

MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL RETREAT HELD TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2023 AT 8:30 A.M. AT THE MARKET STREET AND GRILL LOCATED AT 2985 EAST COTTONWOOD PARKWAY, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Present: Mayor Mike Weichers, Council Member Shawn E. Newell, Council Member Ellen Birrell, Council Member Douglas Petersen

Staff Present: City Manager Tim Tingey, Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, Finance and Administrative Services Director S. Scott Jorges, Police Chief Robby Russo, Public Works Director Matt Shipp, Executive Assistant Beatriz Mayorga

1. Welcome and Introduction.

Mayor Weichers called the meeting to order at approximately 8:30 a.m.

City Manager, Tim Tingey reviewed the schedule and noted that the items discussed are not voted on but will move forward with the consensus of the Council. Consensus includes approval of three council members. The direction received is not indicative of a final decision having been made but allows Staff to work on proposals and return to the Council while conducting research and providing information during regular City Council Meetings.

2. Review of Year-End Report and 2022 Strategic Initiative Progress.

Mr. Tingey presented an overview of the Year-End Report and highlighted the policy priority list for each department. 2022 priorities included the following:

City Manager's Office:

- Facilitated weekly reports;
- Facilitated budget reports;
- Served on multiple committees;
- Communications and media; and
- Conducted the community survey.

Community and Economic Development:

- 151 total Land Use applications processed;
- 787 Building Permits processed;
- 2000 + inspections conducted;
- Planning projects related to Fort Union bike lanes;
- Mid-valley active transportation; and
- The SLEDS Ordinance.

Business Licensing:

- Events with continued networking and community events;
- Facilitated all business licensing within the City;
- Installed solar panels on City Hall; and
- Waterwise landscaping ordinance was adopted.

Cottonwood Heights Police Department:

- Maintained staffing;
- Improved community relations with a variety of functions;
- Training and intervention responses; and
- Awards for K-9 dogs.

Emergency Management:

- Shake out events completed;
- Collaborate with Salt Lake County;
- School security training;
- Animal issues addressed; and
- Public Works Department.

Capital Projects:

- Bengal Boulevard round-a-bout;
- Ferguson Park project;
- 924,000 square feet and 132 tons of leveling course used for chip seals;
- 1.8 million square feet of surface treatments; and
- Crack seal completed.

Records, Culture, and Human Resources:

- 143 records request;
- Provide meeting support on all Planning Commission and City Council Meetings;
- On-boarded 28 new employees;
- Updated personnel manual;
- Yearly trainings; and
- Compensation study.

Culture Accomplishments:

- Willy Wonka;
- Bunny Hop and a variety of other events; and
- Butlerville Days.

Finance and Information Technology:

- Continue to receive financial awards for work completed;
- Facilitate new bonds; and
- IT accomplishments.

Mr. Tingey reviewed the 2022 City Council Strategic Initiative process. He noted that those items marked completed may indicate that item was brought before the City Council but may not confirm the project has been completed. Prioritized items included the following:

- City Council availability calendar;
- Election reform;
- Land use and density issues;
- Y2 Analytics survey was completed in September 2022;
- City fiber optic options presented;
- Took part in grants discussions;
- Bonding of the Public Works Building;
- Community Development and Renewal Agency (“CDRA”) funding;
- State legislative road funding;
- Road improvements;
- Staff compensation and merit;
- Valley Emergency Communications Center (“VECC”) fee increase;
- Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) contract increase;
- VST portion of funding for Ferguson Park improvements;
- Public Works Building design;
- 1700 East Sidewalk Project;
- Ferguson Canyon parking commenced with Federal Aid funding;
- Bengal Boulevard and Highland Drive intersection. Reconstruction requires additional funding to enter the environmental phase;
- 2600 East sidewalk. An additional \$35,000 to cover expected overages;
- Waterway replacement improvements;
- Street signage funded with implementation including replacement and new installs;
- Traffic calming funded including speed radar signs;
- IT investments for cyber security. An audit was conducted with a favorable outcome;
- Antczak Park improvements to provide funding for additional lighting;
- 7200 South Target Hillside Trail Community Development Recreation Area (“CDRA”) Funding was available;
- Chapter 14 Code revisions are in process;
- Permit parking consideration of Code changes were adopted;
- Animal Nuisance Code was adopted;
- Business Licensing is still in process;
- SLEDS Ordinance draft is available and scheduled for action; and

- Discussion on a Climate Change Resolution. Staff brought forward the Sustainability Master Plan and Resolution.

General discussion items included the following:

- Request to modify the Executive Summary of Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan;
- Develop a Resolution for consideration for speed and safety concerns along Wasatch Boulevard;
- Landscaping Ordinance changes adopted February 15, 2022;
- The Public Safety Advisory Committee was brought to the Council for consideration in November 2022 and received direction to prepare plans to move forward;
- Finalization of the Vulnerable Citizen Registry;
- Funding options for the Old County Urban Renewal areas were prioritized;
- General Plan process Open House was completed;
- Finalization of the Community Reinvestment Areas;
- Transportation Master Plan drafted;
- Economic Development Research related to the “Plans”;
- Pavement Use Study Evaluation through the Stormwater Plans; and
- Shuttles along Fort Union Boulevard discussed. Mr. Tingey confirmed that UTA representatives will be present at future meetings where this is discussed.

3. Current Project Updates.

Mr. Tingey provided current project updates including the following:

Ferguson Park: Mr. Tingey reported that the Ferguson Park area is near completion. The parking area will move forward weather permitting with project completion and ribbon cutting in the spring. Mr. Tingey stated that the contractor made errors in the location and cutting of the hillside requiring environmental mitigation. The error was mitigated at the contractor’s expense, which was built into the contract. Change orders were described. He anticipated the cost of the remaining completion items to be \$30,000, which are expected to come in slightly under budget.

Public Works Building: There have been delays primarily due to the Rocky Mountain Power lines along the west side of the property that require relocation at the City’s expense. Analysis and design relocation are underway.

Bengal Boulevard Trail Crosswalk: Mr. Shipp reported that the City was awarded \$1.1 million in funding through Salt Lake County for the Bengal Boulevard Trail Crosswalk. The project will run from City Hall westward to the nearby federal project. Funds will also be utilized for the Crosswalk Project Improvements at Brighton High School. The use of a High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk (“HAWK”) signal for the crosswalk was considered.

General Plan and Form-Based Code: Mr. Tingey reported that the Form-Based Code is built into the General Plan contract that would allow an individual to assist the City in the development of the Code. Staff continues to meet regularly with the contracted individual to further educate and

assist the City in its development. There was additional discussion regarding the Form-Based Code component will take place at the February 21 Work Meeting.

Public Safety Committee: This item is currently in progress and a proposal is expected sometime this spring.

Hillside Plaza Due Diligence: Staff received the First Amendment to the Purchase and Sales Agreement for the Hillside Plaza. Mr. Tingey confirmed that the agreement has been finalized and signed. Redline Codes, Covenants, and Restrictions (“CC&Rs”) are progressing.

The Highland Drive and Bengal Boulevard Intersection: This is the Federal Aid Project that connects with the previously discussed Bengal Boulevard Rail Crosswalk Project. Additional details would be forthcoming.

HAWK Signal at Fort Union: Mr. Tingey provided a display demonstrating the HAWK signal location. Flags will be provided when crossing the intersection. A budget amendment for 6.77% will be before the City Council at a future meeting.

The 2700 East Sidewalk: Mr. Shipp reported that the 2700 East Sidewalk Project is the connection between Toni Circle and 2600 East. This is a Federal Aid Project and construction will commence in the Summer of 2023. The project will go out for bid as soon as confirmation is received from the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”). Council Member Birrell shared safety concerns and urged a maximum speed of 20 MPH.

The 1700 East Sidewalk: Mr. Tingey reported the 1700 East Sidewalk Project was budgeted in 2022 and Staff continues to work with the property owners to develop the project. A property rendering was displayed. Several property owners have agreed to terms with two larger property owners still in negotiations. Mr. Shipp expected the project to go out to bid in March 2023. He confirmed that they have been unsuccessful in their grant requests.

Big Cottonwood Canyon Trail Reconstruction and Wayfinding: Mr. Tingey reported that Salt Lake County funding has been received with completion expected in the Spring of 2023.

Manhole Razing and Inspection/Storm Water Project: Mr. Shipp reported manhole razing is part of the Stormwater Project with 98% of the manhole surveys having been completed. The Public Works Department is in the process of razing 250 buried manholes and have experienced delays due to the winter weather. Mayor Weichers requested a timeframe for the project. Mr. Shipp stated that the additional exploration and camera work will require a Summer 2023 contract as the City does not have adequate staffing and equipment to do the work.

The Fort Union Boulevard Sidewalk: Mr. Johnson provided a PowerPoint presentation detailing the Fort Union Boulevard Sidewalk Project. The project is located between 1700 East and Brookhill Drive as part of the Fort Union Area Master Plan. It includes both a sidewalk and a bike lane. The City received funding from Salt Lake County for corridor preservation for acquisition for enough right-of-way for construction of a wider sidewalk and asphalt bike lane. The City also received \$400,000 from UDOT to construct the improvements. Once the survey results and

drawings are received, the improvement designs will allow for the negotiation and acquisition of property. Staff continued to work through the details to proceed with the project.

Community Renewable Energy Program Participation: Mr. Johnson reported that the Community Renewable Energy Program was enabled through House Bill 411 and is a partnership between Rocky Mountain Power and various Utah communities. There was no change in power origination, however, if residents opt in their monthly power payment may be invested in renewable energy sources. Cottonwood Heights is one of 18 participating cities who signed a Governance Agreement. Staff was currently collaborating with the other participating communities on these administrative steps. It was anticipated that the matter will come before the Council for a vote in summer 2023 at which time it will be determined whether the new electricity rate will be offered. The maximum increase estimate was \$7 to \$10. Investment in the City upfront gives the residents a choice to opt in or out.

The Doverhill Drive Subdivision and Preliminary Park Design: Mr. Tingey reported that Ivory Development submitted a 13-lot Subdivision and Concept Park Design. The Planning Commission unanimously approved the 13-lot subdivision. The proposal was reviewed by the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee specifically for park design suggestions. Feedback was largely favorable with concern over the Doverhill Drive parking potentially restricting the open feel and visibility of the park. A more prominent trail into the park, grading for a small sledding hill, and exploration of additional amenities was recommended. The project was also issued a Certificate of Design Compliance by the Architecture Review Committee (“ARC”). Ivory Development itemized the cost of the park with a goal of working the plan through a price reduction in their negotiations with the listing property owner so that while Ivory builds the subdivision, the property owner builds the public park to the City’s specifications and timeline. Mr. Johnson stated that it was clear that the City’s approved purchase price would not change.

It was Council Member Birrell’s understanding that because the City was willing to take the existing east side property, Ivory Homes will receive a reduction from the owner of the real estate and not only build out their homes but the public park for Cottonwood Heights at a net zero cost to the City.

4. General City Council Discussion Items:

Break

Mr. Tingey reviewed housekeeping items and reported that staff met previously with City Council Members regarding the City Council Policies and Procedures. One year ago, there were discussions regarding potential modifications. Mr. Tingey reviewed the proposed modifications. Rather than mileage reimbursement, there was now a monthly stipend mentioned. The language related to the mileage reimbursement was removed and the monthly stipend language drafted. In addition, language regarding privately owned computers was modified. The City Council is required to pass a Resolution adopting the changes. It was to be brought forward at the next City Council Meeting. The revised language would be shared beforehand.

Mr. Tingey reminded the Council Members that it is important to be familiar with the internal policies. The City Council Policies and Procedures document contained information related to training and conferences, the use of computers and telephones, media relations, and so on. He noted that the Mayor represents the Council in media situations. If a Council Member is contacted by the media, that media representative would need to be referred to the Mayor. It was possible for Council Members to speak to the media as long as they are not representing the City Council. The City Council Policies and Procedures document also reviewed interactions with Staff, Committee assignment work, and how to initiate City actions. There was a lot of essential information.

Council Member Birrell felt it was important for Council Members to follow procedures. When the new City Council Policies and Procedures document is approved, she asked that it be provided to the Council Members in writing. She wanted to have a copy of the revised version. Mr. Tingey explained that there would be a cover memo as well as the revised version of the City Council Policies and Procedures document in the next packet.

Mr. Tingey shared information about upcoming conferences. The National League of Cities (“NLC”) Congressional City Conference was scheduled for March 26 to 28, 2023. His understanding was that all of the Council Members would attend the conference in Washington, D.C. That expense was budgeted for. Research was conducted on flights and there was a desire to book them this week. The Council Members would need to fly into Washington, D.C. on March 25. There would be a choice to fly out on March 28, 2023, but it was likely that the best time to return would be on March 29, 2023. On the Tuesday, the intention was to arrange a Capitol Tour for Council Members. A list of attendees was needed.

Another conference was the Utah League of Cities and Towns (“ULCT”) Midyear Conference, which all of the Council Members attended the previous year. It is to take place between April 19 and 21. The conference is to be held in St. George. Staff had already made hotel reservations. Anyone not planning to attend was asked to notify Staff. Mr. Tingey reported that the Annual Convention was scheduled on September 6 to 9. He informed those present that he planned to attend the City Manager’s Conference.

The Council discussed the NLC Congressional City Conference in Washington, D.C. Mr. Tingey believed all of the City Council Members were planning to attend. This was confirmed. He wondered if any spouses would be there. There was some uncertainty but Council Member Birrell stated that her spouse would attend. Mayor Weichers indicated that his spouse would not attend due to a conflict. Mr. Tingey reported that Executive Assistant, Beatriz Mayorga, would schedule the flights. She would work with individual Council Members to make those arrangements.

Mr. Tingey reviewed the different flight options. For departing flights, one of the options was a non-stop flight at 9:59 a.m. out of Salt Lake City that would arrive at 4:00 p.m. on March 25, 2023. Council Members were supportive of that flight option and felt it made sense. As for the flight back, if there was interest in an early morning flight, there was one at 6:59 a.m. to 12:37 p.m. with one stop in Atlanta. The only non-stop option was an evening flight. Some Council Members were interested in the non-stop flight and some were interested in the early morning flight. Ms. Mayorga would work with Council Members directly and handle the final arrangements.

Council Member Newell asked for details regarding the NLC Congressional City Conference schedule. Mr. Tingey reported that the sessions begin at 9:00 a.m. on March 26, 2023, and end at 5:00 p.m. On March 27, 2023, the sessions end at 1:45 p.m. There would be some free time on Monday afternoon. On March 28, 2023, there would be meetings with delegation in the morning. That would be done by 10:30 a.m. At 11:00 a.m. there would be the Capitol Tour. Council Members would stay at the Marriott Courtyard, which is across from where the conference will be held.

Mr. Tingey reported that there were instances where the scheduled City Council Meeting dates may need to change. For instance, Election Day will be the same night as a scheduled City Council Meeting. The question was whether the Council wanted to meet that day or move the meeting. It was also possible to hold a shorter meeting on the scheduled date. A decision did not need to be made tonight but it was something to think about. Another meeting date that might need to shift was the March 7 meeting. Mayor Weichers explained that he would not be available on that date. That meeting could be moved to March 1, 2023 instead. Alternatively, Council Member Bracken could act as Mayor Pro Tempore. Council Member Bracken had concerns about moving the meeting date from a Tuesday. Changing the week might be better. Council Member Birrell suggested that the meeting take place on March 14. Mayor Weichers stated that he was unavailable on that date as well. Council Member Birrell, Council Member Petersen, and Council Member Newell believed they were available on March 1, 2023. Council Member Bracken offered to check his calendar. There would be some follow up about that date.

The list of City Council articles for the newsletter was reviewed. Mr. Tingey noted that there was some flexibility but the tentative schedule was written. The order was Mayor Weichers, Council Member Petersen, Council Member Bracken, Council Member Newell, Council Member Birrell, and Mr. Tingey. The 2023 schedule for articles would be shared with the Council.

5. Review of Five-Year Financial Projections and Capital Improvement Plan.

Mr. Tingey reported that each year, the Five-Year Financial Projections and Capital Improvement Plan is prepared and reviewed during the Retreat. He noted that one document shows the base projections and another showed projections with the Hillside Plaza purchase so there was a clear comparison. Finance and Administrative Services Director, Scott Jurges reported that the document with the Hillside Plaza projections was marked. Both documents were distributed.

Mr. Jurges asked that the Council review the base document, which did not include the Hillside Plaza purchase. He noted that the top row showed the actuals from the 2021/2022 budget year. It showed the beginning actual Fund Balance, the budgeted reviews, budgeted expenditures, transfers in and out, the budgeted ending Fund Balance, the variance to that number, and the ending Fund Balance. He reported that \$1.5 million in additional sales tax revenue came in, because the sales tax revenue had been budgeted lower. There was also \$500,000 in other tax revenues. Between those two items, \$2 million was added. There was also an under expend of \$950,000. There would always be between \$750,000 and \$800,000 of under expend. That ended up totaling approximately 3% in under expend. He explained that the City always need to under expend a little bit.

Typically, there were not significant variances with sales taxes between the budgeted amount and the actuals. Mr. Jurges reported that at the time the sales tax budget was set, there was some uncertainty due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Early on, it became clear that the sales tax numbers would be higher than anticipated and there would be a variance. Council Member Petersen wondered where the extra sales tax and under expend went. Mr. Jurges reported that the difference between the Fund Balance would be added back in, or taken away from fund balance, if the number was negative.

The numbers were reviewed for 2022/2023. Mr. Jurges noted that the City was halfway through the fiscal year. The document showed the beginning actual Fund Balance, the budgeted revenues, budgeted expenditures, transfers in and out, and the budgeted ending Fund Balance. He reported that there would be a revenue under expend. What was shown was the beginning budget. A budget adjustment was adopted on November 1, 2022, which had approximately \$500,000 of Fund Balance use. That was for items that were budgeted the prior year. Mayor Weichers asked if there was an assumed sales tax increase. Mr. Jurges explained that the sales tax was already built in and adopted in the revenue budget. If it came in higher, that would impact the ending Fund Balance. The City was doing well with sales tax for the year so far. The December numbers would be received in approximately three weeks, which was normally a larger amount.

Council Member Bracken noted that the 2021/2022 budget and projected sales tax numbers were heavily debated during the budget preparation cycle. Some believed it should be even and others believed it should be reduced. Part of that had to do with the unknowns related to the pandemic. He felt the City was back on track with sales tax projections. Mr. Jurges confirmed that the budget was normalizing. It was important to be cautious when it came to projections.

Council Member Petersen asked about online sales versus in person sales. Mr. Jurges explained that if something that was purchased in Cottonwood Heights and there was \$1 of sales tax, the City would receive 50 cents immediately. The other 50 cents went to the State and the State added it to their pool. A population share would be received in future. Currently, the City receives slightly more than that 50 cents from the State. This was because the population is higher than the relative sales tax base. Online sales were considered to be in Cottonwood Heights if the item was shipped to a point of delivery in the City. The full amount of sales tax was received for those online orders. Mr. Jurges reported that one-time transfers were removed because those transfers would not occur again. The 2023/2024 budget projection assumptions were reviewed.

Mr. Jurges stated that with property taxes, there is generally a bit of new growth. That happens when a basement is finished, there is an addition, or new homes are built. There were not a lot of new houses being built in Cottonwood Heights. As a result, there was approximately \$50,000 per year from new growth. It rarely went above \$100,000.

The Council Members discussed property taxes for both residential and commercial. There were certain variables. For instance, one house may have increased more in value than the average house in the City and that would result in an increased bill. Council Member Petersen had not heard of any residents who had a lower property tax bill in the current year than in the previous year. Mr. Jurges stated that the amount of property taxes the City receives stays the same. There

were other taxing entities to consider as well. In 2018, a property tax increase was done. It was noted that the City received approximately \$900,000 more as a result of that.

Mr. Jurges reported that the starting Fund Balance projection was \$8,098,205. The overall revenue changes were anticipated to be \$530,000. Annual sales tax revenue was shown as an increase of 8%. Mr. Jurges stated that there was a general mix between the Annual Class C Roads and Franchise Tax. There was a decrease in the revenue generated from the fee that was paid on vehicles when they are renewed. The reduction in grant revenues was \$2 million because of the end of the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds ("SLFRF"). The expenses and increases were reviewed. When the budget projections are done, there was not the full CPI for the year. He had put in a 7% cost-of-living adjustment ("COLA") but it ended at 6.5% for the CPI. The City generally tried to match CPI in the early projections. The merit was approximately \$205,000 and that was standard based on the structure of the compensation system. For health and dental, 5% was shown, which was approximately \$50,000. The net on employee compensation was \$973,000. That was not typical. The remaining years in the five-year financial projections showed a 2% COLA rather than 6.5%.

Mr. Jurges noted that elections were shown every other year in the five-year projections. There was \$45,000 added but it might be slightly more than that. For fire services, a holder of \$270,000 was shown. Last year, it was a \$268,000 increase. Though \$270,000 would likely be the highest amount, it could ultimately be as low as \$225,000. As for annual unidentified increases, \$200,000 was shown. The City was currently working with departments to determine whether there were areas that could be decreased. Mr. Jurges reported that \$50,000 was added for radios and there were various reductions in Public Works that were related to the Public Works Building. Those items might be delayed because the building may not be in place as soon as initially anticipated. Some one-time expenditures were also shown.

There were some changes in the debt service schedules. Mr. Jurges reported that the Public Works vehicle lease and Police vehicle lease increased \$187,000. There was \$124,000 shown in other debt service changes. The transfer to the Public Works Building was reduced as well as the Storm Water Funds for the Keswick Road project. The Cost of Living Allowance ("COLA") amount went down to 2% each year moving forward. Whatever the debt service schedule was would be matched to the debt service payments. For fire increases, there was 3.5%, which was a fairly average amount. Mr. Jurges noted that the document did not show Telecom Tax. There would be discussions about that during a later section of the City Council Retreat Meeting agenda. Mr. Jurges explained that if the City chose to charge a Telecom Tax, there would be between \$300,000 and \$350,000 in annual revenue. Townships and unincorporated areas were unable to charge for that tax.

Council Member Petersen asked about Google Fiber. He wondered if there was a benefit to the City if residents use the service. Mr. Tingey reported that the City would receive a small percentage of the hookups. There would be some benefit but it would likely not offset the costs of road maintenance. From a tax perspective, there would not be any money received. The money that would be received was based on the number of installations rather than on a monthly basis.

Mr. Jurges noted that the fund balance projections went down each year in the five-year financial projections. He explained that it is always that way because he wanted to be conservative with the projections. If the City received an additional \$500,000 in revenue each of those years, the need to do a tax increase could be delayed another year or two. Additionally, if grants are received for planned projects, that would delay the need to do a tax increase. In a general sense, the five-year plans always show that after five years, a tax increase would become necessary. However, he reiterated that this could be delayed to future years depending on what occurred.

Council Member Birrell wondered if the five-year financial projections took into consideration the bonding that the City would enter into. Mr. Jurges clarified that the base document did not take into account the Hillside Plaza but it did take into account the Public Works Building. The Hillside Plaza was part of the second document that had been distributed.

Mr. Jurges reviewed the second document, which included the Hillside Plaza. Generally speaking, the City needs to start making debt service payments one year out from financing. If it was financed in March 2023, then in March 2024, a payment would need to be made. In March of 2024, this document assumed that a payment would need to be made. It was listed as \$1.1 million, but there could be some variation there. As a result, the Fund Balance would be \$1.1 million less than what was shown in the base projection document. Mr. Jurges assumed the revenues for the plaza would offset any operating expenditures. If the City decides to sell it in the future, that would change the dynamic of the projections. There were a lot of variables, so the spreadsheet only stated that there would be \$1.1 million each year going out. The unknown factors were not considered.

Council Member Birrell asked if the numbers shown reflect the anticipated \$1 million grant for housing. Mr. Jurges explained that it would come in and offset the sale price. Mayor Weichers explained that the grant money could not be used for a debt service payment as it needs to reduce the price of the property. Council Member Petersen asked about restrictions on the grant money. Mr. Tingey explained that a housing element was needed for the grant. Mr. Jurges stated that once certain variables are known, it would be possible to structure the bond accordingly. If the City wants to refinance to be tax exempt or refinance to a lower rate, that could be done down the line. There were a lot of different options. The portion that was associated with the City Center could be tax exempt. If a portion was sold at a reduced price to incentivize a developer, that would have to stay on a taxable bond. It would all depend on what happens.

Mr. Jurges explained that the difference between the two documents that were distributed was that one had the \$1.1 million annual debt service payment. Council Member Birrell asked what the anticipated tax increase would be at the end of the five years. Mr. Jurges reported that a 1% increase resulted in approximately \$80,000 per year. The tax base brought in \$8 million. Those details were included at the bottom of the sheet that was distributed. Council Member Bracken pointed out that the last increase had been 13%. Mayor Weichers noted that at the end of the last budget year, he paid close attention to the tax rate for other cities. Cottonwood Heights has one of the lowest property tax rates in Salt Lake County. Sandy, Draper, and the City of Holladay also have low rates. There was discussion regarding different property tax rates and the variables.

Council Member Newell noted that there would be a five-year period where tax increases would not be considered. Mr. Jurges explained that there were a lot of different options. Some cities

wanted to do small tax increases every two or three years where others wanted to do slightly larger tax increases every five to 10 years. Cottonwood Heights did not do a tax increase for 12 years initially. It all depended on what approach the Council wanted to take. Mayor Weichers referenced the inflationary pressures that had occurred over the last year or so.

6. Transportation Master Plan Discussion.

Mr. Tingey reported that the City had been working with a consultant, Horrocks Engineering, to draft the Transportation Master Plan. There had also been discussions with the City Council in the Fall related to the Draft Plan. In January 2023, additional conversations took place. The Transportation Master Plan provided an existing conditions analysis, travel demand modeling, future conditions, and a Capital Facilities Plan. The main objectives were to provide safe and efficient traffic movement, improve active transportation, enhance neighborhood connectivity, and support regional coordination. Input was received from the Council on the Draft Plan. Staff was looking at incorporating that input and coming back with another draft. In addition, the population figures were being examined because there were some concerns related to that, as well as the road conditions that had a Level of Service (“LOS”) E or F. A new draft would be brought back to the City Council for consideration. Mr. Tingey asked for additional input before then.

Mayor Weichers noted that one of the City Council concerns had to do with the Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) projections for growth. He wondered how those figures would be further examined. It was noted that all of the information that went into those projections would be brought back. The estimates were not only related to population, but businesses in the City. The Transportation Analysis Zones (“TAZ”) were taken into account, including the flow from one TAZ to another. The projections were not just related to Cottonwood Heights homeowners or residents. It had to do with travel through the City, businesses, and residents. Cottonwood Heights could do its own population growth projections, but traffic models generally rely on more than just the number of residences or the population of a city. That was the reason the WFRC information was used. Mayor Weichers asked if the growth pattern for WFRC was by area. It was reiterated that WFRC had sections, or TAZ, throughout the metropolitan area. There was not information specific to Cottonwood Heights, but information specific to the different zones.

Council Member Bracken reported that one TAZ was Highland Drive East, which followed the City borders. The TAZ that was west of Highland Drive went into Midvale. It was possible to find that information online and review it further. Mr. Tingey noted that based on the input received, there needs to be some sort of clarification in the Transportation Master Plan. For instance, clarification about what is counted as part of the growth pattern. It was noted that the Draft Plan took into account The Gravel Pit. Some growth would need to be considered. It would include people who live in the City, travel through the City, and the different businesses. Day living needed to be taken into account as well as the residents. Council Member Bracken shared the WFRC website that contained the forecast map information. It was reviewed by those present. The forecast map showed projections from the current year to 2050.

Council Member Birrell noted that in 2045, the WFRC map showed that the south gravel pit area would shift from nine households to 1,026. The Council needed to consider whether higher-density was still desired in that area in the future. Mayor Weichers wondered if the data accounted

for what is already entitled in the north gravel pit area. Mr. Tingey explained that it is not currently. The year 2025 showed the households at eight. Council Member Birrell asked how many households the north gravel pit currently anticipated. It was reported that there would be between 325 to 425. There was discussion regarding the data and the projections shown. Council Member Bracken pointed out that the gravel pit area will result in the most significant change.

Council Member Birrell asked if the City wanted to focus on meaningful transit to alleviate the future traffic levels. She noted that it was not in the Utah Transit Authority's ("UTA") plan to do anything meaningful within their region. She wanted to know if the Council was interested in prioritizing transit discussions to prevent heightened vehicular traffic. She urged the Council to contemplate what was needed in the future. Mr. Tingey believed the concern was that over time, in the next 30 years, there might be failing LOS ratings. It was important to look into possible transit opportunities to address that. Council Member Birrell felt there was already a need for better transit. Current issues would only become worse over time if nothing was done. Mr. Tingey noted that regional coordination was one of the objectives in the Transportation Master Plan. Council member Birrell conveyed the desire to have more detail about how the City could advocate for that.

The Council discussed transportation needs in the City. Council Member Birrell pointed out that Cottonwood Heights paid into a tax to support UTA, but very little was received. She noted that Draper also received very little. An analysis was done that showed that Herriman, Bluffdale, and Riverton do not have a single bus stop but pay a rate of taxation to UTA. It was important to look into what is equitable and what is needed. Cottonwood Heights paid into UTA through taxation and if UTA is not able to provide the needed services, then either a lower tax should be paid into UTA so the money can be applied in a way that brought transit relief to the community. Mayor Weichers believed some good points had been raised. Cottonwood Heights participated in the UTA taxation and received very little. It was important to determine how the City could advocate for better transit and also encourage transit ridership. Mr. Tingey noted that the Transportation Master Plan needed to balance the current issues and needs as well as the future needs. If the City was not receiving adequate transit services, that needed to be an objective in the plan. There should be some long-term strategies included.

Council Member Newell pointed out that if there was not enough ridership, UTA will be unlikely to increase transit service. There needs to be a cultural shift that encourages more transit use. Council Member Birrell explained that Cottonwood Heights has never had viable transit opportunities. There was an east-west route that took residents to the TRAX line, and there was Highland Drive, which did not move residents into the work centers. There are a lot of residents who want to use transit but the limited options make it difficult and triples the overall travel time. It is unfair for UTA to state that Cottonwood Heights does not have the ridership when inadequate options have been offered. Mayor Weichers wondered if the Council could reach a consensus about specific routes to advocate for. Council Member Birrell stated that she tried to obtain travel data from WFRC and UTA. She was promised the data but it was never produced.

Mr. Tingey reported that the Transportation Master Plan would come back with clarifications about the population data. Additionally, some suggestions from Council Member Birrell would be incorporated. Including safety as a stronger theme and include safe systems (SS4A) for all

information. An element of advocacy for transit could also be added. All of those would be in the next Draft Plan and brought back to the City Council for consideration. A separate issue would be to look at the data on transit routes and work with WFRC and UTA.

Council Member Birrell asked if her fellow Council Members supported her position that safety should be the overarching message in the Transportation Master Plan. Currently, the Transportation Master Plan prioritizes the LOS for motorists. She wondered if other Council Members want to see safety prioritized throughout the language. Council Member Bracken stated that safety is paramount but believed the current plan addresses safety. Council Member Birrell noted that safety for all users is essential. She reported that there is new funding coming out of WFRC for cities that built a Safety Action Plan. Safe Streets and Roads For All (“SS4A”) was referenced. Safety was something Staff could incorporate into the Transportation Master Plan. Mayor Weichers noted that safety is currently an important component of the Transportation Master Plan. However, Council Member Birrell was asking if there was support to make that a central component instead of a pillar as it was currently. Mr. Tingey reported that the safety component of the plan could be strengthened further.

Council Member Birrell emphasized the importance of safety for all. All of the roadways in Cottonwood Heights have human powered users, which includes pedestrians and bicyclists. If the City was willing to incorporate a Safety Action Plan related to SS4A, it would be possible to receive additional funds. She noted that residents informed the City that there was interest in transportation alternatives and reduced traffic. There was also a desire to feel safe moving through Cottonwood Heights. She hoped the Council would elevate safety within the plan. Council Member Petersen agreed that safety was important but was not sure how to prioritize it further. Mayor Weichers pointed out that there was more data now than in the past. It was a good idea to look through the Transportation Master Plan and make sure safety is considered throughout.

Mr. Tingey reiterated what would be done on the draft moving forward. He also noted that there was a desire to focus on all user groups. Council Member Birrell explained that to be eligible for the funds that become available through the SS4A program, the City needs to have a Safety Action Plan in place. Public Works Director, Matt Shipp reported that SS4A is going through WFRC. He serves on the Committee that developed the scope of work to send out for consultants. That scope of work was for all of the Wasatch metropolitan area. The money was not available to anyone unless a Safety Action Plan is in place. It was decided that WFRC would be the lead and they would bring in the municipalities and develop a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) for a consultant to come in. Once that is approved, applications could be submitted.

Cottonwood Heights did not need to do anything individually, although it was noted that some cities opted to do that on their own plan, such as Provo. Once there is approval, it would be possible for Cottonwood Heights to apply for the funds. Mr. Shipp explained that WFRC sent in an application for funding for a consultant. WFRC was waiting to hear if there was approval there. Mr. Shipp would be part of the group that will choose the consultant and that consultant would meet with all of the cities. It is a long process but if funding is received, it would move forward. It was not possible to apply for the money until there was an approved plan.

Council Member Birrell was not certain it made sense to finalize the Transportation Master Plan without a Safety Action Plan in place. She asked when the City will work on a Safety Action Plan. Mr. Shipp explained that the City is involved in the development of a plan. The plan would be fairly general. Down the line, it would be possible to start focusing on the specifics, such as trails and sidewalks. The Transportation Master Plan was still needed. He believed the plan took different user groups into account. Mr. Shipp was not sure it made sense to wait. Council Member Birrell pointed out that Provo has been proactive and made their own Safety Action Plan. She was not suggesting that the Transportation Master Plan be delayed but wanted to know if it would be possible to create a Cottonwood Heights Safety Action Plan and include it as a chapter in the Transportation Master Plan. It did not need to be separate. It was determined that Messrs. Tingey and Shipp would meet and discuss the matter further.

Lunch Break

7. Strategic Initiative Discussion – 2023.

Mr. Tingey reviewed the 2023 Strategic Initiative agenda and stated that the priorities will be reviewed and may require a consensus of three Council Members to move forward. He clarified that moving an item forward does not necessarily guarantee that it will be included in the Budget.

The five elements related to revenue options were presented. Cottonwood Heights and Millcreek City are the only two Salt Lake County cities that have not implemented the Telecom Franchise Tax. If incorporated, the tax would provide revenue of \$300,000 to \$350,000 per year. Implementation would require a lead time of several months. Mr. Tingey confirmed that it is their intent to pursue as many grants as possible. Everything from Public Safety grants to the Wasatch Front and Zoo, Arts and Parks (“ZAP”) will be evaluated and ideas will be brought to the Council prior to moving forward.

Tax increase alternatives were described. Mr. Tingey stated that needs have been reviewed and Staff will continue to work toward obtaining State Legislative Road funds, a Quarter of the Quarter funds, as well as other opportunities. Mr. Tingey reported that there is an option to create a Special Fire Service District area. Items pertaining to the New District to consider would include the following:

- A separate tax rate that would cover all fire-related costs;
- The City tax rate would cover non-fire-related costs;
- The additional cost of managing two separate funds;
- Fire increases would be covered within the Fire District rate;
- Need for adjustment through a Truth and Taxation process;
- Sales tax revenue would not be directly available to the Fire District unless there is a direct transfer from the General Fund of sales tax revenues;
- The City would benefit from access to the full sales tax revenue increases to fund needed expenses with the only way to gain access through a transfer from the General Fund; and

- The District would be required to advertise a 100% tax increase the first year that may coincide with the City's corresponding tax increase. It would reduce the General Fund by the same amount that would be put into the Fire Services District.

Mayor Weichers reported that the yearly contribution to Unified Fire Authority ("UFA") is \$4 million with an average increase of \$250,000. Because these increases are covered with monies from the General Fund, such a large increase would necessitate raising the property tax rate. If a Special Fire District Tax is created, it would be completely separate from the General Fund with an adjustable yearly rate.

Mr. Juges reported that the general public is often more agreeable to increases that go toward a specific service as opposed to general items. Due to advertising requirements, the percentage must be declared. He reported that it would be a 100% increase in the creation of the district but a reduction to the City's rate. Mayor Weichers recommended reviewing the issue in one year's time rather than raising the City's present rate to create a district. Various scenarios were discussed.

Council Member Bracken considered the increase to be minor and stated that there are items to be discussed that could be put to good use. He remarked that relying too heavily on a single source can be complex. Mayor Weichers commented that his consideration was increased largely due to the inflationary pressures the City is facing.

Council Member Birrell was of the opinion that most accumulative taxes are unavoidable. She was concerned with the elderly residents in her district and had mixed feelings about an increase.

Council Member Petersen remarked that the City is not immune to inflation and felt that the proposed increase is minimal. A tax increase is imminent and as a Council, they are tasked with finding the best way to move forward.

The Base Funding program was discussed. Mr. Tingey stated that the City budgeted \$2.8 million for the Five-Year Road Plan. The Public Works Department has not transitioned from the paving portion to the rebuild side, which often comes at a higher cost. Mayor Weichers noted that road infrastructure is as important as any work they consider in the City. He stated that the City looks critically at the issues and determines the immediate needs.

Mr. Shipp presented the Base Funding Proposal and stated that the area reconstruction of Prospector, Grandeur, and Town Drives were skipped in the last Five-Year Plan. In the previous plan, chip seal, slurry seal, and crack seal were the primary focus where many roads were skipped as they were too far gone for regular maintenance. The plan being presented is Year One of the Five-Year Plan where the focus has shifted to roads that are in need of heavy repair and reconstruction while still performing yearly maintenance of main arterial roads. A road map was displayed. Mr. Shipp confirmed that the budgeted projections total \$2.75 million with an additional request for \$400,000 for maintenance of roads not requiring reconstruction. Bengal Boulevard maintenance was considered.

Council Member Birrell stated that residents have expressed frustration with chip seal maintenance along main roads as it creates difficulty for bicyclists. She asked if there is a different option that

would provide a safer experience. She preferred to see residents to the north, south, and east side of Bengal Boulevard be serviced by safer routes for cycling and pedestrians. Mr. Shipp pointed out there is a bike lane along Bengal Boulevard, however it is not separated. The issue was permitted parking along one side. Neighborhood bypass routes were discussed.

Mr. Tingey stated that reconstruction and maintenance issues will be discussed further at the next City Council Meeting and looked at as a core funding element. Prioritization will be considered. The Valley Emergency Communications Center (“VECC”) fee increase was next discussed. Mr. Tingey reported that he met with Police Chief, Robby Russo and believed there is a chance there will not be an increase this year. The Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) contract increase will be \$225,000 to \$275,000. The increase will eventually be incorporated into the core budget.

Mr. Tingey next reviewed staff compensation and merit increases. He explained that staff has included the Cost-of-Living Allowance (“COLA”), the 6.5 Consumer Price Index (“CPI”), and merit increases for the current year. This will serve as a benchmark when reviewing other communities. He asked for direction as the budget is prepared.

Staff reviewed the following items not included in the funding priorities:

- The waterway reconstruction item will be incorporated into the budget proposal as part of the storm water budget.
- The Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) Replacement Program will add enhancements to the City’s ADA ramps. Funding requires immediate access as needs must be filled once a request has been received and will be included in the budget.
- The City will provide the addition of 10 speed radar signs at a total cost of \$25,000. Council Member Bracken conveyed data based on multiple studies that radar signs are the most effective method of traffic calming over a long period of time. He felt that the accessibility of the data they provide was beneficial. Council Member Birrell commented that they are a band-aid rather than a long-term solution and expressed opposition. The item was to move forward for budget review.
- The City Hall Plaza improvements will include a stage or platform and electricity for events with an estimated cost of \$50,000. An aerial image was displayed. Mayor Weichers felt that the improvements were not a priority and suggested it be postponed until a later date. Council Member Newell recommended that events be held in the City Hall parking lot to allow the City to gauge interest.

Mr. Tingey next discussed building maintenance and custodial needs. He stated there is no employee on staff to provide building maintenance, custodial, lawn care maintenance, and snow removal. Staff has proposed hiring an individual to fill the needs at a cost of \$70,000. All items are currently outsourced at a cost of \$50,000 to \$76,000 based on snow removal needs. He explained that the challenge will be finding an individual who has the skill set to meet the requirements.

Council Member Bracken asked if hiring two additional Public Works employees would be adequate. Startup costs were described. Mr. Tingey reported that hiring a Facilities Manager

would allow them to eliminate a portion of janitorial work at City Hall. It was the consensus of the Council to continue the discussion. If determined to be workable, it will be proposed in the budget.

Staffing in the Engineering Department was next discussed. Mr. Tingey shared Staff's concerns with the number of items moving forward. The various projects include stormwater, daily engineering work, development reviews, grant writing, tracking, applications, project oversight, and work involved in a recent State Audit. It was Staff's intent to propose positions for staff engineering, inspections, and proposals for budget evaluation. Mr. Shipp noted that three Public Works Operations Specialists have been hired with a pay range of \$20.00 to \$25.00/hour. Their duties include overseeing snow removal, storm drain, pothole repair, street repairs, right-of-way, and sidewalks.

Mr. Johnson reported that the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee ("PTOS") provided a list of priorities and recommendations to the City Council. Their list was comprised of 20 projects and later reduced to three.

The East Jordan Canal Trail was constructed along the back side of Mountain View Park. The plan reflects the future trail continuing all along the corridor. The challenge is with the canal opening up to a public waterway with Salt Lake City Public Utilities having jurisdiction. PTOS recommended that Cottonwood Heights initiate negotiations with Salt Lake City in an effort to extend the trail to the east and north potentially creating a connection to Highland Drive. Mr. Johnson reported that Cottonwood Heights will be part of a grant received by the City of Holladay for the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") to conduct a Feasibility Study for an I-215 Corridor Trail Study. Council Member Birrell questioned whether the use of an existing utility bridge may be designated for safe bike passage. Council was supportive of exploring the feasibility of this trail connection and working with Salt Lake City Public Utilities.

The Bonneville Shoreline Trailhead is a 26-acre open space that has been identified as a secondary level amenity for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail with limited parking. The City also envisions a shared use path along the parcel, constructed by UDOT who has proposed as part of its Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") plan connecting Big and Little Cottonwood Canyon with a shared-use path. He stressed the importance of including the trail in a Concept Master Plan to receive funding from the State. Council Member Birrell preferred a trolley system and was opposed to any additional parking lots in the foothills of District 4. It was the consensus of the Council to create a Concept Master Plan for the site and explore future opportunities.

Campaigns were reviewed. The Council recommended pursuing this issue bringing it back to the City Council at a future date.

Mayor Weichers was in favor of including the Active Transportation and Neighborhood Bypass Routes System. Council Member Bracken stated that a budgeted amount could be designated to active transportation that may be utilized as projects arise. Improvements to designated safe routes were described.

The Sustainability Master Plan was next discussed. Mr. Tingey reported that a number of recommendations may be pursued. Projects included the following:

- Protect and enhance the Tree Canopy Project;
- Making progress on sustainable City landscaping;
- Progress on water conservation initiatives;
- Pursuit of the rain barrel program or other programs for residents; and
- Assist Electric Vehicle (“EV”) adoption through City requirements and initiatives.

Mr. Tingey recommended narrowing the list down while compiling input received and return to a Work Session with Staff recommendations. This would allow for additional time to discuss concerns.

The Community Room Floor Replacement was discussed. Mr. Tingey stated that the Community Room floor is carpeted and requires constant upkeep and cleaning, particularly after an event. Laminate vinyl flooring was recommended at a cost of \$17,000. It would allow for easy upkeep and mopping as opposed to the expense of carpet cleaning. Council Member Birrell expressed concern with the removal of carpet and the negative acoustical effect of a meeting room. She was opposed to the replacement. Acoustical concerns were discussed, and this item was not designated to move forward.

The Veterans Memorial Project was being pursued by the Historic Committee. It was their desire to pursue fundraising rather than going with the Gold Star model. They are interested in a more City-driven option that may be designed to the City’s needs. Mayor Weichers reported that the Gold Star Program focuses specifically on those who have lost loved ones in conflicts. Because the Gold Star Program is nationwide, specific requirements must be met. Funding needs were described. Staff confirmed that the project will honor law enforcement, armed forces, and firefighters who reside in Cottonwood Heights at an anticipated cost of \$40,000. The way be a need for the city to match fundraising efforts. More detail will be provided after fundraising efforts from the Historic Committee.

Prioritization of Canyon Centre Park was next discussed. Mr. Tingey provided a property rendering and stated that there are dedicated funds through Tax Increment Financing (“TIF”) to develop a public park as part of the project. Approximately \$150,000 is collected with an additional \$150,000 next year for a total of \$300,000. Residents have communicated their desire to pursue the park as early as possible. He reported that the Development Agreement states that it may not be pursued until the early spring of 2024 as it will be a staging area for development of the rest of the project. Construction of the parking structure to a certain point is required for the Canyon Centre Park to commence. Staff confirmed that a portion of existing funds may be used to initiate the design phase and receive input prior to the time of construction.

Council Member Bracken supported the initial design but commented that the funding received for the park is not at the same rate as the other tax increment through the project. It is specifically designed for the first five years of the tax increment. Staff confirmed that they will remind the developer of the timeline agreement. Parking limitations were described.

Mr. Tingey presented the proposal for a fourth firefighter and reported that Station 116 has not employed a fourth firefighter in over five years. The estimated cost to the City would be \$375,000 or a 4.5% annual increase. Mayor Weichers believed this will have a dramatic impact on the General Fund and suggested there be additional discussion next year.

The City Council took a short break.

Mr. Tingey reviewed Legislative Policy Options, some of which were continuations from the previous year. Staff had been working on Chapter 14 Highway Sidewalks and Public Spaces, Business Licenses, storm drains, and flood control development, all of which they plan to bring to the City Council. The Ordinance modifying Chapter 14 requires the City to maintain private access easements that are used for private purposes. Mr. Tingey reported that there are six properties in the City under these circumstances. They include an area near Milne Lane, Timberline Drive, two separate areas along Siesta Drive, Wasatch Boulevard, and 3500 East. Some of the properties are private-drive access easements to residential properties that have been maintained for decades by the homeowners that own the benefited properties. It was noted that in addition to the adoption of Chapter 14, anything related to private drives is required to be brought up to Code prior to the City considering any type of maintenance. Property renderings were displayed. Mr. Tingey reported that Staff would need to make modifications to the section on private road and access easements and any residents who live on a private lane have the ability to petition the City to take it over but it must be built to City standards.

Mayor Weichers and Council Members Petersen and Birrell agreed to conduct additional research and have further discussion at a future Work Session. Council Members Bracken and Newell were opposed to the request.

The Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan Initiative research was next discussed. Council Member Birrell presented an overview of the 2019 Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan and stated that there is an issue with the Bengal Boulevard and Golden Hills Corridors referred within certain sections within the plan. The Master Plan reflects two lanes in either direction similar to the UDOT EIS and their preference for a five-lane road design. UDOT's plan includes consideration of a flex shoulder to better move peak time traffic. Wasatch Boulevard to the south of Bengal Boulevard will be open to all vehicles during peak periods. Council Member Birrell believed that the language in the City's plan also allows UDOT to phase in a two-lane imbalance and potentially turn it into two private vehicular lanes. She proposed an Executive Summary be prepared that clearly states the intent for the corridor that does not include the two vehicular lanes going north and south.

Council Member Newell was in favor of speed reduction and emphasized that when considering Wasatch Boulevard is a state road, as a City, they have limited power. There was considerable discussion about what would be reviewed and there were statements that a minor change could be initiated but not an overall review of the plan. Mr. Tingey confirmed that the minor modification of this point will be reviewed and brought back through an approval process through the planning commission and consideration by city council.

Mr. Tingey next reviewed traffic calming and the Sidewalk Study Project. The project will create a traffic calming program and focus on various traffic-calming types while identifying needs within the City. The City Council will review the project, provide direction, and return to the Planning Commission with an adopted plan. It will provide a tool to budget and prioritize. Council Member Birrell recommended this item be integrated with the focus on neighborhood bypass routes. She urged that a comprehensive view be taken that enhances both traffic calming and walkability and be citizen driven. She was not opposed to utilizing a Consultant but preferred a select group of citizens be brought in to provide input and pass on the information. Council Member Bracken commented that if at some point this item is citizen-driven there must be a reason stating why it makes sense. Mr. Tingey reported that the proposal was not anticipated to include the creation of a committee for the development of a plan. As stated in a prior discussion, the intent was to bring in a Consultant to conduct the evaluation and present it to the council. It was the consensus of the council to continue to focus on active transportation and address the traffic calming and Sidewalk Study at a later date.

Community Reinvestment Areas (“CRA”) were next discussed. Mr. Tingey reported that the adoption of 2300 East and Fort Union Boulevard has been completed. With regard to the pursuit of TIF, he recommended seeking Interlocal Agreements with taxing entities after having an approved design and implementing a Concept Plan. Staff proposed that this item be postponed until a more detailed development plan can be presented. The council agreed with this recommendation.

Mr. Tingey next presented the Economic Development Research proposal and reported that a portion of the work being done with the General Plan involves evaluating current office space occupancy. Mr. Johnson stated that data representing occupancy rates and the square footage of Class A office space is available.

Council Member Birrell remarked that her intent was not only to examine offices within the City, but to explore space related to Class A and B office space parking stall usage. It was her opinion that this will be associated with the General Plan and the City’s intent with the gravel pit area. She asked if either the Form-Based Code or underutilization of Class A and B office space would be considered and the necessary parking ratio evaluated. She commented that an audit does not equal new policy but would provide clarity when being written. Mr. Johnson explained that when planning applications, very rarely the city’s parking requirements require more parking than developer wants. As an example, if the City requires four stalls per 1,000 square feet, the developer will most often consider six stalls to attract larger leasing tenants. Mixed-use parking was described. Council Member Petersen referenced the lack of parking at the Canyon Center along Racquet Club Drive that resulted in parking on the streets. The item was moved forward for additional discussion, with consensus for staff to collect some information about occupancy and tenant parking demands.

Mr. Tingey next presented the SR-210 Fort Union High-T intersection. Council Member Birrell wanted to work with the UDOT Region 2 Director to look at how the Bengal Boulevard and Golden Hills Corridor may be better understood by motorists. This is a heavily bicycled area and she felt that effort should be made to discuss how UDOT might be willing to work together to

improve danger zones. Mr. Tingey indicated a meeting could be coordinated to discuss this item with Region 2 Director.

The Council next discussed the Hillside Plaza and Big Cottonwood Canyon Gravel Pit research and envisioning associated land use zoning codes and revamping existing policies. Mr. Tingey reported that this item will be pursued with the Hillside Plaza as part of the General Plan and rezoning process. Mr. Johnson reported that the City submitted a grant application for a Master Plan of the Hillside Plaza. Understanding the direction of the Council regarding the urban core was requested. Mayor Weichers referenced the southern portion of the gravel pit and believed that high density makes sense as it will not have a negative impact on surrounding neighborhoods.

Council Member Petersen felt that the gravel pit location would be ideal for construction of a high-density community. It was noted there are at least 10 miles of green space adjacent to the property. It was Council Member Birrell's opinion that a portion of the property could provide a spectacular experience that will draw people to Cottonwood Heights while increasing business at restaurants and shops, but that she is concerned and opposed to high-density development at the site due to geologic hazards.

The Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan was addressed. Mr. Tingey reported that the General Plan and the direction of the zoning elements of the plan will cover shared issues. Policies and envisioning the associated land use will be addressed. The plan will then follow up with a rezone or zoning ordinance that will adopt different elements when addressing policies. He noted that this item will move forward.

Commented [SB1]: What is this? The Wasatch Blvd Master Plan? or something else? - needs to be clarified

Mr. Tingey reviewed the water system discussion and suggested that Salt Lake City Public Utilities Staff representatives be invited to attend at an upcoming Work Session.

The Council supported continuing a ZAP discussion with Ben Hill at a future work session.

8. **Adjourn.**

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council Retreat adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Cottonwood Heights City Council Retreat held Tuesday, January 31, 2023.

Paula Melgar

City Recorder

Minutes Approved: April 4, 2023.