

SOUTH JORDAN CITY  
CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

May 6, 2025

**Present:** Mayor Dawn Ramsey, Council Member Patrick Harris, Council Member Kathie Johnson, Council Member Don Shelton, Council Member Tamara Zander, Council Member Jason McGuire, City Manager Dustin Lewis, Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen, City Attorney Ryan Loose, Fire Chief Chris Dawson, Police Chief Jeff Carr, City Engineer Brad Klavano, Associate Director of Recreation Brad Vaske, Public Works Director Raymond Garrison, Director of City Commerce Brian Preece, Director of Strategy & Budget Don Tingey, Communications Manager/PIO, Rachael Van Cleave, CTO Matthew Davis, Senior Systems Administrator Phill Brown, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, City Recorder Anna Crookston, Engineering Operation Manager Becky Messer, Long-Range Planner Joe Moss, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson, Planner III Damir Drozdek

**Absent:**

**Others:** Fred Philpot, Rachel Jepperson,

4:38 P.M.  
REGULAR MEETING

**A. Welcome, Roll Call, and Introduction - *By Mayor, Dawn R. Ramsey***

Mayor Ramsey welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

**B. Invocation – *By Council Member, Patrick Harris***

Council Member Harris offered the invocation.

**C. Mayor and Council Coordination**

Council Member Harris inquired about receiving an update on the parade, Summer Fest, and related activities when appropriate.

City Manager Dustin Lewis stated that staff will email council members with final event details. He noted that there is one more council meeting prior to the events, which begin the week of June 2. The float preview is scheduled for June 3, though it conflicts with a City Council meeting this year. Traditional events will take place leading up to the parade on June 7, including breakfast and transportation to the parade route. Invitations will be sent for chalk art judging and other related activities. He added that the core activities have been relocated to the west side of City Park in the larger field area to allow for expanded space for the carnival and other events. He noted this change will provide more room for activities, improve safety, and enhance the overall experience.

**D. Discussion/Review of Regular Council Meeting:**

**Utah Black Diamonds Land Use Public Hearing Items:**

**- Resolution R2025-23, Development Agreement pertaining to property 272 West 11000 South.**

**- Zoning Ordinance 2025-03-Z, Rezoning property 272 West 11000 South, from C-F (Commercial - Freeway) Zone to C-F (Commercial - Freeway) Zone and PD (Planned Development) Floating Zone; Nichols Naylor Architects (Applicant).**

**Public Hearing Items:**

**- Resolution R2025-25, Adopting the 2025 Drinking Water System Master Plan.**

**- Ordinance 2025-05, Amending Section 17.40.020 of the City of South Jordan Municipal Code.**

**Action Items:**

**- Resolution R2025-18, Appointing a member to the BCRPA Board.**

**- Resolution R2025-20, Adopting FY2025-2026 Tentative Budget.**

**RDA Action Item:**

**- Resolution RDA 2025-01, Adopting FY2025-2026 Tentative Budget.**

**E. Presentation Items:**

E.1. Storm Water Rate Study. *(By Director of Public Works, Raymond Garrison)*

Public Works Director Raymond Garrison introduced Vice President of LRB Financial Advisors, Fred Philpot. He noted that the last stormwater rate study was conducted in 2021 and that the City is approaching the five-year mark, prompting the need for an updated analysis. He stated that staff has been working with Mr. Philpot and his team over the past few months to complete the update, and Mr. Philpot would present the findings, with time allotted for discussion afterward.

Mr. Philpot reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment A), providing an overview of the storm utility rate review, following the same format used in prior utility analyses. He outlined the objectives, methodology, and assumptions used in the financial model, which projects through 2030 but focuses on the next five years for rate setting. The model incorporates actuals from 2023, estimates for 2024, and the adopted 2025 budget, including anticipated system growth, expenditure trends, and construction inflation. He explained that the storm utility is simpler to evaluate because it typically charges a flat rate per equivalent residential unit (ERU) rather than using tiered demand structures. The primary goals of the analysis include ensuring financial sustainability, maintaining adequate cash reserves, covering debt obligations, and avoiding subsidization from other funds. The model starts with a \$1.7 million fund balance and includes capital improvement needs, such as the storm drain portion of the new Public Works facility. Two scenarios were presented: one with no rate increase, which would lead to the fund balance falling below target levels, and another with phased annual 3% rate increases to preserve financial targets and improve debt coverage. He noted that gradual increases help smooth the financial impact and align with inflation, as opposed to a single large adjustment. A comparative analysis of storm rates across neighboring communities was shown, indicating that South

Jordan's proposed rates would fall in the mid-range, not the highest, but not the lowest. Mr. Philpot concluded by highlighting that other communities, have faced challenges due to delayed rate adjustments, underscoring the importance of timely and sustainable rate planning.

Council Member Zander asked whether the bar graph showing a rate of approximately \$9 reflects the City's highest projected rate under the proposed increases.

Mr. Philpot clarified that the \$9.29 shown on the bar graph represents the starting point under the proposed rate increases. As rates continue to rise over time, the City would eventually exceed that amount, approaching rates similar to Bluffdale, assuming those other cities do not adjust their rates. He noted that storm enterprise funds are often the least frequently evaluated, which can lead to significant future increases when capital needs are eventually addressed. He added that the comparison chart includes only communities within Salt Lake County.

Council Member Zander asked when the City last implemented a stormwater rate increase.

Director Garrison stated that the last rate study was completed in 2021 and recommended a 6% annual increase, which the City has implemented each year since.

Council Member Zander confirmed that the City has applied a 6% annual stormwater rate increase since 2021 and noted that the current recommendation is for a 3% increase moving forward.

Director Garrison explained that the previous rate study was a five-year plan, and one year remains on that schedule. He recommended incorporating a 3% rate increase into the upcoming tentative budget review.

Council Member Harris asked whether the recommended reduction from a 6% to a 3% rate increase is primarily due to decreased inflation or if other factors are influencing this adjustment.

Mr. Philpot added that, in addition to decreased inflation, updates to the capital improvement plan and reassessment of necessary projects contributed to the recommendation for reduced rate increases. Incorporating these factors into the model produced a scenario supporting a lower increase.

Director Garrison stated that the stormwater master plan was updated to closely evaluate the recommended projects. The team reviewed the necessity and timing of each project, resulting in a more refined and finalized project list that has been incorporated into the current rate study model.

#### E.2. Development Fee Study. *(By CFO, Sunil Naidu)*

CFO Sunil Naidu provided background information, noting that the fee schedule was updated in 2022, but due to recent legislative discussions regarding governmental fees and concerns about charges to developers, the City opted to conduct a comprehensive study. This study includes cost and process analyses to ensure fees align appropriately with expenditures and comply with regulations.

Mr. Philpot reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment B), explaining the City's updated approach to evaluating fees for service, emphasizing the importance of aligning fees with the actual costs of providing those services. The process involves a two-pronged methodology: first, a cost analysis including employee salaries, department overhead, and administrative overhead; second, a detailed process map identifying each task involved and the time spent by personnel. This combined data informs the fee calculations. He provided an example showing how staff time is calculated with fully loaded costs per minute, including technology fees and overhead allocations. The process maps identify steps and personnel involved, averaging costs when multiple employees may be involved, resulting in an estimated total cost per application. The updated fee schedule generally reflects increases, primarily driven by higher personnel costs since the previous study. Some new fees were added for services such as right-of-way vacations, development agreement amendments, and floodplain permits. Certain fees, like the text amendment, saw minor decreases due to more efficient processes. Mr. Philpot highlighted South Jordan's proactive stance in linking building permit fees more closely to actual cost of service rather than purely valuation-based fees, a practice that some neighboring communities are still working to adopt. The updated schedule incorporates tiered fees based on valuation and reflects increases in salaries, benefits, department overhead, and administrative overhead. He added that a revenue analysis was conducted to estimate the overall financial impact of the revised fee schedule. Using prior year data for building permits and planning fees, the analysis applied both the current and proposed fee schedules to show potential changes in revenue. Under the proposed schedule, building permit revenue could increase from approximately \$2.3 million to \$2.7 million, nearly a 20% rise. Planning fee revenue could increase by about 25%, from just under \$300,000 to nearly \$360,000. He emphasized that these figures are illustrative, based on prior year activity, and actual revenue will vary depending on factors such as growth, the number of permits processed, and future development activity. Therefore, the projected amounts should not be considered guaranteed revenue but rather a contextual estimate assuming other conditions remain constant.

Mayor Ramsey expressed appreciation for the thorough analysis, noting that many cities will need a paradigm shift to adopt such a detailed, data-driven approach to justify permit fees down to the precise time and cost involved. She commended South Jordan for being proactive in establishing a sound, transparent process. She requested a printed copy of the presentation to keep for reference, explaining that she and City Manager Lewis will be attending a meeting at the governor's mansion with a group discussing the future of housing and development. Since fees are expected to be a topic, she wants to have this detailed data on hand to demonstrate how South Jordan manages fees effectively and as an example that other cities could follow. She emphasized that this would be a valuable educational tool and support for the city's approach.

Council Member Zander requested clarification on the revenue slide, asking if the approximately \$2.7 million in building permit revenue reflects net revenue to the city after covering all personnel costs calculated down to the minute and the penny through the cost analysis, or if that figure represents gross revenue before those costs.

Mr. Philpot clarified that the \$2.7 million figure does not represent profit. Instead, it reflects the total revenue generated by the fees based on the cost analysis. Essentially, it shows the amount

collected to cover the costs associated with providing the services, calculated down to the minute, rather than a surplus or net income.

Council Member Zander confirmed her understanding, noting that the term “revenue” here refers only to covering the city’s costs, not generating profit.

Mr. Philpot replied, yes, we’ll generate that revenue, but the intent is to show that amount essentially covers the costs associated with providing those services, not profit. It’s about recovering the expenses involved in processing the permits and fees.

City Attorney Ryan Loose added that legally, we can only charge fees that correspond to the actual work done. That principle really guides how we set fees across the board.

Mr. Philpot explained that staffing and departmental functions do not fluctuate directly with growth, as there are fixed expenses that remain even if building permits decline significantly. He noted that the city would not furlough staff during such periods. He emphasized the importance of accounting for revenues carefully to ensure that any surplus funds are retained to offset future expenses. The purpose of the analysis is to demonstrate the expected offsetting revenue based on current cost assumptions.

Council Member Harris expressed support for the updated fee structure, emphasizing the importance of accurately covering the costs associated with permit processing. He noted that if fees are insufficient, the city must cover those costs through the general fund, which could lead to higher taxes for all residents. He stressed that permit applicants should fairly bear the costs related to their applications and appreciated the thorough approach taken to ensure fees correspond to actual expenses.

Council Member Johnson noted that cities often encounter financial trouble when they rely on the general fund to cover all expenses without properly accounting for or recouping costs through appropriate fees.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the proposed fees are included in the tentative budget.

CFO Naidu responded that the proposed fees are not yet included in the tentative budget but are intended to be incorporated before the public hearing.

Council Member Zander asked if there is any state mandate requiring cities to justify fees down to the minute, or if South Jordan is simply being proactive in this approach.

Mayor Ramsey responded that South Jordan is ahead of the game. Although there is no current state mandate requiring this detailed fee justification, there has been ongoing discussion and proposals over the last three legislative sessions aimed at eliminating cities' ability to collect impact fees altogether. This thorough process positions the city well amid such challenges.

Attorney Loose added that while the legislative proposals target impact fees specifically, non-impact fees, such as building permit fees, still must cover the actual cost of services provided.

For example, inspectors who review and inspect houses must be paid, and it would be unfair for taxpayers to continue subsidizing those inspections.

Mayor Ramsey noted that the legislature has previously proposed eliminating certain fees, but emphasized that not everyone should bear the cost of specific services, reinforcing the importance of fee structures that fairly allocate expenses to those who directly use or benefit from them.

Attorney Loose explained that in the housing sector, fees are a major topic of discussion. He noted that while some reports claim fees make up about 30% of the cost of a house, the actual impact depends on how the data is presented. He cautioned that removing governmental fees entirely to reduce housing costs is often oversimplified and doesn't fully reflect the true cost factors.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification on whether the City is being required by the legislature to conduct this level of detailed fee analysis.

CFO Naidu clarified that, no, the City is not being required by the legislature to conduct this level of detailed analysis. He emphasized that this approach has been the City's preference for a long time, reflecting a proactive commitment to transparency and accuracy in setting fees.

Attorney Loose explained that, even without conducting a formal study, the City would still be required to demonstrate the justification for its fees if they were ever challenged. By proactively conducting detailed cost and process analyses, the City is better positioned to defend its fees. He noted that challenges to fees do occur, but with expert-backed data and a transparent methodology already in place, the City is well-prepared to respond.

Mr. Philpot clarified that there will always be some level of generalization in fee structures due to the nature of averaging across different user groups. While this ensures broad equity, it doesn't create exact fairness for every individual scenario. He emphasized that the City's ordinance, similar to impact fee statutes, already allows for flexibility by permitting applicants to present data to justify an alternative fee if their situation is unique. He also noted that although there's no current legislative mandate requiring this level of fee justification, pressure is increasingly coming from auditors. Several neighboring cities have engaged in similar studies after audit findings raised concerns about lacking documentation for how fees were determined. The State Auditor's Office has also weighed in, signaling a growing emphasis on accountability and transparency in municipal fee structures.

Council Member Harris expressed concern about the potential for legislative action that could eliminate cities' ability to collect building permit and planning fees. He emphasized that the combined revenue from these sources, over \$3 million, represents actual costs tied to services the City must provide. If those fees were prohibited, it would effectively become an unfunded mandate, requiring the City to raise taxes to cover the same expenses. He stressed that these obligations and associated costs don't disappear just because the revenue source is removed. Moreover, legislative expectations for prompt service delivery remain high. He underscored the importance of policymakers and voters understanding the real-world financial implications of

such decisions, noting that the costs must be paid somehow, either through user-based fees or general taxation.

Mayor Ramsey noted that this issue is part of a broader conversation that the League has been actively engaged in for several years. She explained that water and sewer districts are also facing similar legislative challenges. She referenced a specific instance from two years ago when Senator McKay proposed a bill that would have eliminated the ability of water districts to charge any impact fees. This reflects a growing trend of proposals aimed at restricting local entities' ability to recover costs through fees, highlighting the need for continued vigilance and advocacy.

Council Member McGuire expressed appreciation for the foresight of those who implemented priority-based budgeting in South Jordan years ago. He emphasized that this approach laid the essential groundwork for the City to now deeply understand its costs and appropriately align fees with actual services provided. He noted that while government is not structured to make a profit like private businesses, the City can, and should, strive to break even by ensuring that those who incur costs are the ones who pay them.

City Manager Lewis stated that this type of detailed cost analysis is applied to every City program. He gave the example of tracking the exact cost when a crew is sent out to fix a light pole, noting that they account for the personnel, equipment, and time involved. He emphasized that this level of tracking ensures the City operates in a fiscally responsible manner.

Council Member Zander asked whether the City plans to make the fee analysis publicly accessible on the website, rather than only sharing it upon request. She suggested that offering a "deeper dive" tab where residents can review the detailed breakdown would reflect positively on the City and highlight the proactive approach staff have taken, especially since most cities are not yet doing this kind of comprehensive analysis.

Mr. Philpot explained that while much of the fee analysis data is public, some details are sensitive. Because of this, many communities hesitate to publish the full detailed data online. Instead, they typically keep the information at a higher, more general level in publicly shared studies to balance transparency with privacy concerns.

Council Member Zander asked how much detailed information the city shares when residents or applicants challenge their fees.

City Manager Lewis responded that if someone wants to challenge a fee, the city is willing to sit down and review the details as thoroughly as needed. He referenced City Attorney Loose's point that when fees are challenged, they go through the analysis carefully with the concerned parties.

Attorney Loose noted that while the city doesn't often face formal challenges, some jurisdictions do end up in court over fees. He expressed caution about broadly publishing detailed fee analyses online. He mentioned that while the detailed data won't be directly posted on the city's website, it remains public and accessible through meetings and records requests.

## **F. Discussion Item:**

### **F.1. R-M text amendments. (*By Long-Range Planner, Joe Moss*)**

Long-Range Planner Joe Moss had a handout of a online survey (Attachment C). Planner Moss reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment D), explaining that in February, they explored how design standards could shape and influence R-M style (residential multifamily) development. They discussed creating a “menu” of design options to incentivize certain features. The goal for tonight’s meeting was to review these potential options with the council to gauge priorities and help weigh them appropriately in the draft. He noted that R-M zones may be separated from other residential zones due to their distinct development patterns. For example, townhomes require different regulations than single-family homes, and small-lot single-family homes may have different setback and design needs compared to larger lots. The current draft framework is organized into two main sections, with the first covering purpose and applicability, and the second focusing on standards. The aim is to make the document more visual and user-friendly, and shared a preview of the work in progress, emphasizing it is not yet complete.

Council Member Harris asked if the design options presented are the current standards.

Planner Moss explained that some of the design options are current standards while others are modified. They are working on separating standards for different development types, such as small-lot single-family homes versus townhomes. Currently, the city lacks specific design criteria for anything beyond single-family homes, especially for Planned Developments (PDs). Although there are no undeveloped R-M zones currently, this framework would provide a useful zoning tool, allowing developers to start with a clear set of standards focused on quality development that the city supports.

Mayor Ramsey asked for clarification that there are currently no undeveloped R-M zones within the city. Planner Moss confirmed that while there are a few very small, leftover parcels zoned R-M, they are minimal and not really available for development.

Director of Planning Steven Schaefermeyer clarified that while the city has undeveloped planned developments with R-M as the base zone, there are no undeveloped areas zoned strictly as R-M. He noted that other zones, such as BHMU, do allow for additional residential development. He also referenced recent projects like The Rise and the Jerry Salt project, mentioning that despite the extensive work done, the Jerry Salt project will not proceed. He added that although the city is actively developing, there are currently no new applications being submitted specifically for R-M zones.

Council Member Harris asked if, despite the extensive work being done, the city is not anticipating any new applications for R-M zones in the near future.

Director Schaefermeyer responded that the city does anticipate future applications, particularly for developments like townhomes, which are common. He noted that staff often directs applicants accordingly. He added that the purpose of this discussion is to gauge the council’s comfort level. Although the zone has been changed, it doesn’t mean new projects will suddenly appear everywhere the R-M zone exists, as most of those areas are already developed. He



explained that future projects would likely involve rezone requests, and if applicants are not comfortable with pursuing a planned development, staff can guide them to consider the R-M zone as an alternative, which might be less complex than going through the planned development process.

Mayor Ramsey clarified for the benefit of all viewers and readers that these standards and processes do not apply to the master-planned community of Daybreak, and may or may not apply to other upcoming master plan developments.

Director Schaefermeyer explained that the BHMU zone serves as a good example of existing residential entitlements that are not zoned R-M. While there are no undeveloped R-M zones available, which would typically be the primary tool for rezones, there are numerous planned developments already in place, including large ones like Daybreak.

Planner Moss explained that they have been putting together different elements based on the feedback the council provided last time regarding what is most important to them. He noted that the current slide is a draft framework and that things might shift depending on how the council prioritizes the various aspects. He described the approach as having two options: on the left side are items that would be required as mandatory standards, while on the right side are items that would be incentivized, meaning developers could choose from those options. The goal is to create a menu of options where developers can select from various features and accumulate points to meet a certain threshold, ensuring the inclusion of key items that promote high-quality development. He highlighted some of the important points, such as managing transitions and compatibility of scale, especially in areas where townhomes or multifamily housing meet single-family neighborhoods. This could include requirements to limit the number of stories or restrict certain features like second-story roof decks to soften the scale differences. He also mentioned screening, which would involve a combination of walls and shade trees to create a layered buffer that provides privacy between different types of uses. He then invited the council to provide input on the relative importance of these items, asking them to rank each from zero to ten, where zero means the item is not needed in the code and ten means it is absolutely essential. He emphasized that the ranking is not a zero-sum game, so one item being less important than another does not necessarily mean it will be excluded, but it might receive fewer points.

Council Member Harris expressed some reservations about the process, acknowledging that while the concept behind the survey is good, he is uncertain about how the information gathered will be used. He shared his preference for open public voting and discussion when making recommendations, feeling that this survey approach feels somewhat uncertain and risks leading to closed or less transparent decision-making.

Planner Moss clarified that the results of the survey would be included in the public notes and minutes provided to City Recorder Anna Crookston, emphasizing that this is part of a public meeting and the process remains transparent. He added that the purpose of the exercise is simply to give staff a sense of which elements the council wants to weigh more heavily than others. Due to limited time, they opted not to dive into each item individually, instead grouping them together for efficiency.

Council Member Harris expressed that if he were a resident watching the meeting, he would likely feel frustrated and confused, unsure about what council members were doing, how they were voting, or what the implications of those actions might be. He emphasized the importance of open discussion to ensure transparency and public understanding.

Director Schaefermeyer clarified that the intention of the exercise was not to bypass open discussion or to present a finalized code based solely on the results. He emphasized that staff still wanted to have meaningful dialogue with the council and that the survey-style ranking was meant to guide early drafting efforts based on council input. He acknowledged the concern raised and said if the process felt uncomfortable or inappropriate, they were more than willing to stop, regroup, and take a different approach. The goal was to avoid investing significant time drafting something that might not reflect the council's priorities, and instead ensure their direction was properly understood from the outset.

Council Member Harris expressed discomfort with participating in the prioritization exercise without first having a full discussion. He acknowledged the intent behind the exercise, relating it to prioritization in budgeting, but emphasized that, unlike in previous instances where discussion preceded input, this process lacked that open exchange. While he recognized the results wouldn't be final, he believed they would still influence the direction of the code development. Because of that concern, and the absence of prior dialogue on the individual items, he stated he would not be participating in the ranking.

Mayor Ramsey asked the council whether they preferred to continue with the prioritization exercise as planned or to pause and reschedule in order to first have a more in-depth discussion. She acknowledged the concerns raised and emphasized the importance of making sure everyone is comfortable with the process moving forward.

Council Member Shelton acknowledged the value in the conversations the Council has had, noting that while staff likely gets a general sense of their priorities through discussion, he understands the staff's intent to try and quantify those priorities more clearly. However, he expressed support for stepping back from the current exercise, especially out of respect for Council Member Harris's discomfort. He suggested it may be better to find a different approach to communicate the Council's preferences to staff.

Council Member Zander shared that she sees value in the exercise because it gives all six members of the Council, including those who may be less vocal in open discussion, an opportunity to express their individual opinions. She acknowledged Council Member Harris's concerns but proposed a possible compromise: having a full discussion first, and then allowing each member to share their individual stance. This way, staff still receives clear direction from all Council members, not just the most outspoken ones, which she believes is important. She concluded by affirming that she agrees with the intent behind gathering everyone's input.

Mayor Ramsey emphasized that the Council typically operates by engaging in open discussion, where each member is given a chance to voice their perspective. She acknowledged the intent behind gathering individual input quickly, such as through ranking or surveys, but reinforced that, as a body, their process involves hearing each other out. Through discussion, members often

gain new understanding or see different viewpoints, and from there, the Council tends to arrive at a shared direction. She pointed out that while members may begin with differing views, it's the collective dialogue that shapes the Council's final stance, and that approach has served them well historically.

Council Member Johnson expressed that evaluating priorities in the abstract is challenging because each development project is so context-dependent. She noted that factors such as location, whether a property is near a railroad or a busy road versus being more interior, significantly affect what the community might need from a project. Additionally, the intended demographic for a project plays a role; for example, design elements for a senior housing development would differ from those suitable for families with young children. Because of this variability, she felt it's difficult to assign rigid priorities without knowing specific project details, and emphasized that each case should be assessed individually.

Council Member Shelton acknowledged Council Member Johnson's point but emphasized the challenge of creating a code that applies broadly. He explained that the city needs a code that serves the entire community, rather than tailoring standards to individual projects, because the code must provide consistent guidance citywide.

Council Member Johnson agreed, noting that the master development process is designed to address those unique project circumstances.

Council Member McGuire emphasized that the frequent use of development agreements allows the city to tailor development projects specifically to their unique circumstances.

Council Member Shelton noted that many projects don't come before the legislative body but are approved by the planning commission if they meet existing code requirements.

Council Member McGuire added that if the council is going to postpone this discussion to fully dive into each item and hear everyone's opinions, it would essentially turn into a study session focused solely on the R-M code, which would require a dedicated meeting.

Mayor Ramsey shared that she feels the same way and believes this topic deserves much more time and attention to ensure it's done right. She expressed concern that the council doesn't have adequate time tonight to fully address what's needed, including the information staff requires and the decisions the council must make. While understanding staff's need for input, she acknowledged this format isn't working well and recommended setting a future meeting dedicated to having a thorough conversation on this issue.

City Manager Lewis suggested sending pre-meeting materials to the council members in advance for their review. This way, the council can come prepared, and the city can dedicate a full meeting solely to discussing the R-M code and design standards.

Mayor Ramsey expressed appreciation for the work staff is doing and emphasized the importance of getting clear direction from the council. She acknowledged that the topic deserves more time than what was available and that the reality of limited time means it's best to schedule

more focused discussion later. She believes dedicating more time will lead to better outcomes and thanked everyone for their efforts.

**Council Member McGuire motioned to recess the City Council Study Meeting and move to City Council Executive Closed Session to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property and to discuss the character, professional competence, physical or mental health of an individual. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion; vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

*RECESS CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING AND MOVE TO EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION*

**G. Executive Closed Sessions:**

G.1. Discussion of the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property.

**Council Member McGuire motioned to recess the Executive Closed Session and City Council Study Meeting and return to discuss the character, professional competence, physical or mental health of an individual after the Combined City Council & Redevelopment Agency Meeting. Council Member Zander seconded the motion; vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

**Council Member Johnson motioned to adjourn the Combined City Council & Redevelopment Agency Meeting and move back into Executive Closed Session to discuss the character, professional competence, physical or mental health of an individual. Council Member Harris seconded the motion; vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

G.2. Discuss the character, professional competence, physical or mental health of an individual.

*ADJOURN EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION AND RETURN TO CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING*

**Council Member McGuire motioned to adjourn the Executive Closed Session and return to the City Council Study Meeting. Council Member Zander seconded the motion; vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

**Council Member Johnson motioned to adjourn the May 6, 2025 City Council Study Meeting. Council Member Shelton seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The May 6, 2025 City Council Meeting adjourned at 10:17 p.m.