

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-WORK SESSION
CITY HALL-10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
DECEMBER 2, 2025

FINAL

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 6:15 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Lisa Watts Baskin
Councilmember Tammy Clayton
Councilmember Suzette Jackson
Councilmember Ted Knowlton
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Dee Lalliss, Heidi Smoot, Barry Bryson, Carolyn Jacobson, Karen Bradford, Stan Porter, Rob Baskin, Thomas Baskin, Nicholas Daniels, Sarah Thomas, Hunter Thomas, Grace Kirato, Anisha Thota, Anastasia De'Mzee, Rueben Wolsey, residents; Wilford Cannon, Shandell Smoot, Eaglewood Development.

1. ANNUAL JUSTICE COURT REPORT BY JODI ADAMSON

Jodi Adamson reported that she was the Judicial Administrator for the court and shared the court motto: strive to improve the quality of life in our communities. She spoke on how the court was a neutral party between both sides to ensure things were handled fairly and effectively. She focused on court staff who shared in the administrative work (calls, emails, scheduling) and specializing in different areas. She recognized Kathy Ruggiero, 8 years, part time as coordinating with outside agencies (interpreters, attorneys, counseling, probation agencies), paperwork for small claims, and warrant validation. She reviewed responsibilities of Suzie Combe-Van Komen, 19 years, full time who provided support on probation, interacted with jails, collections, the alternate terminal agency coordinator (TAC) for the Bureau of Criminal Investigations (BCI), BCI suspense file (fingerprints), warrants, calendar prep of pretrials, and protective orders.

Jodi Adamson acknowledged her job duties included overseeing all operations of the court to ensure the City and judicial rules were followed, as the in court judicial assistant, budgeting, preparation of court calendars, monthly reporting, BCI TAC, audits, and small claims court with pro tem judge. She then focused on Judge David Miller and his education and experience including 17 years as the justice court judge for the City. She shared that staff regularly received compliments related to how kind and caring Judge Miller was.

Ms. Adamson provided an overview of the court which was a Class II (monthly average of 201-500 cases) and said the City had approximately 300 cases per month. She said the Justice Court had jurisdiction over traffic, criminal, and small claims, infractions, Misdemeanor C and B cases, and West Bountiful justice court cases. She noted that West Bountiful paid for their own prosecution and public defender. She mentioned that the City and West Bountiful split the retained revenue for West Bountiful cases at 50% each.

Councilmember Knowlton asked why the Justice Court did not handle the City's code enforcement cases. Jodi Adamson explained that the City had a civil process for Code violations and these were handled through the Community Development department.

Jodi Adamson reviewed the court programs including a remote desktop with storage on the State servers. She noted that this was transitioning to an internet based service and would allow defendants access to their cases. She then reported on the types of hearings including arraignment, pre trials, orders to show cause, sentencing, review hearings, warrant hearings, bench/jury trials, and small claims. She followed up with court scheduling including that the majority of hearings were held virtually via WebEx, held two to three Tuesdays per month (9am-noon and 12-5 p.m.), small claims held once a month on Wednesdays, bench trials on Friday, and jury trials scheduled on Fridays (in person).

Jodi Adamson presented graphs comparing 2023-2025 traffic charges and DUI cases for both the City and West Bountiful. She said that the numbers may not match as there could be multiple charges on one ticket. She then reviewed charts showing criminal cases from 2023-2025 for the City and West Bountiful. She noted that this included domestic violence, assault, alcohol related, controlled substance, theft, and other. Ms. Adamson explained that decreases in domestic violence could be attributed to one on one assault rather than assault on multiple family members. She noted that this may also be the case for theft statistics and that theft may be down or individuals were stealing larger amounts which was prosecuted through district courts instead.

Ms. Adamson spoke on a decrease in controlled substance cases which she attributed to individuals obtaining medical marijuana cards. She continued with a graph showing total cases filed for both the City and West Bountiful with a yearly comparison from 2021-2025. She shared

a graph showing the combined case load of cases filed and disposed from 2021 through 2025. She explained that staff had disposed of 300 more cases than last year which she attributed to the approval of the second full time court clerk.

Mayor Horrocks mentioned that he was surprised the City split the revenue at 50% with West Bountiful. Jodi Adamson clarified that the City kept 100% of the revenue from their cases and split 50% of the revenue with West Bountiful on their cases.

Mayor Horrocks asked which firm provided defense and prosecution services. Jodi Adamson replied that they were full time prosecutors with the Davis County attorney's office. She continued that the public defender was Roger Adams who had previously worked for the City as an interpreter.

Councilmember Jackson thanked the court staff and Judge Miller for their efforts. Ken Leetham commented that this was a great team and spoke on their increasing capability.

David Miller commended the judicial assistants and mentioned that people may be abrasive or difficult to deal with and the compliments from attorneys. He spoke on their efficiency and professionalism.

Councilmember Van Langeveld echoed the sentiments and thanked the judge and court staff.

Mayor Horrocks spoke on the decision to continue the court services in the new City Hall building and how that ended up being a good decision.

Councilmember Baskin arrived at 6:35 p.m.

2. OVERVIEW OF HB48 REQUIRING MUNICIPALITIES TO ADOPT A WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE CODE

Ken Leetham reported on the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) code year end deadline. He said this bill was complicated and not yet resolved between the Forest, Fire and State Lands Division (FFSL) and the counties in the State. He mentioned that he had attended trainings, spoke with neighboring cities, and said action was required before the end of the year. He explained that the Wildland Urban Interface code (WUI) was a zone where structures and other human development met or intermingled with undeveloped wildland. He reviewed parts of the bill which included:

- 1) WUI code adoption

- 2) High risk WUI boundary
- 3) Structures assessed a fee
- 4) Lot assessments
- 5) Insurance requirements

Mr. Leetham spoke on the requirements including the adoption of code and maps. He noted that in Utah there was a building code chapter with a set of provisions that dealt with Wildland Urban Interface that was prepared by the International Code Council. He explained that this would be processed through the Planning Commission as a land use ordinance and then could be adopted by the City Council in two weeks.

Ken Leetham said the second part of the requirement was the adoption of a map identifying the wildland urban interface property locations in the City. He shared that in 2026 the State would then prepare its own fire risk map and assess properties it believed were in a risk category for wildland fire. He explained that these are two different maps.

Councilmember Baskin commented that the State would assess the risk with a number and insurance companies would then know risk factors for properties.

Ken Leetham shared his opinion that there were some very responsible and appropriate regulations that the City should adopt that would apply to development in areas that were at risk of wildfire. He continued that there were regulations in the WUI code that the City had already implemented including robust water systems and fire storage. He said there were other parts of the code that would allow the City to help homeowners lower their fire and insurance risk.

The Council discussed a potential mitigation fund that would be available to fund problems and how this was currently an unfunded bill from the State Legislature.

Ken Leetham commented that the City had areas of concern related to wildland fire and the potential for catastrophic events. He spoke on the opportunity to help the public be safer related to fire hazards. He said the insurance question was a potential negative for the State as not enough had been done. He clarified that the City Council would consider adopting an ordinance on December 16th to adopt the building code for wildland urban interface and a map detailing where regulations applied to which properties.

Councilmember Jackson asked if this would apply retroactively to current buildings as well as future builds. Ken Leetham replied that the WUI code would apply to residents who make expansions or alterations to current homes or new builds. He noted that property owners may want to make changes to their properties to reduce their risk assessment.

Ken Leetham reviewed the requirements for cities/counties related to WUI code:

- Counties and municipalities are required to adopt and enforce the WUI code by 1/1/2026
- The local jurisdiction must specify where the WUI code applies by creating a boundary map

He also presented additional State requirements:

- FFSL required to create a high risk WUI boundary map
- Structures within this boundary will be assessed a fee
- Property insurance carriers must use high risk WUI map when evaluating wildfire risk

Councilmember Knowlton asked why the cities could not use the maps created by FFSL. Ken Leetham replied that they would not be the same. He said the city maps would identify locations in the city with wildland urban interface between developed and undeveloped areas that were at risk of fire. He explained the State's map would be more detailed and specific with individual properties.

Ken Leetham continued that House Bill 48 specified a fee amount which would be variable and based on the square footage of a structure within the high risk wildland urban interface to pay for the costs associated with the implementation. Assessed fees will be collected by the county. He said it would be an annual fee and the real negative exposure was the insurance impact or potential insurability for homeowners. He shared the following information about the fee amount:

- Counties would collect the fee
- Fees would be deposited into the Utah Wildfire Fund
- FFSL would allocate fees to the county based on agreement
- Fees could only be used to cover implementation costs
 - Lot assessments, fee assessments, high risk WUI mapping, database software

He then reviewed homeowner impacts:

- Structures in designated high risk WUI areas subject to fees
- Property owners may request lot assessments
- Properties in the local WUI zone will be subject to the WUI code

Mr. Leetham said the State would hire hundreds of inspectors to perform individual lot inspections every five years for every property within the high risk WUI area.

Councilmember Knowlton asked regarding the cost to pay for inspectors. Ken Leetham replied that the cost would be covered by the landowner's assessed fee.

Ken Leetham presented a draft WUI map of the City and noted that there was no penalty if the City did not adopt a map before January 1, 2026.

Councilmember Jackson commented that the onus was to the residents and not the State. She said the burden was on the municipalities to perform the work of assessing these properties instead of insurance companies. She mentioned that this would identify where insurance rates could be increased and was potentially devastating for residents. Ken Leetham said once the code was adopted and there was a better understanding of what it would mean to a homeowner to abide by those provisions, then the City may be better able to determine which properties it should apply to. He expressed being cautious and careful about what areas should be added or not.

Ken Leetham continued that the City should take their time creating the map. He shared that the State would put any property they felt was at risk on their map which meant properties could be further scrutinized even if they were not on the City's adopted WUI map. He said there would be a different process the State would use to create their maps regardless of the maps the cities create. He clarified that the City's map would identify properties subject to additional restrictions (building code) surrounding fire mitigation when/if new or additional construction/modifications were made. Mr. Leetham noted that some of the benefits of the City's map would be improved fire safety, implementing precautions, and evaluating risk.

Mayor Horrocks asked if the Foxboro Wetlands area would qualify as a wildland urban interface area. Ken Leetham replied that the fire district personnel made the argument that the wetlands area may be in a category of WUI. He also mentioned the area on the other side of Legacy Highway may also include some risk to the City.

Councilmember Baskin asked if her understanding was correct that if a property was assessed at a certain level of risk that the property owner would pay more fees into the fire mitigation fund. Ken Leetham responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Baskin noted that this was meant to avoid a fire that would spread throughout a city but generally applied to homes in forested areas. Ken Leetham said properties near forested areas were the highest risk areas. He shared that there were many things the City could do including mitigation programs in association with the fire department to trim trees, clear growth in the canyons, etc.

Councilmember Knowlton suggested that when reviewing different versions of the map that the rationale, methodology, or core criteria was provided. Ken Leetham replied that staff would not have the map prepared by December 16th. He said the City Council would adopt the code in December and then take the time necessary to prepare the map based on appropriate criteria.

Councilmember Baskin commented that she would not be surprised if the deadline was extended as many cities were upset and would like to ensure things were done correctly.

Councilmember Jackson asked about potential penalties if the code was not adopted by January 1, 2026. Ken Leetham responded that there were no penalties in the bill. He said some pieces of the bill such as adopting the building code which was drafted in 2006 would be a good thing for the City to implement.

Sherrie Pace mentioned that counties were already required to adopt WUI prior to HB48. She said essentially this code required classifying a property related to any construction to an existing or new property including evaluating roofing materials, subdivision design, water system, vegetation around the structure, topography, slope, etc. related to fire hazard. She noted that the classification system would then require certain standards related to eaves, decks, vegetation, etc. She also said the high risk assessment map would classify each property as a Class 1 and would provide two years for property owners to mitigate their risks before being assessed.

Councilmember Jackson commented that this would be beneficial for future builds but spoke on the cost to property owners to lower their risk (tree removal, roofing, etc.) and the potential to be dropped from fire insurance. She urged the City to be protective of their residents in regard to the proposed map and how many may take the high risk classification and pay the assessed fees. She said the City's map would not improve the safety of existing homes and would only assess the risk of the home unless residents participated in mitigation efforts. Councilmember Jackson shared her concerns that the map would put classifications on properties and self identify all of the homes that could be assessed a higher fee by insurance carriers.

Ken Leetham commented that some of the homes in the foothills may have already been constructed to be hardened for fire mitigation. He said the assumption should not be made that every property on the City's map would be assessed at the highest risk category or lose their insurance. He noted that insurance rates would most likely increase.

Councilmember Knowlton felt that it was prudent to wait and see what the State would require after the legislative session or after they had prepared their maps.

Councilmember Van Langeveld noted that she would like to see a WUI map for the City that was as small as possible and a separate fire safety map that could apply to the entire City. Ken Leetham commented that when reviewing the proposed building code that the City was well prepared with water storage at the highest elevations, streets that were the right width, and a robust water system.

Councilmember Jackson asked how burdensome it would be to create hardened code for the City related to fire mitigation. She mentioned having standard specifications for fire mitigation for renovations and new builds. Sherrie Pace replied that all of those standards would be part of the building code and could not be easily amended with the Legislature. She gave the example of requiring fire sprinklers on properties over 6,500 square feet and how onerous this had been to implement which was then changed to over 10,000 square feet by the Legislature.

3. ADJOURN

Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 7:17 p.m. to begin the regular session.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-REGULAR SESSION
CITY HALL-10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
DECEMBER 2, 2025

FINAL

Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 7:32 p.m. Suzette Jackson provided a thought, invocation, and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Councilmember Lisa Watts Baskin
Councilmember Tammy Clayton
Councilmember Suzette Jackson
Councilmember Ted Knowlton
Councilmember Alisa Van Langeveld

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Dee Lalliss, Heidi Smoot, Barry Bryson, Carolyn Jacobson, Karen Bradford, Stan Porter, Rob Baskin, Thomas Baskin, Nicholas Daniels, Sarah Thomas, Hunter Thomas, Grace Kirato, Anisha Thota, Anastasia De'Mzee, Rueben Wolsey, residents; Wilford Cannon, Shandell Smoot, Eaglewood Development.

1. RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBER LISA WATTS BASKIN

Mayor Horrocks reported that Councilmember Baskin would complete her third term on the City Council this year. He noted that she was elected in 2006, 2018, and 2022 and served as mayor pro tempore three times. He said she had shared her legal expertise and had improved many City ordinances and contracts. He commended her for serving on the Legislative Policy Committee, the Audit Committee, Golf Committee, as the Senior Lunch liaison, Great Salt Lake Scenic Byway Committee, proponent of A Bolder Way Forward as well as her risk management skills, as a Tree City champion, and for spearheading annual Arbor Day celebrations.

Mayor Horrocks then presented Councilmember Baskin with a plaque in recognition of her service to the City.

Councilmember Baskin shared her prepared thoughts including how local government was democracy in the details. She spoke on a representative government at a local level in cities and towns across America. She said while the State and Federal Government was struggling that the City was a great example of a city that lived up to America's potential. She noted that it had been an honor to serve on the City Council and the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Baskin mentioned several successes during her time on the Council including acquiring open space at Tunnel Springs Park, the resolution of the Springhill Landslide, numerous tree plantings, and the Deer Hollow detention basin. She mentioned serving on various committees, working with residents on difficult issues, and slowing down traffic on Eaglewood Drive. She spoke on achieving the dream of the people leading one another through fair and open participation.

2. CITIZEN COMMENT

Carolyn Jacobson, resident, shared the reason why her husband Conrad Jacobson had run for City Council again was due to miscommunication. She spoke on her experience campaigning and meeting with residents and the vast miscommunication on what the City could and could not do. She shared the concerns from residents including the perceived excess in the Hatch Park design and the removal of existing trees. She also mentioned the need for a variety of housing types including those for seniors, those with disabilities, and for families. Ms. Jacobson urged the City to find a way to share information with residents regarding where the park funding was coming from, the balanced budget, and competent staff. She asked the City Council to consider the seniors and those with disabilities in the City.

Wilford Cannon, Eaglewood Development, expressed gratitude for City staff associated to the agenda item amending Title 10-1-39 and 10-12 related to definitions and the Sensitive Area District and geologic hazards related to the buildable envelopes. He spoke on how this would increase safety in these areas.

Stan Porter, resident, expressed appreciation for the time he served with Councilmember Baskin. He spoke on the former Uniting Neighbors Committee and previous discussions on fire safety including the need to clear out scrub brush and creating a defendable space around homes. He suggested the City work with the fire department on fire prevention methods, modeling, and planning for fire risk.

Dee Lalliss, resident, spoke on the Senior Lunch Bunch and expressed gratitude to Councilmember Baskin as the liaison. He noted that there were 80 seniors in attendance at the

last lunch and hoped that this would continue. He suggested a civic center at Hatch Park to accommodate these types of events.

There was a brief recess from 8:16 p.m. to 8:27 p.m.

3. COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Knowlton requested an agenda item to discuss solar panels on City property and other ways to hedge against energy prices. He spoke on the price of energy related to the growth in data centers. Councilmember Van Langeveld voiced her second of the request.

Councilmember Knowlton spoke on a consent agenda to streamline the City Council meetings. He commended Councilmember Baskin for her fearlessness, preparedness, and leadership.

Councilmember Jackson thanked Councilmember Baskin for her years of service and example she had set. She mentioned the first official thanksgiving in 1879 to celebrate the creation of the constitution. She spoke on the caveat of Thanksgiving with the acknowledgement that the nation's future was dependent on the virtue and faith of its people.

Councilmember Van Langeveld noted that she would need to leave the meeting early and shared her action item updates. She requested revisiting the strategic plan at the start of 2026 to fine tune the scope. She thanked Councilmember Baskin for her leadership and mentorship.

Councilmember Clayton reported on attending the Youth City Council leadership conference recently. She shared that the YCC met weekly and expressed gratitude to the YCC and the adult leadership. She spoke on how Winter Fest was a fun and community building event. She thanked staff and the Council for hosting this event. She also thanked Councilmember Baskin for her service to the City.

4. CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Todd Godfrey had nothing to report.

5. MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Horrocks spoke on damage to the parking lot and sidewalk at a shoe repair company along US-89. He mentioned the National League of Cities convention and speaking with Chick-fil-A on a potential location in the City. He shared the need to look at legislation related to e-bike use in the City.

6. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Ken Leetham shared upcoming events including the City's annual committee dinner on December 4th, the December 16th City Council meeting, and the oath of office ceremony and reception for the new City Councilmembers during the January 6th City Council meeting.

7. CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE 2025-19: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 10-10-3 AND 10-19-17, MODIFYING THE SETBACK AND MAXIMUM SIZE FOR AN ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, RUEBEN WOLSEY, APPLICANT

Sherrie Pace reported on the application from Rueben Wolsey to amend the City Code related to accessory structures and size. She explained that prior to 2018 the City Code allowed any size accessory structure provided it did not exceed the size of the main structure on the lot. She noted that City Code has since been updated to allow a maximum 50% of the footprint of the main structure for accessory structures. She shared that Mr. Wolsey's property, located on Odell Lane, was 0.88 acres with a 15,000 square foot rear yard and a 2,500 square foot dwelling and how current Code would not allow him to construct the proposed 2,200 square foot shop.

Ms. Pace reviewed the current Code and the proposed amendments. She noted the current Code for residential accessory structures:

- a maximum height of 14 feet with a 20 foot roof peak
- a maximum height of 50% of the main structure
- rear yard coverage with a maximum of 25%.

She continued that the proposed amendments included:

- no change to the maximum height
- a maximum size:
 - lot size ½ acre or less 50% footprint of main structure
 - lot size greater than ½ acre no greater than the footprint of the main structure
- additional setback (>800 sq. feet)
 - side and rear yard 10 feet
 - rear w/firewall 5 feet
- rear yard coverage no change

Sherrie Pace noted that in addition to the proposed Code amendment, the Building Official requested an amendment to 10-10-3 regarding the minimum setback for accessory structures in residential zones. Ms. Pace said currently the Code allowed a setback for side and rear property

lines of three (3) feet which may be reduced to one (1) foot if the wall adjacent to the property line has a one (1) hour fire rating and no doors or windows on that wall. She commented that this conflicted with International Building Code and could be corrected with this application to adjust the standard to five feet (5') with the exception being three feet (3') with the one (1) hour fire rating.

Ms. Pace presented aerial photos of several half acre or larger properties in the City with existing large accessories structures to show the scope of the requested proposal. She showed that these had minimal impact on adjacent properties. She shared an aerial view of Mr. Wolsey's property with the proposed structure. She continued that the Planning Commission held a public hearing with no public comments and recommended approval of the Code amendment.

Councilmember Van Langeveld asked if the setback changes would only apply to larger lots. Sherrie Pace replied that the setbacks would apply to all accessory structures in the City. She said an existing structure would be grandfathered in as long as they were lawfully built with a permit.

Councilmember Jackson moved that the City Council approve Ordinance 2025-19 amending City Code Sections 10-10-3 and 10-19-17 regarding the setbacks for accessory structures and the maximum size of accessory structures for lots greater than one-half acre in size with the following findings:

- 1) The proposed amendment is in accord with the comprehensive general plan, goals and policies of the City.**
- 2) Changed or changing conditions make the proposed amendment reasonably necessary to carry out the "purposes" stated in this title.**

Councilmember Knowlton seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, and Van Langeveld.

8. CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE 2025-20: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 10-1-39 AND 10-12 RELATED TO DEFINITIONS AND SENSITIVE AREA DISTRICT AND GEOLOGIC HAZARDS RELATED TO THE BUILDABLE ENVELOPES FOR PROPERTIES WHICH ARE LOCATED WITHIN SENSITIVE LANDS

Ken Leetham commented that the City began working with the developer of The Cove due to disagreements on subdivision plat notes. He said the developer raised concerns about the vagueness of those notes and differences of opinion. He explained that the City entered into a process of amending some ordinances related to geologic hazards and work prior to construction

including studying the conditions of the lot and permitting/approvals. He said the new changes were clearer and had applications to other locations in the City.

Sherrie Pace shared a slope map for Eaglewood Cove and stated that there were notes on the plat stating that each individual lot would have a site specific topographical plan performed to identify areas of 30% slope. She shared an example of several lots with slopes greater than 30% in the building envelope and how some areas in the building area may not be buildable due to the slope.

She reviewed the proposed amendments including:

Section 10-1-39: Definitions with impacts to the terms Geologic Hazard; Geologic Hazards Study; Lot Area, Buildable; Lot Area, Nonbuildable; Nonbuildable Area; and Problem Soil.:

- 1) Geologic Hazard – Changed “Unstable Soil” to “Problem Soil”
- 2) Geologic Hazards Study – Added definition
- 3) Lot Area, Buildable – Grammatical, adding reference to Section 10-12-22 (Sensitive Lands Chapter)
- 4) Lot Area, Nonbuildable – correction of term “Geologic Hazard Study”, clarification: outside building envelope that are greater than 30% slope, clarification: portion of lot inside building envelope greater than 30% slope, except as provided in 10-12-22, and clarification: any portion of a lot with geologic hazards that cannot be mitigated
- 5) Nonbuildable Area – deleted as redundant to “Lot Area, Nonbuildable”
- 6) Problem Soil – added to define what types soils may be geological hazards

Chapter 12: Sensitive Area (SA) District and Geologic Hazards:

10-12-2: Definitions:

- 1) Buildable Area – replace “accepted engineering geologic report” with “Approved Geologic Hazards Study”
- 2) Nonbuildable Area – same as above

10-12-4: Responsibility for Geologic Hazard Studies:

- 1) Removal of Section A, as the definition of Geologic Hazard Study was added to the definition section
- 2) Updated section with correct term “Approved Geologic Hazard Study”
- 3) Clarification of who is responsible for submittal of Geologic Hazard Studies and that standards to the minimum requirements may be increased if there is “compelling” evidence from the approved study
- 4) Clarification that “Study” for a building permit shall contain both engineering geologic hazard and geotechnical engineering analysis

10-12-22: Lot Standards and Identification of Building Envelope:

- 1) Clarification that a building envelope is required on subdivision plat when any portion of a lot exceeds 15% for an elevation change of 8 feet or greater.
- 2) Specifying exclusions from building envelopes for:
 - a. Required setbacks
 - b. Easements or Rights of ways
 - c. Known geologic hazards
 - d. Slopes greater than 30% unless certain circumstances exist
 - e. Critical vegetation needed for erosion control unless mitigated
 - f. Areas identified in Approved Study that should be avoided, unless mitigated
- 3) Specifying the circumstances when slopes greater than 30% but less than 50% may be included in a building envelope:
 - a) Existing subdivision lots with building envelopes containing such slopes which may be disturbed with a site-specific study that contains slope stability modeling and meets the minimum acceptable factors of safety.
 - b) New subdivision lots may have such slopes within the building envelope that may only be distributed with a site-specific study that contains slope stability modeling and factors of safety, and such area may not exceed 25% of the total building envelope, provide that the building envelope has a minimum of 5,000 square feet less than 30% slope.
 - c) Specifies that no building permit may be issued retaining walls, grading, structures or other improvements on such slopes unless the study and slope stability factors of safety are met.

Ms. Pace added that no building permit may be issued within areas between 30-50% without approved study (site specific) and meeting factors of safety. She continued that clarification of identification was required on the site plan.

10-12-24: Slope Protection Easements:

- 1) Clarifies that slope protection easements for critical slopes does not include slopes greater than 30% when the vertical rise is eight feet or less (current practice has been to not include slopes with a vertical rise of 5 feet or less)
- 2) Specifying that slopes under 30% slope may be designated as critical slopes for issues identified in the approved study

Ms. Pace noted that several grammatical corrections had been made to this section as well.

Councilmember Baskin asked if this addressed the issues the developer had with phases 13-15. Sherrie Pace replied affirmatively and said staff had streamlined the process including pre application meetings with lot owners to explain the process. She mentioned this included helping

property owners to find qualified geotechnical consultants. She commented that these lots were not unbuildable but may need special attention for certain issues.

Councilmember Baskin referenced Section 10-12-22 that no permit may be issued within areas between 30-50% without approved study (site specific) and meeting factors of safety. She confirmed there could be a lot with a 30% slope as long as a geotechnical report and mitigation was done then someone could obtain a permit. Sherrie Pace replied affirmatively.

Councilmember Jackson commented on the work done by the developer and staff to streamline the process.

Councilmember Baskin moved that the City Council approve Ordinance 2025-20: an ordinance amending Title 10, Chapter 1, Section 39, Definitions and Chapter 12 Sensitive Area District and Geologic Hazards, related to the buildable envelopes for properties which are located within the Sensitive Lands Overlay Zone, with the following findings:

- 1) The proposed amendment is in accord with the comprehensive general plan, goals and policies of the City.**
- 2) Changed or changing conditions make the proposed amendment reasonably necessary to carry out the "purposes" stated in this title.**

Councilmember Van Langeveld seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, and Van Langeveld.

Councilmember Van Langeveld was excused at 8:59 p.m.

9. CONSIDERATION OF BID AWARD FOR EARLY SITE MASS GRADING AND UTILITIES RELATED TO HATCH PARK CONSTRUCTION

Karyn Baxter reported on the Hatch Park expansion project and early site mass grading. She explained that this bid would include mass site grading, structural fill as required, relocation of storm drain detention basin location, grading to subbase depth for pavement & concrete flatwork, seeding of disturbed areas, and SWPPP controls. She presented a drawing of the storm drain work and reviewed the proposed work including a new control structure in Center Street (vault), new storm drain pipe to the detention basin, and reestablishing inflow and outflow controls for the detention basin. She said the construction manager/general contractor bid the work by utilities or subcategories and shared the following results:

SWPPP

| | |
|---------------|---------|
| Cearley SWPPP | \$1,750 |
| ECS | \$4,220 |

Earthwork & Utilities

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| BH Inc. | \$901,013 |
| Wind River Excavation | \$1,098,205 |
| Hogan Construction | \$1,374,000 |
| Reynolds Construction | \$1,471,541 |

Seeding

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| Great Western | \$40,000 |
|---------------|----------|

Site Survey

| | |
|--------------------|---------|
| Hogan Construction | \$5,000 |
|--------------------|---------|

She shared that this was a rebid from September as there were no responsive bidders for SWPPP. She noted that the previous earthwork & utilities bid was \$1,249,068 and the previous survey bid was \$45,000. She continued that BHI has GPS run computers which would not require field staking which was a substantial savings.

Councilmember Jackson commented that this message could be shared with residents including the frustration that the bid process has taken longer than expected but because of the pause that pricing had decreased significantly. Karyn Baxter added that part of the length of the delay was that the bid process took one month and that during that delay UDOT provided plans for lowering Center Street which allowed the City to redo the grading plan which would work seamlessly with the I-15 widening.

Councilmember Clayton moved that the City Council award the Reseeding of future phases to Great Western for \$40,000, and the Earthwork and Utilities of the Hatch Park Early Site Package to BHI for \$901,013. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Clayton, Jackson, Knowlton, and Van Langeveld.

10. CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED WAGE ADJUSTMENTS IN THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Ken Leetham reported that this was based on several years of reviewing the Public Works department including high turnover.

David Frandsen spoke on retaining a high performing team, improving recruitment, and protecting internal equity and morale while remaining competitive. He shared that he had been with the City for ten years and during that time:

- 22 employees separated from the organization
- 6 of those were removed
- 8 went to other government entities (higher pay and opportunity)
- 6 to the private sector (higher pay)
- 1 retired/1 health reason

He continued that while some turnover was healthy that three employees recently interviewed for other organizations. He said that many employees shared that they loved working for the City during their exit interviews, but had to leave in order to improve their financial circumstances.

Mr. Frandsen reviewed recruitment challenges including a starting wage of \$20 and said that fast food jobs had similar starting wages and construction jobs started at \$24-25. He shared some statistics including how a one bedroom apartment was \$1,500 per month, the average home price was \$550,000, and how a lower starting wage was difficult for employees with responsibilities (mortgage and children). He spoke on what the competition offered including hiring entry level employees higher in the scale (cities), signing bonus (cities), recruiting experienced employees (cities), and higher hourly wages (construction companies).

David Frandsen said the reason why the City was not matching the competition was due to wage compression or when the pay differences between employees with different skills, experience, and job responsibilities diminished or disappeared. He explained that it was unfair to offer signing bonuses or hiring someone at the same pay level as current employees. He noted that the average new hire cost was \$3,000 in training for the first year. Mr. Frandsen reviewed the certifications that employees received within the first five years and said one goal was high expectations and high support. He reviewed the results of the job comparison survey, which had been conducted over the last five years, and showed a misalignment this year for the following positions:

- operations manager
- streets and storm supervisor
- parks superintendent
- parks maintenance worker

David Frandsen shared the following proposal which was designed to preserve internal equity and allow the City to be competitive:

- 1) Adjust pay grades on following positions:
 - a) Operations manager
 - b) Streets and storm supervisor
 - c) Parks superintendent
 - d) Parks maintenance worker
 - e) Fleet manager
 - f) Storm/streets leadworker
 - g) Water foreman
 - h) Construction leadworker
 - i) Distribution technicians
 - j) Water technicians
 - k) Public works inspector

- 2) Move all employees up \$2.00 within their ranges

Ken Leetham clarified that the first step to adjust the pay grade for the aforementioned positions was an adjustment of the grade and not the wage. He said the grades in the market were higher than what the City was currently offering.

Councilmember Baskin asked what low grade meant related to the job comparison survey. She added that she wanted the employees in those four positions to receive a raise. David Frandsen replied that an outside company performed the survey which showed that those four positions were low grade and not competitive. She stated that she wants the four positions to receive a raise in addition to the proposed \$2.00 per hour. She also observed that government employees also receive benefits that employees in the private sector do not receive to the same degree. She asked about adjusting wages for these four employees and what that would do for other employees. David Frandsen said that the grades for these four employees are in grades that are low, but not necessarily that their pay is low.

Ken Leetham commented that an employee who was at the top of the step would only receive a COLA and not a merit raise.

Councilmember Knowlton shared that it was implied that the City was less competitive compared to similar entities in all the grades. He said the idea was to adjust the grades to be competitive. David Frandsen responded that the survey showed that this was the first year that those four jobs were not competitive.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on the benefits of a governmental versus a private sector job including COLA, retained pay even when times were difficult, STEP increases, retirement, etc.

She said morale, reputation, and job satisfaction were also important. She noted the private sector may cut employees when needed and do not give COLAs; but, government employees always adopt COLAs. She asked what the financial impacts of the proposal are.

Heidi Voordeckers reviewed the financial aspect which affected 26 employees at a cost of \$160,000 per year. She explained this would be split across four funds including the General, Solid Waste, Storm Drain, and Water funds. She continued that the impact for the first fiscal year would be \$28,400. She noted that the \$2.00 increase also included a 2% step increase every year, and a 2.5% COLA. That has been the average COLA over the last several years with some higher and some lower. She shared total available tax revenue (sales tax, property tax, RDA project areas, and franchise taxes) and her ten year projection.

Councilmember Knowlton shared the reasons why he thought this plan should be implemented including that this was not a large amount of money, public works was the base of a good City, and the need to be competitive to attract and retain good employees. He expressed support for this proposal.

Councilmember Clayton said these employees did the difficult jobs in the City including snow plowing and road work and that the proposed plan was worth the cost.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on the grade system and potential issues when employees were at the top of the grade. She expressed concern over the possibility of having tenured employees making higher wages over time and said turnover has a place for keeping costs low. David Frandsen responded that retention was important but could restrict movement. He spoke on the balance of having employees with fresh ideas along with those who had skills and experience.

Councilmember Knowlton asked if the grade change was due to time or merit. David Frandsen replied that early positions in the department were under a ladder system which included completing certifications to move up. He said employees were then able to ascend grades due to vacancies or something similar.

Councilmember Baskin inquired about the current lowest wage was in the department. David Frandsen replied that the current lowest position was \$20 hour or \$40,000 annually. Councilmember Baskin noted that in the US the median wage was \$50,000 per year. She said that \$40,000 was a good wage for someone who is a laborer and not a college graduate.

Mayor Horrocks spoke on the cost of living in Utah compared to other states highlighting how the wage must be competitive for this area. He asked about overtime for events, snow plowing,

emergencies, etc. David Frandsen replied that this was overtime and that the average employee had 120 hours of overtime annually.

Mayor Horrocks asked if other City departments would be upset about the potential pay increase. Ken Leetham said public works was the most impacted department and needed an adjustment. He said an adjustment was made five years ago in the police department and did not feel there would be concern from other departments.

Councilmember Baskin said while this was a small dollar amount that the philosophy concerned her that employees can just work year after year and get to the top of the pay scale. She said employees that left for other opportunities could be replaced and the training cost was not significant. She said employees can go to other cities for higher wages and asked what's wrong with that. She acknowledged that the City may lose knowledge or experience when that happens, but the same job can then be done for less money. She added if any department deserved a raise, it was the public works department.

Councilmember Jackson said the number one job of the City Council was monitoring the budget and ensuring the funds were well spent. She was in agreement with this proposal and the tenants of running a good city was streets, water, power, safety, utility, police, and public works. She said public works was the area she wanted high morale and excellence. She is supportive of this, but she expressed caution if the department was all at the top of the pay grade.

Councilmember Baskin spoke on accountability to the tax payers and the potential property tax increase in Davis County to pay for personnel. She noted the lack of COLA in the private sector. She discussed that the private sector can not give raises in the same way as government. David Frandsen said that the City has not increased wages under threat to leave from employees. He continued that the situation is at a point where they were lucky to get three applications for job openings and the inability to compete. He said while he was not against turnover because it allowed other employees to move up. He further explained that inexperience was an issue in the department.

Councilmember Jackson was in favor of the proposal and noted the importance of reviewing the potential ramifications.

David responded that the Public Works Department does most of their work behind the scenes and that the employees collective skills are really improving every year.

Councilmember Knowlton mentioned how a high performing public works department saved the City money.

David Frandsen further emphasized that the employees skill set are improving and that the City has moved out employees who are not performing and now has an improved group of employees.

Councilmember Baskin said while she had reservations that public works often went the extra mile and gave the example of the Saturday cleanup. David Frandsen complimented his department on their extra work.

Councilmember Baskin commented that she wanted to see TJ Riley receive a raise and asked if that would occur with approval of this proposal.

Ken Leetham clarified that employees would receive a \$2 raise and said that if it was the Council's desire to pay those four employees who were at the low step a raise above that amount, then they should direct staff to do that. He said this was difficult to present this proposal but felt it needed to be done. He continued that staff could look at the impacts of an additional raise for those four positions which were middle management positions. David Frandsen added that the purpose of the proposal is to assist the lowest paid employees.

Councilmember Knowlton was not in favor of a review of the middle managers wages. Councilmember Baskin was in favor of this review. Councilmember Knowlton felt this was an overreach and was a management decision.

Councilmember Jackson spoke on variables and said she was comfortable with the proposal reviewed tonight. Ken Leetham commented that moving the grade would allow these employees to be eligible for future merit increases. He continued that the merit increases were based on an annual review.

Councilmember Baskin suggested approving the proposal with the 2% raise and the step increase and then reviewing the four positions that had been identified as low grade. She also noted that this is the most detailed discussion at the Council level that she's had.

Ken Leetham told the City Council he wanted them to understand the City management would not make large scale wage adjustments without the consent of the Council. He wanted to build trust and believed that changes of this size should be considered by the Council. In spite of the detailed work, he thinks it's important to bring it to Council. David reiterated that these changes are for the lowest paid employees.

Mayor Horrocks noted that we a few years ago we did the same thing for public safety employees.

Councilmember Knowlton moved that the City Council approve the recommended grade changes as identified by the Technology Net survey including the approval of additional grade adjustments for key public works positions averaging approximately \$2.24 per hour. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Clayton, Jackson, and Knowlton. Councilmember Van Langeveld was excused.

11. NOTIFICATION OF THE TENTATIVE FY2026 BUDGET AND PROPOSED PROPERTY TAX INCREASE BY THE SOUTH DAVIS RECREATION DISTRICT

Councilmember Jackson presented that the South Davis Recreation Center Board adopted the Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Tentative Budget on November 10, 2025. She continued that this Budget included a proposed property tax increase with a truth in taxation public hearing held the following week on November 17, 2025. She noted that a 5% increase in property tax above last year was approved which would result in an \$86,200 additional revenue in the General Operations Fund. She shared that she was the opposing vote to this tax increase.

Councilmember Jackson said one of the issues was a 77% tax increase two years ago and the budget finally balanced last year due to the \$750,000 increase from that tax increase. She expressed concern that there was no internal change within the budget and that this was not sustainable. She spoke on the need for realignments in overhead, review of programs, and tightening of the budget.

12. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2025-58R: A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AGREEMENT WITH THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (UDOT) FOR THE PURCHASE OF A TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT ON CITY PROPERTY LOCATED AT 121 WEST 150 NORTH AND ADJACENT TO THE PROPOSED I-15 RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Karyn Baxter shared an aerial view of the property on 150 North which abutted I-15. She shared the details of the temporary construction easement:

- Easement only for construction and not permanent property acquisition
- Easement was non-exclusive and owner may use property at any time that did not conflict with construction activities
- Width of three (3) feet at the north end

She continued that the substantial cost was due to:

- UDOT utilizing “cost to cure” which was for the replacement of existing improvements
- Payment was made for the subject property including all improvements thereon
- Cost to cure at this location included 16 feet of fence and trees which must be removed
- Total payment would be \$11,500 plus \$3,000 incentive to expedite agreement

Councilmember Knowlton moved that the City Council approve Resolution 2025-58R: a resolution approving an agreement with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) for the purchase of a temporary construction easement on City property located at 121 West 150 North and adjacent to the proposed I-15 reconstruction project. Councilmember Jackson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Clayton, Jackson, and Knowlton. Councilmember Van Langeveld was excused.

13. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

The City Council minutes of November 18, 2025 were reviewed and approved.

Councilmember Jackson moved the City Council approve the minutes of the November 18, 2025 meeting as written. Councilmember Clayton seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Councilmembers Baskin, Clayton, Jackson, and Knowlton. Councilmember Van Langeveld was excused.

14. DISCUSSION OF ACTION ITEMS

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

15. ADJOURN

Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

The foregoing was approved by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday December 16, 2025 by unanimous vote of all members present.


Brian J. Horrocks, Mayor


Wendy Page, City Recorder

