

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-WORK SESSION
ANCHOR LOCATION: CITY HALL
10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
NOVEMBER 15, 2022

FINAL

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 6:02 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Lisa Watts Baskin
Councilmember Natalie Gordon
Councilmember Ted Knowlton
Councilmember Stan Porter
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; Karyn Baxter, City Engineer; David Frandsen, Assistant City Manager; Jon Rueckert, Assistant Public Works Director; Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Wendy Page, City Recorder; Mackenzie Johnson, Planner.

OTHERS PRESENT: Brandon Weston, Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT); Katie Williams, Horrocks Engineering.

1. PRESENTATION FROM UDOT REGARDING THE I-15 ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT STUDY: FARMINGTON TO SALT LAKE CITY-
ALTERNATIVES PHASE

Brandon Weston, UDOT, presented information about the I-15 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed I-15 expansion project which includes the area from Farmington to Salt Lake City. He mentioned the environmental study timeline included a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) overview and early scoping, purpose and needs analysis, alternatives development, draft EIS preparation, release of draft EIS, preparation of final EIS, release of final EIS and record of decision, and recommended funding, planning and construction. He said currently the project was at the alternatives development phase. Mr. Weston indicated this phase includes developing screening criteria and preliminary alternatives along with public engagement and public outreach with a 30 day comment period. He reported there is an emphasis on quality of life framework with better mobility, good health, connected communities, and a strong economy. A map of the proposed study area was shown. He stated suggestions for public comments included a focus on the alternative that offered improved safety, better connected communities, strength to the economy, and improved mobility for all users. He explained the open houses are being held November 14th via a virtual meeting, November 15th at Rose Park

Elementary in Salt Lake, and November 16th at the South Davis Recreation Center. The public comment period is from November 10th to December 16th 2022.

Mr. Weston demonstrated the interactive map of the study area and the location of proposed walking and biking improvements along with a detailed Alternatives Overview of each geographic area is available online. He shared images of the I-15 mainline alternatives and a map of proposed reversible HOV lanes. He explained the reversible lanes would be southbound in the morning and northbound in the evening and would be barrier separated with access only at the endpoints. He highlighted a comparison of two options for both the four hour peak period average travel times and the speed for the mainline alternatives from 2019 compared to 2050.

Councilmember Porter asked about a potential Center Street connection with an on-ramp to I-215, an off-ramp from I-15 and a connection to Highway 89. He asked if this would be an item for public comment. Brandon Weston confirmed and stated that comments posted on the interactive map would help UDOT and the study team understand the needs and desires of the community.

Ken Leetham stated that staff would share the link to the interactive map for the project with the Council. He suggested the City prepare its position for review by the City Council. Mr. Leetham said a proposal was made to the Mayor that the five cities of South Davis County work together on mutually supportive comments during this public comment period.

Councilmember Porter inquired regarding the route that would allow freeway access from Highway 89 and access to the west side of town as an alternative to Center Street. He felt this will allow residents to avoid the train issues. He expressed his opinion that this could eliminate the Center Street off-ramp. Ken Leetham commented that per the alternative plan the Center Street off-ramp was proposed for removal.

Mayor Horrocks asked about accessing Legacy Highway northbound when traveling north on I-15. Brandon Weston replied that this project would not include a northbound on-ramp to Legacy Highway from I-215, although it is included in long range regional plans.

Councilmember Porter said that previously the plan was to have access to Legacy as an alternate route if I-15 was blocked. Mr. Weston replied that this was outside the scope of this project. Katie Williams, Horrocks Engineering, explained that there was a proposed flyover ramp from northbound I-15 to I-215, which is not warranted at this time, but was in the plan for a future project and that design allowed sufficient room for that option when traffic warranted the construction. It was explained that the proposed new interchange on I-15 at Highway 89 would allow cars to exit I-15 and head west to a new entrance to I-215 however.

Mayor Horrocks mentioned a study that triple the number of cars could utilize I-15 with the use of autonomous vehicles. Councilmember Knowlton replied the separated high-occupancy vehicle

(HOV) lanes could accommodate technological shifts and mentioned the flexibility of the reversible lanes.

Councilmember Porter mentioned a UDOT presentation related to the use of passenger drones as early as 2025. Brandon Weston replied there were no provisions for passenger drones in the plan at this time.

Mayor Horrocks suggested UDOT consider adding an exit off of Legacy Highway for 1100 North.

Councilmember Van Langeveld commented on the Highway 89 corridor and said the plan proposed three traffic lights within a half mile of each other. She suggested alternative routes or a bridge to avoid issues during peak traffic.

Councilmember Knowlton said it appeared UDOT had incorporated the comments into this plan that were made during the workshops related to pedestrian and bicycle safety. Brandon Weston replied the comments made in the Smart Growth Workshops had influenced the outcome and were very helpful in the process of designing the two alternative scenarios.

2. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

The City Council minutes of November 1, 2022 were reviewed and approved.

Councilmember Baskin moved that the City Council approve the minutes of November 1, 2022 as amended. Councilmember Porter seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Council Members Baskin, Gordon, Porter, and Van Langeveld. Councilmember Knowlton abstained from voting.

3. ACTION ITEMS

The action items list was reviewed. Completed items were removed from the list.

Mayor Horrocks asked for an update on the golf course. Ken Leetham replied the potential open house dates were in January and April. He invited the City Council to tour the facility.

Councilmember Baskin said the Golf Committee would be meeting tomorrow, November 16th, and she could provide an emailed report to the Council.

Councilmember Porter asked about the item related to requiring Lakeview Rock Products to meet all SWPPP regulations. Ken Leetham responded the City had regular inspections and contact with them and staff would continue to follow through in ensuring that Lakeview water the road to keep the dust down.

Councilmember Gordon asked about the dog park action item. Ken Leetham suggested a work session for staff to present several options.

Councilmember Baskin mentioned issues at Hatch Park relating to maintenance and tripping hazards along the trail, as well as overgrown vegetation and weeds along the sidewalks on Lacey Way that needed to be cleared out.

4. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Knowlton reported on a workshop for the South Davis Regional Transportation Plan. He said the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) Regional Transportation Plan would be a great place to explore the earlier questions related to the connection to Legacy Highway. He would follow-up with the details of what was in or not in the plan related to the Highway. The bicycle connections between the City and Salt Lake City would be substantially improved and create an ample and safe connection between the two counties and the viability of bicycling in the City.

Councilmember Baskin reported on the Senior Lunch Bunch meeting which included obtaining feedback on the needs from the seniors. This list was given to the Health and Wellness Committee for review. She spoke on the Golf Committee and the new golf simulator.

Councilmember Porter reported on the Jordan River Commission fundraising event at the Zions Technology Center along the Jordan River in Midvale. He explained the campus was sustainably built and included solar panels and other substantial energy efficiencies.

Councilmember Gordon reported on an expansion at Safe Harbor Crisis Center. She asked if staff could invite a representative from Safe Harbor to talk about the expansion and their needs. Councilmember Gordon spoke on a subscription recycling service, Recyclops, that collected items like lightbulbs, Styrofoam, plastic film, and glass.

Councilmember Van Langeveld reported on the Youth City Council along with the Foxboro Elementary student council volunteering at the Bountiful mobile food pantry. She also reported on the Health and Wellness Committee meeting and their priorities for next year including collaborating with the Senior Lunch Bunch. She mentioned one of the goals included offering a wellbeing survey through Utah State University that asked residents questions related to mental health, environment, cultural opportunities, etc. Councilmember Van Langeveld reported that she had invited the winners, from Foxboro and Orchard Elementaries, of a Martin Luther King speech contest to present their speeches to the Council.

5. CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Todd Godfrey had nothing to report.

6. MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Horrocks reported that John Davies from the Sewer District Board had passed away. He then mentioned that he had received a call from a citizen about recycling cans after a wind event and asked staff to work with ACE on ways to weigh the recycling cans down.

Mayor Horrocks spoke on a company in the City, OxEon Energy, LLC, that provided rocket fuel to NASA and mentioned that they would be applying for money from Davis Funds.

7. ADJOURN

Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 6:56 p.m. to begin the regular session.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-REGULAR SESSION
ANCHOR LOCATION: CITY HALL
10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
NOVEMBER 15, 2022

FINAL

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 7:05 p.m. Alisa Van Langeveld offered the thought and Peyton Otis led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Lisa Watts Baskin
Councilmember Natalie Gordon
Councilmember Ted Knowlton
Councilmember Stan Porter
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; Karyn Baxter, City Engineer; David Frandsen, Assistant City Manager; Jon Rueckert, Public Works Director; Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Wendy Page, City Recorder; Mackenzie Johnson, Planner.

OTHERS PRESENT: Joel Powell, Dee Lalliss, Brandon Tucker, Jo Ellen Ashworth, Ryan Holbrook, Jeff Scroger, Cindy Powell, Greg Stewart, Peyton Otis, Andrew Kiruto, Len Arave, Mary Kay Porter, Brynne Burgess, Claire Plowman, Ainsley Reese, BreAnna Larson, Brandi Wendel, Jared Wendel, Mark Angell, Kirk Stratton, Mashelle Boswell, Melanie Galbraith, Roy Galbraith, Michelle Fairbanks, Katherine Baird, Joe Escobar, Chris Moss, Elaine Moss, Tim Brown, T. Brown, Diane DeLuca, Richard Herron, David Herron, Janice Twede, Duane Sjoberg, Sondra Sjoberg, Nicholas Nelson, Steve Beazer, Renae Beazer, Jeremy Bingham, Thomas Call, Katy Bingham, E. McBride, Leta McBride, Frank Coon, Annalisa Hamblin, Patricia Nageli, Jonathan Marsh, Benjamin Ambler. Via Zoom: Angie Dives, Brett, Caryn Larrinaga, CF, Conrad Jacobson, Coombs, Hamblin JV, Hyrum Kruger, Jane, Janene, Jennifer Graves, Jim Brown, Lela C., Paul, Paul Freeman, Peter, Stacey, Steven Deepe, Tonya Passey, Shay Larsen.

1. CITIZEN COMMENT

There were no citizen comments.

2. PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF THE VAL VERDA AREA, ALSO KNOWN AS AREA B OR THE CITY'S ANNEXATION POLICY PLAN AND EXPANSION AREA MAP, LOCATED APPROXIMATELY BETWEEN

3500 SOUTH AND 4100 SOUTH AND BETWEEN HIGHWAY 89 AND ORCHARD
DRIVE IN UNINCORPORATED DAVIS COUNTY

Sherrie Pace presented a brief overview of the proposed annexation area, commonly known as the Val Verda area located approximately between 3500 South and 4100 South and between Highway 89 and Orchard Drive in Unincorporated Davis County. She reported the Davis County General Plan, adopted in 2006, encouraged annexation of the Val Verda area into the City. She read a formal statement from the Bountiful City Mayor and City Council which indicated Bountiful City did not have an active annexation plan (which is required by State law to annex) and did not intend to consider any further expansion. The statement also expressed support of Davis County and North Salt Lake to reconsider how services are provided to residents in the Val Verda area.

Sherrie Pace reported the proposed annexation area was 113 acres including 12.39 acres of institutional use (churches & schools), 17 acres of right of way (roads), 83.89 acres of 295 private properties consisting of 349 dwelling units including 62 multifamily units, 38 duplex/ADU, and 247 single family homes, as well as two vacant remnant parcels, and nine commercial properties. She described the annexation process and timeline including a public hearing and recommendations by Davis County on September 27, 2022 followed by a Resolution of intent to annex by the City Council on October 4th, a public open house at Adelaide Elementary on October 5th, public hearing notices mailed to property owners and residences on October 13th, a Planning Commission work session to discuss possible zoning on October 25th, a public comment period from October 13th to November 15th, and the City Council public hearing and consideration of Ordinance 2022-09 on November 15th. Ms. Pace said the following information was received using the comment form on the City's website including thirteen individuals in opposition, six individuals in support of the annexation, and one undecided. She noted comments were also received by City staff in the form of two letters in opposition, one email in favor, and various questions. She acknowledged on November 9th the City received a protest that was filed by the property owners in the area. All public comments, including the written protest, were previously provided to the City Council.

Sherrie Pace, stated according to State Code property owners may file a protest before or at the public hearing and signatures must be obtained by over 50% of the property owners who own more than 50% of the assessed land value in the area. She explained the City may annex the area without considering the protest filed if the County makes specific findings in their resolution including the area could be more efficiently served by the City than the County, the area was not likely to be naturally annexed by the City in the future as a result of urban development, annexation of the area was likely to facilitate the consolidation of overlapping function of local government, and annexation of the area was likely to result in the equitable distribution of community resources and obligations. She reported the protest that was filed on November 9, 2022 included 186 properties (63%) with 54.54 acres. She noted staff verified the signatures and found that there were four properties, 1.32 acres, in which the signatures were not verified due to

ownership being either an LLC or trust and the city not having record of those persons authorized to sign for the entity. She added also not included in the percentages were three property signatures for properties that were already within the City.

Sherrie Pace reported on the factors for consideration by the City Council including fiscal impacts on the City budget, the property owners in the area, and existing property owners in the City. She mentioned service impacts include snow removal, storm water maintenance, police response, solid waste disposal/recycling, and staff. She noted that factors to consideration for proposed address changes would include: the expense to the property owners; cohesive address system; point of sales (tax reporting); Google mapping; public safety; and coordination with affected entities such as Rocky Mountain Power, Dominion, South Davis Sewer District, etc. She stated another factor for consideration was land use (zoning) for residential and commercial zone designations.

Mayor Horrocks read the following instructions:

The City cares about everyone's input on this matter. In order to receive that input in an orderly way, we request that you please refrain from clapping, cheering, yelling or engaging in other forms of crowd or group behavior during the hearing. These outbursts detract from the purpose of why we are here and have the effect of intimidating speakers and others in the room. We wish to have a fair and thorough hearing where all persons, even if in the minority, are able to express themselves without feeling intimidated.

The Public Hearing is not a back and forth conversation and we will not engage in a conversation with you when you make your public comment. We will make every effort to note your questions and give time to City staff or Council members to answer those questions after we close the public hearing.

The City will conduct the hearing for as long as needed to hear everyone's comments. We ask that when you make a comment, please state your name and address. We will limit each comment to 3 minutes so we can hear everyone who wishes to make comments.

The Mayor also requested that speakers alternate between those opposed and those in favor of annexation.

Mayor Horrocks opened the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Richard Herron, 763 West 3500 South, expressed his concerns were the tax increase, feeling that the City was pursuing this for financial gain, and address changes. He said there were multiple apartment buildings on Highway 89 and felt the City's goal was to tear down the existing homes and build apartments to subsidize the golf course. Mr. Herron felt that existing services including snow removal, garbage, and sheriff services were suitable. He said the residents in the proposed

annexation area did not use City parks or services and reminded the Council that residents in the annexation area all voted and would remember who voted for this.

Jon Marsh, 3879 South 775 West, said he recently called the sheriff's office who did not arrive until 20 minutes later which he felt was unacceptable. He spoke on having the City's police department available and present to everyone versus Davis County who did not provide adequate service. Mr. Marsh spoke on other points including not having to deal with the issue of dual addressing, having access to Google Fiber, and access to reliable emergency services. He said having snow removal and other services provided by the County was a waste of time and money.

JoEllen Ashworth, 4148 South 825 West, said a majority of property owners in the area did not want the annexation as they were opposed to another level of government. She said that she heard numerous comments that the City was imperious and inconsiderate and would be met with disdain by the residents in the affected area. Ms. Ashworth asked if the annexation did occur that it would be delayed until after the new year.

Kirk Stratton, 4128 South 825 West, said most of his concerns were answered at the public open house related to taxes, emergency services, and public works services. He compared the current costs with those of the City and felt that the only issue may be the level of service for streets. He expressed concern that if the area was not annexed at this time, the County would increase taxes beyond what would be paid to the City. He shared the concerns of an address change, taxes, or snow removal but felt that overall he would have an avenue to express his concerns and have representation with a local entity.

Joel Powell, 876 West 3800 South, spoke on being content with the status quo and the preference to be annexed into Bountiful to retain current addresses.

Len Arave, 46 South Eaglewood Drive, commented that there were disparities including the fact that residents used fields/parks that they did not pay for, the City's police department were utilized in emergencies, the sheriff's office response times were long, they used the City's streets. He said it made no sense for the County to provide services to a small number of residents spread throughout the County. Mr. Arave urged the Council to make the right decision. He also suggested retaining the current addresses or adopting Davis County addresses for the whole City.

Frank Coon said he did not live in Davis County but was the trustee of one acre in the County/unincorporated area. He mentioned the term "governmental bloat" and then reviewed annual wage data he had obtained for the City's police chief, city manager, engineer, finance director, golf pro, and city recorder. Mr. Coon said the services enjoyed by the residents should not be interrupted and the County provided them appropriately. He said the right thing for these properties was not annexation.

Thomas Call, 828 West 3900 South, said that he lived in the City and then moved to the unincorporated area in 2004. He felt services were better in the County including the ability to choose from different service providers.

Chris Moss, 3552 South 800 West, commented that he intentionally sought out property in an unincorporated area. He said he did not want to be part of the City and was against another level of government.

Elaine Moss, 3552 South 800 West, said she wanted country life and did not want additional government. She did not think the proposal for the City to hire one additional police officer for the annexation would be adequate.

Rebecca Nageli, 892 West 4000 South, stated she was against building additional apartments or car dealerships.

Emily McBride, 4148 South 825 West, commented she was against the annexation and did not like change. She said the County provided the services they needed.

Steve Beazer, 3882 South 850 West, stated he had lived in the area for 46 years. He served on the County Commission and was involved with the master planning of the Val Verda area. Mr. Beazer said this was an inevitable process but felt those involved did not have a fair opportunity to be involved in the process. He suggested adopting an ordinance or procedure to allow for a 90 day period for a representative group to explore and consider this annexation.

Janice Twede, 3917 South 850 West, mentioned she had lived at her address for 53 years and did not like change. She requested more time to consider the annexation as 65% of the residents did not want to be part of the City. Ms. Twede expressed concerns with housing density, parking, and the timeframe for the annexation.

Diane DeLuca, 708 West 3600 South, commented that she was concerned with the honesty, integrity, and reliability of the City.

Richard Herron asked what the City was offering the residents in the proposed annexation area. He expressed his opinion that the City had bad streets, poor snow plow services, and had a financial reason for the annexation. Mr. Herron felt there was not one good reason for the annexation.

Thomas Call pointed out that in the three weeks since the notification, the residents had organized and obtained over 70% of the landowners to sign the protest in opposition to the annexation.

Mayor Horrocks closed the public hearing at 8:27 p.m.

Ken Leetham responded to the question of subsidizing the golf course. He said the golf course was not subsidized and was entirely paid for by user fees by golfers, events, and the restaurant. He further stated that there were some years in the history of the golf course where the City's General Fund revenues were used to subsidize the golf course, but that for the past three seasons, there has been no subsidy and it was not anticipated that subsidies would be needed in the future.

Sherrie Pace said the other main concern was the address changes and what level of support the City Council would give to residents to bear those costs.

Mayor Horrocks commented he did not know if the addresses had to be changed and did not think the post office required it. Sherrie Pace replied the post office did not require the change and it would be up to the Council to determine what should be done.

Councilmember Gordon asked about the taxation structure currently in the unincorporated area. Sherrie Pace responded State Tax Commission uses the zip codes plus 4 to code and assign the correct taxing entity to the point of sale taxes related to online sales. She explained that the Commission updated their database provided to vendors, such as Amazon, to properly code the sales tax remitted to the State. She noted that when sales taxes are remitted to the State it is the vendor that reports the combined total for the point of sale and not the individual addresses of each sale, therefore the State does not sort the sales tax collected. She explained the database works very well for large sophisticated vendors, but does not work well for smaller retailers or service companies that simply use the combined tax rate table sorted by zip code only. She mentioned those sales taxes collected have the possibility to be coded incorrectly, but the loss is likely not significant.

Councilmember Van Langeveld spoke on the comments related to the concept that the City was building apartments. She clarified the City did not build apartments. She explained that private owners or developers built apartments and the City either allowed it or not based on Code set in place. She added if apartments were built in this unincorporated area it would be because a property owner or developer purchased property from willing sellers and wanted to build apartments.

Councilmember Knowlton spoke on the history and that the City had long thought it made sense to annex the property. He noted the reason for this was that the area was surrounded by the City on three sides. He mentioned every unincorporated piece of land in urbanized areas was part of a municipal annexation policy plan because counties were temporary holders of land per State law. He said the property had been part of the City's annexation plan for 20 years and the reason it was being addressed now was that it was initiated by Davis County. He acknowledged it was inefficient for the County to provide urban services to isolated pockets of developed land. He stated the County's intention was for every piece of developed unincorporated land be annexed

into an adjacent community. He said that no change or maintaining the status quo was not a likely option.

Councilmember Gordon commented that she was initially opposed to this and wanted to understand the resident's concerns. She spoke on how everyone was already part of the same community. She said her children had gone to school with their children and she had lived by and worshipped with many of them. Councilmember Gordon said the County did not want to continue to provide services and how it was currently subsidized by others in the County and that Bountiful City has stated that they do not want to annex the area. She spoke on how this annexation would cost the City money and that consideration for the annexation was not due to greed or a desire for development.

Councilmember Porter commented that he had lost sleep over the annexation and had spent time researching the issue. He explained how the majority of the City had been added area by area through annexation. Councilmember Porter shared the history of the area, prior annexations, and previous address changes. He mentioned this was a hardship for the residents but felt there were ways that the City could help and spoke on the fact that the residents would have more representation and opportunities for involvement.

Councilmember Baskin thanked City staff, the Planning Commission, and those who had made an effort to find answers. She spoke on removing the personal feelings and that good governance was representation and fair taxation for services. She said the big issue for the residents was identity and how services needed to be provided by municipalities which was not occurring here. Councilmember Baskin expressed that it was time for this annexation to occur for good government as these residents were not receiving representation. She said the motive was not money or ego.

3. CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE 2022-09: AN ORDINANCE EXTENDING THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE TO INCLUDE THE ANNEXATION OF THE VAL VERDA AREA, ALSO KNOWN AS ANNEXATION AREA B, LOCATED APPROXIMATELY BETWEEN 3500 SOUTH AND 4100 SOUTH AND BETWEEN HIGHWAY 89 AND ORCHARD DRIVE IN UNINCORPORATED DAVIS COUNTY

Sherrie Pace stated she had drafted three motions for the Council in her report, including one in favor, one against, and one to table. She said the motions could be adjusted to change the effective date of the annexation or policy decisions related to addresses, etc. if the Council desired.

Councilmember Baskin said she did not care what the addresses were and felt that they could possibly be retained.

Mayor Horrocks said he had pride in the City and was proud of what they had accomplished. He mentioned that if the annexation went through that their taxes would increase and provided services would improve. He explained the current services for this area were being subsidized by all County residents. Mayor Horrocks said City and County residents had been subsidizing taxes for the unincorporated area for 20 plus years.

Councilmember Van Langeveld said that personally the only reason she would support the annexation was government efficiency. She was in opposition to the annexation and had explained her reasons in prior City Council meetings which could be viewed in the corresponding minutes. Councilmember Van Langeveld felt there were additional considerations to work through with the County before supporting the annexation.

Councilmember Van Langeveld moved to table consideration of Ordinance 2022-09 until Fall of 2023. There was not a second on the motion. The Mayor called for a vote on the motion, Councilmember Van Langeveld voted in favor, and Councilmembers Gordon, Porter, Baskin, Knowlton voted in opposition to the motion.

Councilmember Porter moved that the City Council approve Ordinance 2022-09 annexing the Val Verda Area, also known as Area B of the City's Annexation Policy Plan and Expansion Area Map, with an approximate location between 3500 South and 4100 South and Highway 89 to Orchard and including approximately 113 acres. Councilmember Baskin seconded the motion.

Councilmember Porter said he did not feel the address changes needed to be part of the motion for annexation but suggested forming a committee to discuss the best option at a later date.

Councilmember Baskin commented the address issue was still in the air and was impactful for their identity. She said addresses would not change before Christmas and then the Council would talk about if they would change at all. She suggested it would be good to see if the County would assist financially if an address change were required.

Councilmember Knowlton said it would be helpful to provide more comfort to the residents of the area that it was not the intention at the present time to require a change in address. He suggested reviewing the pros and cons for changing the addresses. He proposed an amendment to the motion indicating that it was not the intention to require a change of address within the next year which would allow additional time for it to be studied.

Councilmember Porter agreed the City would look at the pros and cons to mitigate or potentially postpone the address change.

Councilmember Porter amended his motion to include that the City would not take an action on the addresses change before 2024 until a group of representatives from the City,

the annexed area, and potentially the post office, tax commission, or others with an interest could make a recommendation to the City Council if it should be required in the future. Councilmember Knowlton seconded the amended motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, and Porter. Councilmember Van Langeveld voted in opposition to the motion.

4. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2022-41R: A RESOLUTION ADOPTING A POLICY AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION IN MEETINGS BY ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH UTAH CODE 52-4-207

Wendy Page reported the City adopted its current electronic meeting policy by resolution in 2020. She explained that due to recent legislative updates staff proposed amendments to the policy that were in accordance with State code. She stated in the 2022 legislative session the Legislature passed house bill 22 (HB-22) with four changes to meetings including having a resolution, rule, or ordinance in place that governed an electronic meeting held after December 31, 2022 that (1) established the conditions under which a remote member was included in calculating a quorum, (2) established the conditions under which a member may vote or take other action by proxy if allowed, (3) if a policy was not in place those of the public body attending a meeting electronically may not be allowed to vote or otherwise act by proxy, and (4) all votes that were not unanimous must be done by a roll call vote during an electronic meeting. She indicated these amendments were incorporated into the proposed electronic meeting policy which was an exhibit to Resolution 2022-41R.

Councilmember Baskin moved to approve Resolution 2022-41R: adopting a policy regarding meeting participation via electronic communication. Councilmember Van Langeveld seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.

5. ADJOURN INTO CLOSED SESSION

At 9:20 p.m. Councilmember Knowlton moved to go into closed session to discuss the acquisition of real property. Councilmember Gordon seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.

6. RECONVENE INTO REGULAR SESSION

At 9:39 p.m. Councilmember Baskin moved to adjourn the closed session and reconvene in the regular session. Councilmember Van Langeveld seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.

7. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Ken Leetham mentioned the proposed alternative in the I-15 project for a new interchange and indicated there were some residents that had expressed concern regarding the proposal to remove the Center Street off-ramp. He stated the City would be formulating comments and asked that any thoughts from the Council be sent to him.

Sherrie Pace commented that her concern for losing the Center Street exit was that it would open an area that allowed billboards. She indicated amendments to Code were possible, but changes to industrial zoning would also be necessary.

Ken Leetham reported that a special meeting would be held on November 29th for a public hearing on the bond for Hatch Park. He informed the Council staff would be adding several other items to that agenda that needed to be acted on before the end of the year.

8. ADJOURN

Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 9:44 p.m.

The foregoing was approved by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday November 29, 2022 by unanimous vote of all members present.



Brian J. Horrocks, Mayor



Wendy Page, City Recorder