woodward stated a developer, or applicant, would have to comply with State Code in terms of building size, setbacks, parking, drainage, and access to the property, and there would be a development application review process. The applicant has indicated he would like to have a soil and gravel storage business temporarily, and a rental car overflow storage site long-term. Using the property as outdoor storage would allow the applicant to lay down gravel and store vehicles. The only access to this property is a private dirt road, and traditionally, industrial use areas are not located in remote areas where there is only an unpaved road.

Council Member Johnson stated he was concerned that what the applicant did with the property would be out of the Council's hands if it rezoned the property to M2.

Mr. Woodward stated the County's zoning ordinance does allow the County Council to approve zoning with zoning conditions, so the Council could limit the uses.

Ms. Lisa Hartman, Associate Deputy Mayor of Regional Operations, stated once the Council approved the rezone, the development application would go to the planning staff. It would not come back to the Council.

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND ISSUANCE OF PUBLIC NOTICES

10. TIME CERTAIN 4:00 PM 25-662
1 Hold a Public Hearing to Receive Comment on a Proposed Ordinance, Amending Title 19, Entitled "Zoning" of the Salt Lake County Code of Ordinances, 2001, by Reclassifying Certain Property Located in Salt Lake County (3483 N 3200 W) from the A-20 Zone (Agriculture) to the M-2 Zone (Manufacturing)

Attachments:
1. REZ2025-001420 Council PP
2. REZ2025-001420 County Council Staff Report Final
3. Ordinance Rezone 001420

A motion was made by Council Member Stringham, seconded by Council Member Johnson, to open the public hearing. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Mitchell Park, Legal Counsel, Council Office, stated traditionally, the Council has allowed three minutes for public comments, but the Council can allow more time.

Mr. Michael Lichfield, Attorney, Skoubye, Nielson and Johansen, LLC, representative of the Petersons and T & S Airport, stated the Petersons have owned this property for over 25 years. The parcel is high, dry, and fenced. The current elevation of the property is about 4,220 feet. This property is north of the Salt Lake City International Airport, and north of the recent Salt Lake City annexation. The property directly to the south is agricultural and the one south of that has many light industrial buildings. This property does not abut the Salt Lake sewage canal, and the Petersons have never used the sewage canal for any sort of drainage.

There is no development proposal before the County. The applicants are exploring options for possible uses of their 48-acre parcel. The application initially requested a rezone to M1, but because of the possibility of storing vehicles, the Planning Commission recommended changing that to an M2 zone, with conditions. The applicant accepted all the conditions without reservation to avoid chemicals, pollutants, or other things that would impact this area. Some uses are already curtailed by this location. Strict height restrictions are in place because of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) tower to the west and the jazz radio tower to the east. There are also restrictions based on proximity to the Salt Lake International Airport. The Planning Commission noted in its report that this was the shoreline area, but still unanimously recommended the zoning change knowing that any site disturbance would go through an additional permitting process. The applicants are solely exploring options to bring in equipment storage.

The applicants first learned of the watershed recommendation a week ago. This property has had a stormwater protection plan in place for five years, which requires that all waters be retained on the property, and that has occurred. Had there been outreach to the applicants, the watershed situation could have easily been addressed. The applicants are disappointed by the belated reversal of the recommendation.

Council Member Johnson stated he read some of the statements Mr. Lichfield gave the Council, and it seemed he was claiming his clients had not been given proper notice about what was happening. However, the September 5th letter seems to address some of the concerns, so the applicants had to know about the issues. He asked if anyone from government had communicated directly with the property owners about these environmental concerns between July and the date of the letter.

Mr. Lichfield stated he wrote the September 5th letter. He called Mr. Smith at various times between July and September 5th to ask why the hearing before the County Council had not been set, and he learned from Mr. Smith that there were some environmental issues. He did not know the dates that he spoke with Mr. Smith.

Council Member Johnson asked if the applicants had made any improvements on the land in anticipation of the change in rezoning.

Mr. Lichfield stated no. The applicant got a grading permit about five years ago, which generated the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

Ms. Claire Gillmor, representative of Gillmor Ranching, LLC, stated Gillmor Ranching, LLC, nearly surrounds the applicants' property. Gillmor Ranching has been in the active livestock business for over 100 years. There is no infrastructure on the property. The equipment that can be seen in the aerial photo is completely related to agriculture. It is limited to farm implements for the purpose of sowing seeds for hay, harvesting hay, and storing hay. That equipment is less intense than what is used in an M2 zone, and it is compatible with all the surrounding uses.

The applicants' property is entirely landlocked. There is one access over an unimproved dirt and gravel road that is privately owned by the Gillmor family. That road has never been a public road; it has always been used to service the livestock operations of the Gillmor family. Gillmor Ranching would like to keep the road exactly the way it wants to. The applicants' limited easement to access their property is a "stock trail and roadway easement." The applicant has attempted to expand the easement through litigation, but that was denied. Ms. Gillmor asked that when the Council considers the private property rights of the applicant, that it also considers the rights of the surrounding property owners.

Council Member Stringham asked if the applicants' property had once belonged to the Gillmor family.

Ms. Gillmor stated yes. Over the years, property was passed onto offspring, and this property was subsequently sold.

Council Member Johnson stated the access easement would not change if the Council passed the rezone request, so approving the rezone would change the necessity of the easement, resulting in Gillmor Ranching becoming involved in a lawsuit.

Ms. Gillmor stated Gillmor Ranching will do everything legally in its power to prevent the expansion of the scope of that easement.

Mr. Christopher Von Maack, representative of G-Bar Ventures LLC, stated G-Bar Ventures LLC is one of the adjoining landowners, and it has owned its property and been engaged in agriculture on that property for over 100 years. There was once a dispute between Gillmor family members, resulting in a partition decree and the easement.

G-Bar Ventures sent a letter to the Council, in which it raised its concern over not receiving notice of the zone change request from the County or its planning staff, but it also raised objection to the zone change. He asked that the letter be included in the record. (A copy of the letter is available in the Council Clerk's Office, at 2001 South State Street, N2-700, Salt Lake City, Utah.)

Mr. Von Maack summarized G-Bar Venture's opposition to the rezone as follows:

- The zoning application is opposed to Resolution 6329; therefore, the resolution militates in favor of denial of this petition.
- The West General Plan militates against passing this resolution.
- Although the Planning Commission initially recommended approval of the application, after reexamination over concerns about the watershed, whether the Flood Control Division had been consulted, and the property location in the West general plan and Shoreline Heritage Area, planning staff recommended denial.
- There are some significant watershed issues with the request.
- This Council can only deal with what is in front of it now, not hypothetical points about what could happen if the applicant had a mitigation management plan for the stormwater.
- T & S Airport talked about the development that was nearby, but the developments were in North Salt Lake and Salt Lake City, and those areas are outside of Salt Lake County's jurisdiction.
- In the original staff report, T & S Airport indicated it would like to do something like the Northpoint area development on this property. T & S Airport reporting on its

temporary use was just to get a toe hold into the Great Salt Lake Shoreline Heritage Area and create an island of M2 surrounded by A-20.

- The access road is owned by the Gillmor family, and it is used for ranching operations, but T & S Airport wants to run rental cars on it.
- There is no infrastructure, power, or sewer on the property, and the property only gets water through a well.
- Mr. Lichfield said the area was high in elevation and fenced, but if M2 uses were allowed on the property, the fencing would be destroyed through erosion.

Mr. Von Maack encouraged the Council to consider its prior work when considering this rezone request, citing its adoption of the West General Plan, which created the Shoreline Heritage Area, identifying future uses of the property, and its adoption of Resolution #6329, supporting protection of the Great Salt Lake, and to be sensitive to the Gillmors' private property rights.

Mr. Jeff Richards, representative of the North Point Duck Club and the Ruddy Duck Club, stated the North Point Duck Club has been in existence for about 125 years. It was one of the first areas to preserve migratory wetlands. This area is important not only for agricultural protection, but for the preservation of all kinds of species of migratory birds and other wildlife. If this zone change is approved, it will change the character of this area and affect the migratory birds and the 4,000 acres that the North Point Duck Club and Ruddy Duck Club manage for migratory birds. Approving this zone change would allow the proverbial camel's nose in the tent door, and it would have long-lasting negative consequences in this whole area.

Mr. Soren Simonsen, Executive Director, Jordan River Commission, passed out a map highlighting the peninsula of land that is the Gillmor property, with the subject property in the center of it. The subject property does not abut the Jordan River; it is upland area, which is not subject to some of the considerations that are given to wetlands. However, the upland areas are part of a continuum of sensitive wildlife habitat areas that surround the Great Salt Lake. The property is used as agriculture, which is highly compatible with many wildlife values. The map illustrates areas that currently have significant protection. They are either private duck clubs, state-owned, or other entity-owned properties. If this area is developed, it would significantly fracture this sensitive wildlife area.

The Blueprint Jordan River identifies some valuable planning tools, and the Jordan River Commission would be happy to support the County in developing those tools. The West General Plan identified tools at the County's disposal, and those included the transferring of development rights, acquisition, or zoning. One model that could work for Salt Lake County is a Transfer of Development Rights Program. Having a Transfer of Development Rights Program allows a property owner with property to transfer their development rights to a more appropriate area with infrastructure, which would help preserve sensitive lands.

There could still be opportunities to do some rezoning in Salt Lake City and other areas that had been rezoned. He cited an example of the Swaner Nature Preserve in Summit County, which had been rezoned and platted for development, but was later preserved, while making property owners whole.

If this property is rezoned and developed, it will set the stage for development that will directly impact the Jordan River, as there are only hundreds of feet separating this property from the Jordan River. It would also open the door for future development, which would be more detrimental.

Ms. Lynn de Freitas, Executive Director, Friends of Great Salt Lake, stated Friends of Great Salt Lake's mission is to preserve and protect the Great Salt Lake ecosystem through education, research, advocacy, and the arts. Salt Lake County 's recognition of the Shoreline Heritage Area and its West General Plan is regarded as an example of a positive and thoughtful way to preserve Utah's future and the Great Salt Lake's future. The Great Salt Lake ecosystem includes the adjacent landscapes that contribute to its wetlands and uplands habitat values, its hydrological connectivity, and its cultural traditions that have been a part of its neighborhood for generations. This belief was declared and confirmed on September 30th, in the Council's resolution to protect the Great Salt Lake and its wetlands. She hoped that the Council would deny this zone change request.

Mr. Brett Peterson, family member of the property owner, displayed a map of the growth that has happened in the last ten years in this sector, showing where development had gone in or was currently being built. One property is being developed close to the Great Salt Lake on the west. There are additional properties right up against the Jordan River. Development has also started going into the northwest corner where there are hundreds of acres of open space, and to the north. One property owner to the north that annexed into Salt Lake City this summer said that while they would like to stay with farming, they would likely sell if they got a sound offer. To the south, Salt Lake City is proposing a homeless campus, which would be on about a 16-acre parcel. The upper right corner of the map shows the Foxboro development in Davis County, which went in within the last 10 years. The Salt Lake International Airport is also planning an extension of its runway on the east side. Furthermore, warehousing is being built to support the Inland Port and the airport in their freight activities. Development is making its way into the Petersons' neighborhood, and they would like to see what options they had to develop their property.

A motion was made by Council Member Winder Newton, seconded by Council Member Stringham, to close the public hearing. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

11. PENDING LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

11.1 First Reading of a Proposed Ordinance Amending Title 19, Entitled "Zoning" of the Salt Lake County Code of Ordinances, 2001, by Reclassifying Certain Property Located at 3483 N 3200 W in Salt Lake County from the A-20 Zone (Agriculture) to the M-2 Zone (Manufacturing) 25-711

Presenter: Curtis Woodward, MSD Senior Planner; Robert Thompson, Watershed Section Manager
(Approx. 4:20, 15 minutes)

Discussion - Vote Needed

Attachments:
1. REZ2025-001420 Council PP
2. REZ2025-001420 County Council Staff Report Final
3. Ordinance Rezone 001420

Council Member Pinkney asked if there had been any type of evaluation or study done about how changing this zoning would further erode the wetlands and soil. It takes thousands of years for the organic soil to be made, and right now, wetlands are eroding, not just in Salt Lake County, but throughout the United States. She has seen a lot of data that shows manufacturing will further erode wetlands.

Mr. Robert Thompson, Watershed Section Manager, Flood Control Division, stated he was not aware of any specific studies for wetlands or soils. Those are usually paid for during the development process. The manufacturing status goes against every plan that exists for the State. The Integrated Watershed Plan does not recommend manufacturing, or light or heavy industrial anywhere near the Great Salt Lake; it recommends preservation of the land, habitat, etcetera.

Council Member Winder Newton stated she felt strongly that an entity should use its General Plan to decide how to zone property. That gives consistency to property owners and helps a city or community to plan. This zone does not fit with the West General Plan.

Council Member Stringham asked Mitchell Park, Legal Counsel, Council Office, to outline the process that normally takes place when the County works with the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (MSD) on rezone requests.

Mr. Mitchell Park, Legal Counsel, Council Office, stated Salt Lake County has contracted with the MSD to conduct the planning at the initial stages for new applications for various types of land use projects. The MSD does the initial work, processes applicable fees, etcetera, and gets matters to the Salt Lake County Planning Commission. The State Statute's County Land Use, Development, and Management Act required the Planning Commission to provide an initial recommendation about a particular item, and that did occur. Then, the process is for the Mayor's Office to prepare a staff report and place it on a Council agenda for the Council's consideration.

Council Member Stringham stated she was not happy with the MSD nor the Mayor's Office for not communicating with the property owner, nor did they communicate with her as the Council's representative on the MSD Board of Trustees. Every time she asked when this request was going to be on an agenda, she was told it would be on the next agenda, yet this was held from July until now. She had not known why it was held, but she had heard that the MSD might remit this back to the Planning Commission. She was not told it was going to be denied.

Mr. Michael Lichfield, Attorney, Skoubye, Nielson and Johansen, LLC, representative for the Petersons and T & S Airport, stated the first indication in writing that this was going to be denied was a week ago today, and the watershed report upon which the denial was extensively based was received on Wednesday.

Council Member Stringham asked how many times the applicant had flown here for a meeting that never happened.

Mr. Lichfield stated his client flew to Salt Lake City at least once after being confirmed he was on an agenda, but then that did not happen.

Council Member Stringham asked if information had been communicated to the applicant that there were problems that were being worked out.

Ms. Catherine Kanter, Deputy Mayor of Regional Operations, stated that is correct.

Council Member Stringham stated with the proper zoning and checks and balances, the concerns could be mitigated. The Planning Commission could zone the property M2, with conditions, or M1, with exceptions. She would like to see this go back to the Planning Commission rather than denying the application.

Council Member Pinkney stated while agriculture is not necessarily the best way to preserve land, manufacturing will impact the carbon dioxide levels. It went against the resolution the Council passed to protect the wetlands. Marsh is being depleted, and that will impact the weather and the future climate. If this is approved, more groups will try to turn to manufacturing. Manufacturing should be moved to a place that is more appropriate. The responsible thing to do is to deny this zone change.

Council Member Johnson stated he understood the Peterson family felt like they did not receive proper notice, but as a legal matter, he did not believe that was true. Regarding the process, the applicant ultimately had to talk to the Council because it is the entity that makes the decision, regardless of any recommendations another entity made. Also, as part of the process, decisions can change, so the fact that happened from July to now should not be surprising. There are competing property interests between the property owners who neighbor the applicant's property and the applicant, and a significant legal problem with the easement, which is the only access point to the property. Most importantly, there are environmental concerns here.

A motion was made by Council Member Johnson, seconded by Council Member Moreno, to deny the zoning application, for the stated reasons and because it went against the West General Plan.

Council Member Theodore apologized to the property owner who felt the process was not fair, but the Council ultimately makes the decision. Anytime an agricultural area changes to another use, that agriculture area is gone forever. This area is not a city center; it is a conservation area. The request went against the West General Plan and the resolution. It would be a shame to see it change over time. She would be voting to deny the application.

Mayor Jennifer Wilson stated the County put a lot of time and effort into the West General Plan, and it is an important plan. Preservation in this area mattered and it was consistent with the West General Plan. She was personally committed to protecting what she could protect. Regarding the process, she did not think anyone was deliberate. The Council has a unique relationship with the MSD, and when other entities are involved, there are potential bumps in the road and the process can feel cumbersome and lengthy, but that is part of the deal with getting government approval. That said, the County can always do better, and she would support further conversations in that regard.

A motion was made by Council Member Johnson, seconded by Council Member Moreno, to deny the zoning application, for the stated reasons and because it went against the West General Plan. The motion carried unanimously by the following roll call vote:

Aye: Council Member Winder Newton, Council Member Pinkney, Council Member Romero, Council Member Johnson, Council Member Harrison, Council Member Moreno, Council Member Theodore

Nay: Council Member Stringham

Mr. Park stated the effect of that vote was that the ordinance was not ready for the first reading.

11. 2 Consideration of a Resolution of the Salt Lake County Council Declaring Official Intent to Reimburse Expenditures to its General Fund or Other County Funds for the Financing of Project Costs Associated with Acquiring, Improving, Renovating, Remodeling or Constructing a Convention Center, other County Capital Projects and Related Facilities 25-676

Presenter: Darrin Casper, Deputy Mayor of Finance and Administration (Approx. 4:35, 5 minutes)

Discussion - Vote Needed

Attachments:
1. Convention Center Reimbursment Resolution (10.6.25)

Mr. Darrin Casper, Deputy Mayor of Finance and Administration, reviewed the resolution, which would enable the County to reimburse itself for expenditures it pays in advance of issuing debt for the Salt Palace project. The County committed to the State, Salt Lake City, and the group that brought this project together that it would issue bonds in the amount of $150 million. The way to make that bond issuance and financing the most efficient was to spend money in advance of issuing the debt. Then once the County issued the debt, it would immediately reimburse itself for a portion of it. That would help the County meet drawdown requirements of the Internal Revenue Service and keep more interest earnings from its invested proceeds.

RESOLUTION NO. 6333

RESOLUTION OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL DECLARING OFFICIAL INTENT TO REIMBURSE EXPENDITURES TO ITS GENERAL FUND OR OTHER COUNTY FUNDS FOR THE FINANCING OF PROJECT COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ACQUIRING, IMPROVING, RENOVATING. REMODELING OR CONSTRUCTING A CONVENTION CENTER, OTHER COUNTY CAPITAL PROJECTS AND RELATED FACILITIES.

The Legislative Body of Salt Lake County resolves as follows:

WHEREAS, Salt Lake County ("County") expects to issue tax-exempt obligations to provide the funding for acquiring, improving, renovating, remodeling or constructing a convention center, other County capital projects and related facilities ("Projects"); and

WHEREAS, because the funds from this issuance may not become available until late 2026, the County must provide interim financing to cover the costs of the Projects incurred for certain capital expenditures, including due-diligence, initial acquisition and construction and planning expenses; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that permanent long-term financing will be authorized and issued at a time when the Projects plans are finalized and approved, and site[s] are acquired by the County; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary, desirable, and in the best interests of the County to advance moneys from its funds on hand on an interim basis until the obligations can be issued and the bond funds become available.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Salt Lake County Council as follows:

1. The County intends to finance the Projects with long-term debt to be issued by the County.

2. The County shall make expenditures as needed from its funds on hand to pay the costs of the Projects until the proceeds of the bond obligations become available.

3. The County hereby declares its official intent under 26 CFR Section 1.150-2 to reimburse said expenditures advanced for the Projects with proceeds of the bond obligations, the principal amount of which is not expected to exceed $150 Million dollars.

4. No funds for payment of the Projects from sources other than the obligations are, or are reasonably expected to be, reserved, allocated on a long-term basis, or otherwise set aside by the County pursuant to its budget or financial policies.

5. Resolutions of the County together with minutes of meetings and other documents pertinent to the Projects are and will be reasonably available at the office of the Council Clerk, Salt Lake County Government Complex, 2001 South State Street, N2-700, Salt Lake City, Utah ("Government Center"). Plans, specifications, architectural drawings and related information are and will be reasonably available as they are developed at the

office of the Salt Lake County Mayor's Finance & Administration, Suite N4-200, which is located at the Government Center 2001 South State Street, Ste N4-200 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114.

This Resolution shall become effective upon its adoption and approval.

APPROVED and ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 2025.

SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL

ATTEST (SEAL)

By /s/ DEA THEODORE
Chair

By /s/ LANNIE CHAPMAN
Salt Lake County Clerk

A motion was made by Council Member Stringham, seconded by Council Member Johnson, that this agenda item be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

12. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING COUNCIL APPROVAL

13. OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS to come before the Council at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 PM until Tuesday, October 28, 2025.

LANNIE CHAPMAN, COUNTY CLERK

By______________________________
DEPUTY CLERK

By_______________________________
CHAIR, SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL