

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

MARCH 3, 2026

Present: Mayor Dawn R. 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, Assistance City Manager Jason Rasmussen, Assistant City Manager Don Tingey, City Attorney Ryan Loose, Police Chief Jeff Carr, Director of Administrative Services Melinda Seager, Director of Human Resources Teresa Robinson, Fire Chief Chris Dawson, Director of Recreation Janell Payne, CFO Sunil Naidu, Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece, Director of Engineering/City Engineer Brad Klavano, Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison, PIO/Communication Manager Rachael Van Cleave, CTO Matthew Davis, Senior System Administrator Phill Brown, City Recorder Anna Crookston, Water Quality Technician John Rose, Associate Director of Director of Public Works Joey Collins

Absent:

Other (Electronic) Attendance:

Other (In-Person) Attendance: Alan Domonoske, Stetson Bassett, Jonathan Franklin, Cordelia Franklin

4:35 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

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

Mayor Ramsey welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

B. Invocation – By Council Member Jason McGuire

Council Member McGuire offered the invocation.

C. Mayor and Council Coordination

Mayor Ramsey reported that significant legislative decisions remain pending within the next few days, noting that committees have extended their meetings beyond the originally anticipated deadline. While the expectation had been for committee work to conclude, sessions have been prolonged, and the timeline for hearing bills within each legislative body is also nearing its deadline. She emphasized the uncertainty of whether all items will be addressed in time, describing the final scheduled day as particularly critical. Additionally, she noted that a new bill was introduced late the previous evening, adding to the workload and complexity of the process. She added that several key legislative measures are facing uncertainty following recent committee actions. She noted that the transportation omnibus bill failed in committee but is expected to be

reconsidered through alternative procedural means. In contrast, the land use omnibus bill is unlikely to move forward. She also indicated that efforts are anticipated to revive the property tax bill. She emphasized that multiple bills previously expected to advance smoothly through committee did not do so, highlighting the evolving and unpredictable nature of the legislative process.

Council Member Zander inquired whether the challenges faced by certain bills was due to ULCT being more organized.

Mayor Ramsey explained that some committee outcomes were unexpected, particularly for bills that had progressed to a point where there was little to no opposition. She noted that despite prior efforts to position these bills for approval, they did not pass as anticipated. Contributing factors included limited attendance at committee meetings, with decisions in some cases made by only a small number of members. She also highlighted that scheduling conflicts impacted participation, citing an instance where a bill sponsor was unable to present due to being engaged elsewhere, resulting in the committee declining to hear the bill. She indicated that the future of such measures remains uncertain.

City Attorney Ryan Loose noted that the land use bill in question was developed by a task force over approximately 11 months, involving collaboration among roughly 30 participants. He indicated that while there are certain elements of the bill that raise concerns, there are also many aspects that are viewed favorably.

Mayor Ramsey expressed concern regarding the timing of bill introductions and deliberations, noting that delaying discussion until the final week of the legislative session creates significant risk. She stated that measures widely expected to pass were not addressed earlier, which has contributed to uncertainty and unfavorable outcomes. She indicated that this approach has not proven to be effective thus far.

Council Member Johnson observed that the legislative process appears to be significantly behind schedule this year, noting a general sense that timelines are not being met as expected.

Mayor Ramsey agreed that a substantial amount of legislation remains to be heard and decided within a very limited timeframe. She noted that this compressed schedule may require procedural adjustments, such as suspending standard rules, in order to address the remaining items.

City Attorney Loose described the legislative pace as inconsistent, alternating between slower periods and rapid activity. He noted that during these more intense periods, only a limited number of items are addressed, but they are completed within a short timeframe.

Council Member McGuire noted the high volume of legislative activity, indicating that over 1,000 bills have been drafted, with more than 600 formally numbered, contributing to the overall workload and pace of the session.

Mayor Ramsey noted the large volume of legislation makes it unrealistic for any individual to review all bills in detail. She emphasized the importance of stakeholder input, explaining that

decision-makers rely on feedback to identify priorities and understand which measures are supported or opposed.

City Attorney Loose noted that due to the council's strong relationships with legislators, there is active communication on pending issues. He shared that a legislator recently consulted with him to review a committee agenda in detail, seeking input on various items and the council's position. He emphasized that legislators are taking time to engage directly and gather feedback, reflecting the value of these established relationships.

Mayor Ramsey stated that established relationships with legislators increase the likelihood that the council's input will be considered. She expressed appreciation for the council's engagement, particularly in monitoring action alerts and responding when outreach is needed, noting that additional opportunities for input may arise. She reported that, following the recent LPC meeting, most tracked legislation was in an acceptable position, with no immediate concerns. However, she emphasized the need for continued vigilance and timely response if circumstances change, as amendments to certain provisions could significantly impact outcomes. She also clarified that when a bill is "circled," it is temporarily held or paused from further consideration, allowing time for additional review before proceeding.

City Attorney Loose provided an overview of the legislative process related to bill "circling" at the state level. He explained that a bill sponsor may move to uncircle a bill, introduce a substitute version, and then re-circle it to allow additional time for review. This process signals to stakeholders that a new version is available and that further consideration is intended. He noted that in some cases, circling a bill may also indicate that it will not advance further. As an example, he referenced SB 211, stating that after significant opposition, the bill was circled and is expected to remain inactive.

Mayor Ramsey clarified that a motion to circle a bill can be made by members of the legislative body, not just the bill sponsor. She shared an example where a legislator requested to circle a bill, and when the sponsor declined, a motion was made and voted on by the body to proceed with circling. She emphasized that legislative actions can change quickly and encouraged Council Members to closely monitor developments over the next several days, noting that any need for engagement would likely be time-sensitive and significant.

Council Member Zander requested a detailed post-session legislative recap, including feedback on which legislators were particularly responsive to the City's concerns. She expressed interest in recognizing and thanking those individuals to strengthen relationships and support future collaboration.

D. Discussion/Review of City Council Meeting

Public Hearing:

- Ordinance 2026-06

Historical Chapel Development Land Use Public Hearing Items:

- Resolution R2026-03

- Zoning Ordinance 2026-02-Z

Park Place Phase 5 Development Land Use Public Hearing Items:

- Resolution R2026-04

- Resolution R2026-05
- Zoning Ordinance 2026-03-Z

Council Members and staff discussed upcoming agenda items for the regular meeting, including a public hearing on the Historic Chapel (“Purple Church”) development proposal. Mayor Ramsey anticipated significant public participation, noting prior feedback from the Planning Commission and submitted comments has been largely supportive, with some questions and requests for clarification. An update was provided regarding ongoing efforts to finalize a shared parking agreement, and staff indicated that options would be available depending on the outcome. The Council discussed the possibility of approving the project with conditions if necessary, and City Attorney Loose confirmed that appropriate language could be drafted to support that approach. The Council also reviewed the Park Place Phase Five development proposal, including clarification on zoning history and site details. Questions were raised regarding map labeling and property addressing, which staff clarified as parcel-based designations rather than established street names. Staff discussed an ordinance to repeal a section of City code related to specialty tobacco business licenses. This action follows prior Council direction to evaluate such businesses. It was explained that the proposed change would prevent renewal of specialty tobacco licenses, while not affecting general retail establishments such as convenience stores. Council Members discussed licensing authority and confirmed that business licenses are subject to change by policy. Staff noted that the affected businesses would receive advance notice if the ordinance is adopted. Additional discussion included legislative updates, potential public comment regarding canal water, and general coordination of meeting topics. Overall, the Council expressed readiness to proceed with the scheduled agenda while acknowledging areas requiring further clarification or follow-up.

E. Presentation Item:

- E.1. Pure SoJo Project Update. (By Director of Public Works, Raymond Garrison & Deputy City Engineer, Jeremy Nielson)

Director of Public Works, Raymond Garrison provided an overview of the Pure SoJo initiative, including its progress, timeline, and next steps. He introduced members of the project team and consultants who have supported the effort, including Alan Domonoske and Stetson Bassett who are representatives of Carollo Engineering, and City staff Water Quality Technician John Ros and Associate Director of Director of Public Works Joey Collins. He explained that the purpose of the presentation was to highlight the success of the program to date and to discuss the ongoing feasibility study for a full-scale treatment plant. He noted that staff will be seeking Council direction to finalize the study and continue advancing the project.

Director Garrison reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment A). He outlined the program’s goals, accomplishments, and upcoming decisions. He explained that the program was designed to diversify the City’s water supply by developing a renewable, sustainable, and drought-tolerant local source of drinking water in a cost-effective and responsible manner. He noted that the project has successfully initiated statewide discussions on direct potable reuse (DPR), positioning South Jordan as a leader in this area and contributing to regulatory progress in Utah. He highlighted several accomplishments, including being the first facility in the state to receive a DPR operating

permit, development of sampling protocols that could serve as a model for future projects, and significant public outreach through tours and presentations. The facility has treated over 26 million gallons of water and collected more than 9,000 samples. The program has also received multiple awards and national recognition, and has attracted interest from local, national, and international organizations. He explained that the pilot program is approaching the end of its current agreement with Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District, which expires January 1, 2027. Staff is seeking Council direction on how to proceed, including whether to extend operations temporarily, remove the equipment, or explore opportunities for reuse or transfer of the demonstration system. He noted that while a short-term extension may be possible, long-term continuation at the current site is unlikely due to planned facility expansion. He also indicated that options for repurposing or transferring the equipment are being explored, though its limited scale and condition may affect viability.

Council Member Harris expressed support for exploring opportunities to repurpose the Pure SoJo demonstration equipment once it is no longer needed by the city. He noted that water resources are interconnected across communities and suggested that if another municipality in Utah could benefit from the equipment, it would be worthwhile pursuing that option rather than disposing of it.

Mayor Ramsey supported the idea of repurposing the Pure SoJo equipment to another municipality, noting that doing so would help continue the broader conversation around water reuse. She emphasized that while South Jordan initiated this effort, expanding participation across other communities would strengthen statewide progress and maintain momentum toward long-term water sustainability goals.

Council Member McGuire emphasized the importance of continuing education and outreach efforts related to water reuse. He noted a recent discussion at a meeting, that broader recognition of programs like Pure SoJo has not yet fully developed at the state level. He expressed support for continuing efforts, whether through operation or other means, to promote awareness and understanding of water reuse as a critical component of future water planning.

Council Member Johnson asked what additional options are available to continue advancing water reuse efforts beyond the current Pure SoJo pilot program, and whether there are next steps or alternative approaches to maintain momentum once the demonstration phase concludes.

Director Garrison explained that staff have explored potential options for continuing the Pure SoJo program locally but identified limited viable locations within the city to relocate or operate the pilot system. He noted that the primary options moving forward include partnering with another municipality or organization that may have interest in using the equipment or evaluating whether there is any resale or market value for the system. He clarified that beyond the Pure SoJo pilot program, the city is actively pursuing a feasibility study for a full-scale water reuse facility. He noted that this study is being partially funded through a Bureau of Reclamation grant, covering approximately 50% of the cost. He explained that while short-term operation of the pilot system may be extended for an additional period, any extension would be temporary and subject to a limited notice period for removal. He emphasized that the focus moving forward is on evaluating

long-term implementation through the feasibility study, which will guide the City's next steps in advancing water reuse efforts.

Mayor Ramsey highlighted that the feasibility study for a full-scale water reuse facility is supported by a federal grant secured through congressional efforts. She noted that this funding, obtained with assistance from federal partners, represents a significant achievement and enables the city to advance planning for next steps in the Pure SoJo initiative.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification on the ownership and value of the Pure SoJo pilot equipment, specifically whether the city owns the system outright and what its estimated value may be.

Director Garrison confirmed that the city owns the Pure SoJo pilot equipment. He indicated that the system was originally procured at an estimated cost of approximately \$1 million, noting that it consists of highly specialized components designed for a specific water reuse application.

Council Member Zander asked whether there are any conditions or obligations tied to the grant funding for the equipment.

Mayor Ramsey clarified that the grant funding received for the Pure SoJo project was not used to purchase the pilot equipment. Instead, the grant serves as a cost-sharing match to fund the feasibility study for a potential full-scale water reuse facility, supporting the City's next phase of planning.

Council Member Zander asked how the Pure SoJo pilot equipment was originally funded. Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen clarified that the Pure SoJo pilot equipment was initially funded through an appropriation from the State. Council Member Zander asked whether any repayment or obligations were tied to the state appropriation used to purchase the Pure SoJo equipment. Assistant City Manager Rasmussen confirmed that there are no repayment requirements, and the equipment is fully owned by the City without additional conditions attached.

Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment A). He provided an update on the feasibility study for a full-scale water reuse facility. He explained that multiple alternatives were evaluated, including various treatment technologies, use of Jordan River water, and a no-project option relying on existing regional providers. Based on analysis of cost and performance factors, staff identified a preferred alternative utilizing the same treatment technology currently used in the Pure SoJo demonstration facility. He noted that the next phase of the study includes environmental and cultural compliance, as well as preliminary design work. A key component of this phase is selecting a suitable site for the facility. He explained that initial consideration was given to locating the facility at the Jordan Basin Water Reclamation site; however, space limitations require a different approach. The current concept includes a pump station at the reclamation facility, a transmission line to South Jordan, and development of a separate approximately five-acre site within the city for the treatment plant. He continued the presentation by illustrating the conceptual layout for a full-scale water reuse system. He explained that the concept includes a pump station located at the Jordan Basin Water Reclamation Facility, which would convey treated water through a transmission line into South Jordan. From there, the water would be delivered to a separate treatment facility within the city. He further detailed the

proposed concept for a full-scale water reuse system, explaining that it would include a pump station at the Jordan Basin Water Reclamation Facility and a transmission line extending through Riverton into South Jordan. He noted that site selection has focused on areas near major transmission infrastructure, particularly around 11400 South, as well as locations within Zone 1 for optimal system integration. One potential site identified is near Riverfront Park, in proximity to existing development such as Lifetime Fitness. He presented a conceptual layout of the facility, noting that while the design could be adjusted, the current concept shows multiple structures for operational efficiency. He explained that the facility would initially be designed to treat approximately 3.4 million gallons per day, with the ability to expand to 6.8 million gallons per day in the future. This capacity would represent roughly 7% of projected summer demand and up to 50% of winter demand, providing a meaningful contribution to the City's overall water supply portfolio. He noted that the projected treatment capacity percentages apply to the City's overall water demand, not just Zone 1. He added that integrating the treated water into the broader City water system would require additional infrastructure, including pumping and transmission improvements, to distribute the water throughout South Jordan.

Council Member McGuire asked for clarification regarding the treatment process, specifically whether the water delivered from the Jordan Basin Water Reclamation Facility would already have undergone treatment prior to arriving at the proposed South Jordan purification facility.

Deputy City Engineer Nielson confirmed that the water would already be treated wastewater at that stage, and the South Jordan facility would provide the additional advanced purification necessary to meet drinking water standards.

Council Member Zander asked how purified water from a future full-scale Pure SoJo facility would integrate with the City's existing water supply system and whether additional plumbing infrastructure would be required for individual homes. She also confirmed her understanding that the city would still rely on Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District for the majority of its water supply.

Deputy City Engineer Nielson explained that purified water from a future full-scale Pure SoJo facility would be integrated into the City's existing transmission line system. He clarified that no changes would be required at the residential level, as the same distribution pipes currently serving homes would continue to be used. He noted that the primary infrastructure changes would occur within the major transmission and pumping systems, where the purified water would be introduced and blended into the City's broader water supply network.

Council Member Zander asked if any other communities in the United States are implementing systems.

Alan Domonoske explained that direct potable reuse is an emerging technology currently being implemented in only a limited number of facilities nationwide. He noted that Phoenix, Arizona, is in the planning and design stages for a large-scale advanced purification facility intended to address future water supply needs. He further explained that there are currently two operating or near-operational direct potable reuse facilities in the United States that closely resemble the Pure SoJo concept. These facilities are located in Big Spring, Texas, and El Paso, Texas. He noted that many more communities utilize indirect potable reuse systems, where purified water passes

through an environmental buffer, such as a reservoir or groundwater basin, before entering the drinking water system.

Council Member Johnson asked how the proposed development and related infrastructure improvements would affect costs to residents, specifically questioning whether the additional pumping requirements and infrastructure would lower, maintain, or increase costs for existing residents.

Deputy City Engineer Nielson responded that staff had evaluated multiple infrastructure alternatives and compared both capital and operational costs associated with each option. He explained that the preferred alternative, identified on the comparison charts presented to the Council, included an estimated upfront capital cost of approximately \$142 million for the transmission pipeline, related piping infrastructure, and treatment facility. He stated that the presentation also identified estimated annual operations and maintenance costs associated with the preferred option. He noted that staff reviewed several alternative scenarios during the analysis process, but the preferred alternative represented the lowest-cost treatment option among those evaluated. He then indicated that additional details regarding the analysis would be provided by Director Garrison as part of the continued presentation.

Director Garrison acknowledged that the estimated \$142 million capital cost represented a significant expense and explained that part of the feasibility study process involved identifying potential grant funding opportunities to help offset those costs. He stated that Carollo Engineers had identified possible funding sources that could provide up to approximately \$50 million in combined grant assistance, which could help reduce the financial burden associated with the project. He further explained that the proposed system would help the city gain greater control over long-term water rates and reduce exposure to future rate increases imposed by Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District. He stated that Jordan Valley's rate structure is heavily influenced by peak demand usage and that South Jordan's reliance on Jordan Valley water contributes to higher peak demand charges. He noted that developing additional infrastructure and operational flexibility would allow the city to better manage peak demand by controlling when portions of the system are activated, thereby helping regulate future costs. He also explained that the proposal would not require additional imported water purchases and would instead help manage existing supply and operational demands more efficiently.

Mayor Ramsey asked whether staff had explored the possibility of utilizing funding from the proposed statewide drinking water infrastructure fee program to assist with the project. She noted that while the intent of the funding mechanism may primarily target other types of communities, South Jordan residents would still contribute financially to the program. She questioned whether the City had evaluated whether the proposed water infrastructure project could potentially qualify for any portion of those funds in order to help offset project costs.

Director Garrison responded that he believes the proposed project could potentially qualify for funding through the statewide drinking water infrastructure program. He explained that when discussions regarding the funding program first began, the city submitted a list of projects, including both growth-related and maintenance-related infrastructure needs, in order to ensure South Jordan projects were included for consideration. He stated that, at the time those submissions

were made, there were no formal stipulations or restrictions regarding which projects could or could not be included on the funding list. As a result, the city submitted projects identified through its master planning efforts, and he indicated that this particular project could likely be added to that list for future consideration.

City Manager Lewis stated that the proposed statewide water infrastructure funding formula would have a significant financial impact on South Jordan residents. He explained that, based on the formula being discussed at the state level, South Jordan residents would collectively contribute approximately \$54 million annually into the statewide fund through water fees. He stated that the proposed calculation would require cities to charge approximately \$160-170 per connection, per month, based on a formula using 0.0015% of the adjusted median gross income of \$134,000 multiplied by approximately 27,000 utility connections within the City. He noted that this would result in South Jordan being required to collect more than \$54 million each year in additional water-related fees to participate in the program and potentially qualify for funding assistance.

Mayor Ramsey noted that the estimated annual amount South Jordan residents would be required to contribute under the proposed statewide water infrastructure funding formula would be nearly three and a half to four times greater than the amount the city currently collects in property taxes. She expressed concern regarding the scale of the proposed fee structure and its potential financial impact on residents.

City Manager Lewis noted that discussions regarding the proposed statewide water infrastructure funding program were still ongoing. He stated that the proposal raises broader considerations about whether South Jordan could instead implement a more localized funding approach that would allow revenues generated from residents to remain within the city and directly support South Jordan infrastructure projects. He suggested that a local fee structure could potentially generate revenue sufficient to support bonding for major water infrastructure improvements without requiring residents to pay the substantially higher fees contemplated under the proposed statewide program. He explained that such an approach could allow the city to retain greater local control over the funds while avoiding the need to contribute large amounts into a statewide system to later compete for access to those funds.

Mayor Ramsey stated that her experience serving on the drinking water board over the past four years has provided her with familiarity regarding the types of infrastructure projects being discussed at the state level and the needs those projects are intended to address. She acknowledged that broader policy discussions remain regarding whether all communities should contribute financially to projects that may not directly benefit them. She stated that she would like the city to continue exploring available options and funding eligibility related to the proposed statewide program. She explained that if the legislative session results in mandatory participation and contributions from South Jordan residents, the city should position itself to qualify for and recover funding through eligible infrastructure projects. Conversely, if participation is not ultimately required, she suggested the city may want to further evaluate local funding alternatives and other approaches for addressing future infrastructure needs.

City Manager Lewis stated that if participation in the proposed statewide water infrastructure funding program ultimately remains optional rather than mandatory, the city could potentially

pursue a much lower local funding rate over a longer period of time. He contrasted that approach with the state proposal, which he said appears designed to generate approximately \$150 million within three years. He expressed concern that South Jordan residents would bear a substantial financial burden under the proposed statewide formula while having limited opportunity to directly access those funds for local projects. He suggested that a more gradual local funding approach over a longer timeframe could be more manageable for residents while still allowing the city to address its infrastructure needs.

Council Member Shelton stated that, from a political perspective, the city will likely face challenges related to public perception of water reuse projects, particularly given concerns about the declining water levels of the Great Salt Lake. He referenced comments previously made by the Great Salt Lake Commissioner opposing the concept of water reuse projects in Salt Lake County and noted that broader public opinion may similarly view removing water from systems that ultimately contribute to the lake as problematic. He acknowledged that technical studies and data may support the project but emphasized that the city would still need to carefully communicate and justify the project to residents and stakeholders to address political and public concerns. He also questioned whether the city currently possesses the necessary water rights associated with the project and, if not, how those rights would be acquired. He further asked whether the cost of obtaining any required water rights had been included within the projected capital costs previously discussed.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that there are relatively few direct costs associated with acquiring the necessary water use approvals because the primary requirement was completion of the feasibility study before the Central Utah Water Conservancy District and Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District would consider entering into agreements for use of the water. He stated that the city is not seeking to acquire new water rights outright, but rather entering into agreements allowing use of water rights already controlled by those entities. He explained that completion of the feasibility study was a necessary component of the review process so the water districts could evaluate the proposal and understand the city's long-term reuse plans. He stated that city staff has met multiple times with both Central Utah and Jordan Valley representatives to discuss the proposed reuse project and the city's long-term vision. Both entities have been receptive to the discussions but must complete their own review processes and satisfy certain procedural requirements before entering into formal agreements. He further explained that House Bill 349, passed during the 2022 or 2023 legislative session, created additional challenges because it restricts reuse projects within the Great Salt Lake Basin. He stated that the city has since completed a detailed analysis of the project's potential long-term impacts and has identified mitigation strategies intended to maintain compliance with the legislation while still allowing reuse opportunities. He noted that one potential mitigation approach involves accounting for water savings achieved through turf reduction projects, park landscaping conversions, and reductions in irrigated grass areas throughout the city. He explained that those documented water savings could potentially offset reductions in flows to the Jordan River associated with reuse activities. He stated that the legislation created significant obstacles for collaborative reuse projects among water agencies and districts but expressed the view that opportunities still exist for South Jordan to pursue reuse projects while remaining compliant with state law and protecting Great Salt Lake interests. He concluded by stating that the city understands the requirements that must be met and believes a pathway forward remains available, although additional work will be required.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the city has an anticipated timeline for implementing the proposed reuse project or whether the effort would instead proceed incrementally over time as regulatory approvals, agreements, and other components gradually come together. He noted that there appear to be several regulatory and coordination issues that would need to be addressed before the project could move forward fully.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that there are still several regulatory requirements and approval processes that must be completed, which he estimated would likely take several more years to work through. He stated that the primary question before the Council is whether the city wishes to commit to the level of financial investment necessary to pursue the reuse project, including pursuing grants, bonding options, and other funding sources. He stated that the decision ultimately centers on whether the city wants to move forward with a long-term commitment to water reuse infrastructure and the associated financial obligations required to implement the project.

Council Member Harris expressed concern regarding the uncertainty surrounding future water-related financial obligations that may be imposed on the city and residents through statewide water funding proposals in addition to the potential costs associated with the reuse project. He noted that if the city were required to contribute significantly toward statewide water initiatives while also pursuing the reuse project simultaneously, the combined financial impact could become substantial. He questioned whether the project could potentially be pursued on a larger regional scale involving broader participation from additional agencies or entities so that both the costs and benefits could be shared more broadly rather than borne primarily by South Jordan residents alone.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen stated that staff initially hoped the proposed non-reverse osmosis reuse option could become a more regional project involving Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District because spreading the infrastructure and operational costs across multiple participating entities would make the project more financially efficient. He explained that city staff had discussions with Jordan Valley regarding potential regional participation but had not received interest from the district in pursuing the project jointly. In response to questions regarding Jordan Valley's lack of participation, he explained that prior Jordan Valley leadership had chosen not to pursue reuse projects and did not want to address the associated challenges and public perception issues. He stated that Jordan Valley is instead pursuing its own plans involving expansion of reverse osmosis treatment facilities and potentially using Jordan River water or shallow groundwater wells as supply sources. He noted that while Jordan Valley's approach could ultimately provide some water supply benefits to South Jordan, the reverse osmosis alternative carries significantly higher capital costs. He referenced earlier presentation materials indicating that the reverse osmosis option would cost more than \$100 million above the proposed reuse alternative being discussed by the city. He added that reuse projects continue to face operational, regulatory, and public perception challenges, which have contributed to hesitation among larger regional water agencies regarding broader participation in such systems.

Mayor Ramsey asked whether the city has had an opportunity to fully educate and discuss reuse concepts with Jacob Young, the new General Manager at Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District. She noted that previous district leadership appeared reluctant to pursue reuse projects, potentially because they were more comfortable with existing systems and approaches that had

been used successfully for many years. She compared the situation to experienced professionals facing entirely new operational challenges late in their careers and suggested that leadership transitions can create opportunities for organizations to reconsider new technologies and alternative approaches. She asked whether sufficient discussions had occurred with the new general manager to provide a thorough understanding of the city's reuse proposal and its potential benefits.

Mr. Domonske stated that he believes there may still be opportunities for collaboration and discussion regarding reuse technologies with Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District leadership. He explained that he has personally discussed the concept of a Jordan Valley direct potable reuse facility with Chief Operating Officer Shazelle Terry and stated that she appeared open to hearing more about the concept and discussing the possibilities associated with reuse. Mayor Ramsey noted that Shazelle Terry now serves on the Drinking Water Board, which could further support broader conversations regarding future water treatment strategies. Mr. Domonske stated that, based on his understanding, Jordan Valley is expected to issue a request for proposals related to treatment of Jordan River water, although the request had not yet been formally released at the time of the meeting. He indicated that he did not expect the forthcoming request for proposals to specifically include direct potable reuse alternatives but stated that Carollo Engineers would likely respond to the solicitation by presenting direct potable reuse as an additional option for consideration alongside more traditional treatment approaches.

Council Member Harris stated that one of his primary concerns is finding ways to spread the long-term financial burden of major water infrastructure investments across a broader base rather than placing the responsibility solely on South Jordan residents. He questioned whether the issue may ultimately be more about timing than feasibility, noting that regional water agencies may not have been prepared to pursue reuse projects in the past but could become more receptive in the future. He asked whether direct potable reuse or similar treatment approaches are likely to eventually become part of Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District's long-term strategy regardless of current hesitation. He questioned whether it would be more prudent for South Jordan to wait until regional participation and broader collaboration become more viable rather than independently making a significant financial investment to move forward earlier on its own.

Council Member Zander stated that water supply and demand pressures will likely continue driving conversations about reuse and alternative water treatment technologies in the future. She expressed the view that as water supplies become more constrained, agencies and decision-makers may become more willing to consider options that previously received limited support or attention. She stated that she would be concerned if broader regional entities wait too long to seriously evaluate those alternatives, potentially leaving communities in more difficult circumstances later due to delayed planning and implementation. She characterized that possibility as a potential leadership concern and expressed disappointment that there has not yet been broader willingness to fully consider or engage in discussions regarding reuse options at this stage.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District is also facing requirements related to preventing depletion impacts to the Great Salt Lake. He stated that if Jordan Valley proceeds with pumping additional water from the Jordan River, the district will need to demonstrate that the project results in no net depletion to flows ultimately reaching

the Great Salt Lake. He stated that, in response to those requirements, Jordan Valley has been purchasing secondary water shares and pursuing other mitigation strategies intended to offset potential impacts associated with additional water withdrawals. He explained that those constraints are also contributing to limitations on the amount of water Jordan Valley is currently willing to provide to South Jordan's annexed areas and are part of the reason the cost of that water is expected to increase. He concluded by noting that Jordan Valley is actively working through approaches intended to achieve a "net zero harm" outcome for the Great Salt Lake while still pursuing future water supply and treatment projects involving Jordan River water.

Mayor Ramsey stated that both in her role as a water district trustee and as a resident and water user, she does not support paying an additional \$100 million for a reverse osmosis treatment option if a more cost-effective alternative is available.

City Manager Lewis stated that every gallon of water the city is able to reuse and keep within its system represents a gallon that does not need to be withdrawn from the Jordan River system. He explained that reducing additional withdrawals helps preserve the natural flow of water downstream toward the Great Salt Lake, which is an important consideration in evaluating long-term water management and reuse strategies.

Council Member Johnson asked whether there would be an advantage to moving forward now with additional study and planning efforts related to the proposed reuse project to position the city for implementation in the future. She sought clarification regarding which specific study components staff was requesting Council direction on and whether Council direction was needed to continue advancing the project evaluation process.

Director Garrison noted that staff recommendation is to finish the study so that when the time comes it is available.

Deputy City Engineer Nielson explained that the next phase of the feasibility study would advance the project design to approximately a 30 percent design level. He stated that in order to proceed with that work, staff needed direction from the City Council regarding selection of a preferred site for the potential treatment facility. He presented two potential sites (Attachment A) located along Riverfront Parkway. He explained that one potential location, identified as the East Riverfront Parkway site, is situated south and east of Lifetime Fitness. The second potential site is located south of 11400 South on City-owned, currently unimproved property. He noted that neither site is presently developed as park space. He stated that either location would function effectively from an infrastructure standpoint because both sites are located near existing transmission lines, making future system connections relatively straightforward. He explained that selecting a preferred site would allow staff to continue moving forward with the feasibility study and additional project analysis.

Council Members and staff discussed the need to identify a potential site to continue the feasibility study process, while emphasizing that selecting a site for study purposes would not permanently commit the city to construction at that location. Staff acknowledged that ideally an undeveloped parcel with fewer surrounding constraints would be available, but the study requires identification of a realistic site option to proceed. Council Members discussed the relative advantages and disadvantages of the two proposed sites along Riverfront Parkway. Some members noted that the

southern site appeared more secluded and would require slightly shorter transmission line connections, while others expressed concern about its proximity to residential properties. Staff explained that the treatment facility would operate similarly to an existing distribution pump station and would not be expected to generate significant noise impacts. Mayor Ramsey stated that completing the feasibility study is important because the city previously sought and received political support from Utah's congressional delegation and state leaders in securing grant funding for the study. She expressed concern that failing to complete the study after receiving that support could negatively impact on the city's credibility in future funding requests. Staff also stated that completing the study would provide a valuable planning document for future projects regardless of whether the city immediately proceeds with construction. Council Members discussed the long-term importance of water planning and reuse efforts, noting that continued population growth and water supply challenges in Utah make future planning essential. Mayor Ramsey referenced comments from state water officials emphasizing that adequate water supply is foundational to addressing all other community needs. Several Council Members expressed a preference for the northern site because it is located farther from residential development and may present fewer impacts to nearby homes. Staff explained that the southern site contains wetland, marsh, and floodplain conditions that would create additional engineering complexity and cost, while the northern site would be more favorable from a geotechnical perspective, although both locations could technically function if necessary. Council Members also discussed preserving the character and recreational value of the Jordan River Parkway area. Questions were raised regarding current uses of the northern open space area, with staff noting that it is primarily open grass space occasionally used for informal recreation and sports practices. Council Members emphasized the importance of ensuring that any future facility be designed carefully to minimize visual impacts on the Jordan River Parkway trail system and surrounding recreational amenities. Suggestions were made that architectural treatments and additional investment in building design could help the facility better integrate into the area and avoid creating an unattractive industrial appearance along the parkway corridor. Staff clarified that trails exist on both sides of the Jordan River in the area and explained that the northern site is located near an existing sewer pump station and trail connections linking the Beckstead Ditch Trail to the Jordan River Trail system.

Mayor Ramsey asked the Council whether there was support for completing the feasibility study so the city could obtain a finalized analysis and better understand the appropriate next steps regarding the proposed reuse project. She stated that completing the study would also help provide information and guidance to outside agencies and decision-makers regarding what the city believes to be the most appropriate long-term course of action related to water reuse and infrastructure planning.

Council Member McGuire stated that he believes the city needs to complete the feasibility study in order to preserve future opportunities related to water reuse. He explained that having a completed study is important because agencies, stakeholders, and decision-makers will expect the city to provide detailed factual analysis and supporting documentation during future discussions and evaluations. He stated that the completed study would allow the city to present credible technical information and demonstrate that the proposal has been thoroughly evaluated as conversations continue regarding long-term water planning and reuse opportunities.

Council Member Johnson agreed that completing the feasibility study would strengthen the city's position in future discussions and potential partnership opportunities. She stated that having a professionally prepared and thoroughly analyzed study would carry substantially more credibility and influence than presenting the concept as only a preliminary idea or vision. She noted that detailed technical analysis could help support future collaboration efforts and provide a stronger foundation for discussions with outside agencies and stakeholders.

Mayor Ramsey stated that if the city ultimately seeks significant grant funding or federal assistance for the project, including support from Utah's congressional delegation and senators, it is important that the city completes the feasibility study that elected officials previously helped fund and support. She explained that members of the congressional delegation had already invested political support in helping South Jordan secure funding for the study, and she expressed concern that returning to request additional assistance without a completed study would undermine the city's credibility and future funding efforts.

Council Member Zander agreed with prior comments supporting completion of the feasibility study and emphasized the importance of pursuing broader regional participation in the project. She stated that obtaining additional partners and participants would improve the long-term feasibility and affordability of the reuse effort by spreading costs and increasing collaboration. She encouraged continued communication with Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District leadership and other neighboring agencies and cities to avoid South Jordan operating in isolation on the issue. She stated that the city should actively communicate its desire for regional cooperation and collaboration so neighboring communities understand that South Jordan is seeking partnerships rather than attempting to pursue the project independently without broader involvement.

Council Members generally expressed support for proceeding with completion of the feasibility study and indicated a preference for the northern Riverfront Parkway site as the preferred study location. Members stated that the northern parcel appeared more favorable from a geotechnical and compatibility standpoint and emphasized that selecting the site for study purposes would not permanently commit the city to final construction at that location. Council Members also emphasized the importance of ensuring that any future facility be designed with attractive architecture, quality landscaping, and careful site integration to preserve the character and visual appeal of the Jordan River Parkway corridor and surrounding area.

F. Discussion Items:

F.1. General Plan Implementation. (By Long-Range Planner, Joe Moss)

Long-Range Planner Joe Moss reviewed prepared personation (Attachment B). He reviewed an update regarding implementation of the City's General Plan, which was adopted in February 2020. He noted that the plan is now more than six years old and stated that staff believed it was an appropriate time to review progress made on the implementation strategies identified in the plan and obtain direction from the Council regarding future priorities. He explained that the General Plan includes a series of goals supported by implementation strategies and approximately 24 specific action items. He referenced a matrix included in the implementation chapter that categorizes items based on relative cost and impact. He noted that while some action items are identified as lower impact, they are still important and often require additional supporting actions

or longer implementation timelines before producing measurable results. He reviewed the current implementation status categories, explaining that green items represent completed or substantially progressed actions, orange items reflect ongoing or in-progress efforts, and red items identify actions that have not yet been completed. He explained that the implementation schedule was divided into short-term, mid-term, and long-term timelines, with the initial short-term period covering 2020 through 2025. He noted that the city has now entered the mid-term implementation phase. He stated that the city has made meaningful progress on several short-term implementation items, including updates to accessory dwelling unit (ADU) regulations and landscaping requirements. He also noted ongoing progress related to pedestrian enhancements, including mid-block crossings and coordination meetings involving traffic counts and connectivity planning. He further explained that some action items were written broadly or involve evolving issues that continue to develop over time. As examples, he referenced efforts related to unique transportation options such as ride shares, scooters, hoverboards, and e-bikes, noting that some transportation technologies and trends have changed significantly since the plan was adopted. He also referenced action items involving infill residential development standards, explaining that while discussions have occurred regarding potential design standards, no formal policy changes have yet been adopted. He additionally noted that the city has not yet implemented changes related to revising commercial development review processes to further incentivize businesses through expedited approvals, although current review processes have remained generally consistent. He stated that additional opportunities may still exist to streamline portions of the commercial review process in the future.

Council Member Harris questioned how relevant and effective the General Plan's implementation strategies related to business incentives and expedited commercial review processes remain under current state laws and regulations. He specifically asked whether the city still has the same ability to incentivize development and streamline approvals as originally anticipated when the General Plan was adopted in 2020.

Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece responded that improving the speed and efficiency of the development review process can itself serve as a meaningful incentive for businesses and developers. He explained that reducing approval timelines does not necessarily require direct financial incentives from the city because time savings translate into cost savings for applicants. He noted that, in the development industry, time is closely tied to project costs, financing, and overall project viability, so a more efficient review process can provide significant value to businesses seeking to develop within the city.

Long-Range Planner Moss continued reviewing prepared presentation (Attachment B). He explained the implementation progress under the General Plan and noted that several transportation and streetscape-related objectives have advanced significantly. He explained that work associated with the preferred alignment of the Red Line transit corridor, development of bike lane standards, and related transportation planning efforts have largely been incorporated through the city's streetscape projects and ongoing transportation planning initiatives. He stated that updates to the streetscape plan has been completed and represent a major accomplishment within the implementation matrix. He noted that some implementation items remain partially complete or ongoing. He explained that certain urban design elements, including street furnishings, coordinated material palettes, and gateway design features, still have room for further refinement

and implementation. He also referenced coordination efforts with Salt Lake County regarding the Jordan River Trail system and inventorying future improvements needed along the corridor. He stated that evaluations of streetlights, sidewalks, bike lanes, and other safe mobility features occur regularly as part of the city's development review process. He further explained that one implementation item involving required trail connections to existing parks has not yet been formally adopted into city policy and may require additional exploration in the future. He noted that the city has also completed work associated with arts and culture planning through adoption of the recreation and arts master planning efforts. He then reviewed several long-term implementation actions originally scheduled for 2030 and beyond, explaining that the city has already made progress on several of those items ahead of schedule. These include ongoing coordination regarding public transit extensions, adoption of updated parks, recreation, trails, and open space master plans, and continued implementation of traffic calming measures as development occurs. During the discussion, Council Member McGuire questioned whether upgrades to existing parks identified in the new parks plan had actually been completed. Long-Range Planner Moss acknowledged that while the new master plan itself has been adopted and implementation efforts are underway, substantial additional work remains regarding actual park upgrades and improvements. He clarified that park improvements are being addressed incrementally as projects and funding opportunities arise. He also referenced ongoing efforts related to identifying locations for arts districts in coordination with the South Jordan Arts Council, as well as continued energy efficiency upgrades to City-owned facilities following completion of an energy audit. He explained that the city is actively implementing lighting and other efficiency improvements as part of that process. He concluded by presenting several options for how the city could proceed moving forward. He explained that the city could continue focusing primarily on completing the existing implementation actions identified in the current General Plan or alternatively reevaluate whether some of those actions remain relevant given changing conditions over the past six years. A third option would involve a broader reevaluation of the underlying strategies and goals themselves to determine whether updates are needed so the General Plan continues to align with current priorities and community conditions. He requested feedback and direction from the Council regarding those potential approaches.

Council Member Harris expressed appreciation for the implementation update and stated that he would find it helpful for staff to provide a more prioritized set of recommendations moving forward. He explained that, from his perspective, the next step should include identifying which implementation items or policy areas staff believe most urgently need to be addressed or advanced by the Council. He noted that while the matrix and status updates were useful, the volume of information made it somewhat difficult to immediately determine which items should receive the highest level of focus or attention. He stated that a staff-driven prioritization process would help the Council better evaluate where resources and policy efforts should be directed next.

Planning Director Preece responded that staff could pursue a combined approach by reevaluating the existing implementation items and strategies while also developing prioritized recommendations for the Council's consideration. He indicated that staff could review the relevance and status of the current action items and then return to the Council with recommendations identifying which items should receive the greatest focus moving forward.

Council Member Zander stated that it was difficult to immediately evaluate and prioritize the various implementation items during the presentation because the information had just been presented and involved multiple slides and topics. She explained that she would benefit from receiving a summarized list of remaining implementation items and staff priorities in advance so she could review and consider them more thoroughly. She agreed with Council Member Harris that staff recommendations and prioritization would be helpful, while also allowing Council Members to independently review the remaining pending items and provide additional feedback or identify other priorities they believe should receive attention. She stated that having the information available for review outside the meeting context would allow for more thoughtful discussion and informed decision-making.

Long-Range Planner Moss stated that staff believe it may be appropriate to reevaluate portions of the General Plan's goals, strategies, and remaining implementation items given the progress already made over the past several years. He explained that the city has completed or substantially advanced several longer-term implementation items while some earlier action items remain unfinished, suggesting that priorities and approaches may need to be reconsidered in light of current conditions and community needs. He stated that, in his opinion, it would be beneficial to review whether the remaining implementation items still align with the city's current priorities and whether they remain the most effective methods for achieving the General Plan's broader goals over the next five to ten years. He clarified that staff is not proposing eliminating all incomplete action items, but rather reevaluating and potentially refining some of the language, strategies, and approaches so they better reflect current circumstances and more practical methods of accomplishing the plan's objectives today.

Council Member Johnson stated that because she was not serving on the Council during the original General Plan discussions and adoption process, she would appreciate receiving links or access to the relevant background materials and implementation information for further review. She explained that reviewing the original plan documents and staff recommendations would help her better understand the context of the discussion and allow her to provide more informed feedback and input regarding future priorities and implementation strategies.

Council Member McGuire asked how frequently the city typically updates its General Plan and noted that the current plan process began around 2017 or 2018 and took several years to complete before adoption. He questioned where the city currently stands within the overall planning cycle and whether it may be premature to begin a broader reevaluation or restart of the General Plan process so soon after completion of the existing plan.

Long-Range Planner Moss explained that conducting a complete rewrite of the General Plan, like the process completed in 2020, is a major undertaking requiring extensive public outreach, numerous meetings and events, and significant time and financial investment. He noted that the prior General Plan update process took multiple years to complete and involved substantial community engagement efforts. He stated that the city has already made some smaller amendments to portions of the General Plan since adoption, including updates last year to address new state legislation requirements. He noted that additional updates may become necessary in the future depending on pending legislative changes, including potential requirements related to wildlife corridors. He explained that the General Plan itself anticipates periodic review and updates as

needed and emphasized that targeted updates to specific chapters, strategies, or implementation items are far less intensive than undertaking a full plan rewrite. He stated that more limited modifications can allow the city to address identified issues, refine direction, and strengthen implementation strategies without initiating a lengthy multi-year planning process, although broader public involvement becomes increasingly important as the scope of proposed changes expands.

Council Member McGuire stated that he supports reevaluating portions of the General Plan and making targeted modifications where appropriate. However, he expressed hesitation about directing staff to undertake an extensive or highly detailed review process if the city may already be approaching the timeframe for a larger comprehensive General Plan update within the next few years. He indicated that he would prefer a more measured approach focused on practical adjustments and refinements rather than committing significant staff resources to an intensive reevaluation process if a broader update may ultimately occur in the near future.

Director Preece responded that making smaller updates and refinements to the General Plan over time can help extend the usefulness and lifespan of the existing plan before a full comprehensive rewrite becomes necessary. He explained that by periodically addressing specific issues, modifying implementation strategies, and making targeted adjustments as conditions evolve, the city may be able to delay the need for another large-scale, resource-intensive General Plan update process involving extensive outreach and public engagement.

Long-Range Planner Moss stated that, based on his professional experience, many cities begin considering a more comprehensive General Plan rewrite approximately every eight to ten years, although practices vary by community. He explained that South Jordan is not yet at the point where a full rewrite is necessarily required and agreed that maintaining the plan through periodic updates and refinements can help keep it relevant and functional for a longer period of time. He noted that treating the General Plan as a more “living” document through ongoing maintenance and targeted updates can significantly extend its useful lifespan. He referenced one community he assisted in 2024 that was still operating under a General Plan originally adopted in 1999, although he stated he would not recommend waiting that long before undertaking broader updates.

Council Member McGuire stated that he supports the option of reevaluating the remaining implementation actions and continuing to treat the General Plan as a living document that evolves over time. He emphasized that South Jordan continues to change and grow, and the city’s planning documents should reflect those ongoing changes and current community needs. He generally concurred with that approach, with additional comments noting that changes in state legislation also regularly require the city to adapt and update its planning policies and implementation strategies accordingly.

Long-Range Planner Moss explained that, in addition to reviewing implementation actions, staff have also been evaluating how the City’s future land use strategy and future land use map have functioned over the past six years. He displayed the original future land use map (Attachment B) adopted with the General Plan and noted that it has evolved over time through various amendments and development approvals. He also noted that the recently annexed areas currently do not yet contain assigned future land use designations on the map. He stated that South Jordan’s future land

use framework is somewhat unique because the map functions less like a traditional long-term land use map and more like an “area of change” map identifying where development or redevelopment was anticipated to occur. He explained that this approach created categories such as “stable neighborhood” and “residential development opportunity,” which were intended to distinguish between areas expected to remain largely unchanged and areas anticipated for future development. He stated that changing development patterns over the past six years have created challenges with that framework because some parcels originally identified as development opportunities have since developed and no longer fit that classification. At the same time, there are infill parcels within areas designated as stable neighborhoods where the plan currently provides limited guidance regarding appropriate transitions, redevelopment expectations, or future infill development patterns. He explained that the term “stable neighborhood” itself can sometimes create confusion because, while the plan narrative discusses infill and redevelopment considerations, the map and associated descriptions do not always provide clear direction regarding where transitions or changes may be appropriate within those areas. He further explained that one of the primary challenges with the current future land use map involves the “residential development opportunity” and “stable neighborhood” categories. He noted that some parcels originally identified as residential development opportunities have since been developed, while other parcels located within stable neighborhood areas may still have redevelopment or infill potential that is not clearly addressed within the current plan framework. He stated that the existing plan provides limited guidance regarding how future development or transitions should occur in areas located between differing land uses, such as parcels situated between commercial and residential areas. He explained that the current language generally states that future development should remain consistent with surrounding uses, but it does not clearly define how transitional areas or mixed contexts should be evaluated. He stated that the General Plan anticipated periodic refinements and outlined several potential approaches the city could consider moving forward. One option would be to maintain the existing future land use categories while simply updating the map to incorporate the annexed areas as future land use designations are established through the annexation development agreement process. A second option would involve making minor modifications to the existing categories to add additional guidance related to issues such as land use transitions and redevelopment expectations. A third option would involve developing additional future land use categories to provide more detailed and nuanced direction regarding different development conditions and transition areas. He explained that a fourth option would be a more substantial undertaking involving development of entirely new future land use categories and a significantly revised future land use map. He noted that such an approach would require a much larger effort, including extensive public engagement and a broader planning process.

Planning Director Preece stated that he would recommend a similar approach to the one previously discussed regarding implementation strategies by focusing on targeted reevaluation and minor modifications rather than undertaking a complete rewrite of the future land use map and categories at this time. He explained that staff could review the existing categories, identify areas where additional clarification or minor adjustments may be beneficial, and then return to the Council with recommendations for consideration. He indicated that, in his view, a full-scale overhaul of the future land use framework would not be necessary until the city is prepared to undertake a broader comprehensive General Plan rewrite process in the future.

Council Members agreed with the recommendation to pursue targeted refinements and modest updates to the future land use framework rather than initiating a complete rewrite of the General Plan at this time. Members indicated support for staff evaluating the current categories and identifying areas where clarification, consolidation, or minor restructuring may improve the functionality and usability of the plan.

Long-Range Planner Moss noted that some existing categories may no longer clearly reflect current development conditions or planning needs. One suggestion discussed was potentially combining the “residential development opportunity” and “stable neighborhood” categories into a more unified residential neighborhood designation while adding clearer guidance regarding transitions between differing land uses and development patterns. Council Members expressed support for staff further exploring those types of refinement and returning with recommendations for future consideration.

F.2. Fire Code Adoption Discussion. (By Fire Chief, Chris Dawson)

Fire Chief Chris Dawson discussed a proposed ordinance amendment to formally adopt selected appendices of the International Fire Code into the city’s municipal code. He explained that state law automatically adopts the primary International Fire Code but does not automatically adopt the appendices, as those appendices address more localized issues that may vary between municipalities. He stated that state law does allow cities to separately adopt applicable appendices if desired. He explained that the appendices being proposed address issues the city already regulates and applies in practice, including fire sprinkler requirements, fire hydrant placement and distribution, fire access road standards, and water supply requirements necessary to adequately protect structures. He stated that adoption of the appendices would provide clearer legal authority for enforcement of standards already being utilized by the city and incorporated into engineering and development review processes. He also explained that several of the appendices address hazardous occupancies and hazardous materials, including facilities such as Ultradent and Merit Medical. Adoption of those provisions would allow the city to more clearly regulate and inspect hazardous material storage and operations to ensure public safety. Additional appendices address noncompliant fire sprinkler conditions, firefighter air replenishment systems in high-rise buildings, and indoor trade shows and exhibitions. He stated that the proposed amendments are intended primarily to formalize and ratify standards and practices the city is already applying and enforcing operationally. He indicated that he would return to the Council at a future meeting seeking formal adoption of the ordinance amendments.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the city had experienced any legal or enforcement challenges due to the appendices not yet being formally adopted. Fire Chief Dawson responded that the issue has largely been a matter of clarifying legal authority and aligning with updated state guidance regarding the adoption process. He noted that the process for municipal adoption has become more clearly defined under current state law and stated that he was not aware of other municipalities that had failed to adopt similar appendices.

Council Member Harris clarified that the reason the State does not automatically adopt the International Fire Code appendices is because the needs and circumstances of each municipality are different. He stated that the State instead provides local governments with the discretion to

adopt only those appendices that are appropriate and necessary for their specific community conditions and operational needs. He confirmed that this flexibility is the reason municipalities individually determine which appendices to incorporate into their local codes. Fire Chief Dawson confirmed that some of the International Fire Code appendices are not applicable to South Jordan's specific conditions or operational needs. He stated that staff is only proposing adoption of the appendices that are relevant and necessary for the city and would not be requesting adoption of appendices that do not apply to the community.

City Attorney Ryan Loose explained that the proposed ordinance changes will be incorporated into Chapter 15 of the City Code, which addresses adopted construction codes. He stated that Section 15.08 currently includes adopted codes such as the International Building Code, Electrical Code, and Manufactured Housing Code. He explained that the ordinance amendment will involve inserting a new section related to the International Fire Code and applicable appendices, which will require some renumbering and reorganization within the chapter structure. He noted that certain existing policy-related provisions, such as those addressing code copies and violations, will be shifted accordingly to accommodate the new section. He stated that the revised formatting and numbering changes will be included in the Council's next meeting packet for review.

Council Member Johnson stated that formally adopting the applicable International Fire Code appendices would create greater transparency and clarity regarding the standards and requirements being enforced by the city.

Council Member Harris expressed support for maintaining strong public safety standards through adoption of the appendices.

Council Member Zander asked whether the city had previously encountered provisions within the International Fire Code that staff believed were inappropriate or unsuitable for South Jordan.

Fire Chief Dawson responded that, generally, the city has not had significant disagreements with the standards contained in the International Fire Code, although some appendices simply do not apply to South Jordan's conditions and therefore are not being proposed for adoption. He further explained that the code provides flexibility through the authority having jurisdiction, which in South Jordan is shared between the Fire Department and Engineering Department depending on the situation. This authority allows staff to apply reasonable judgment and make decisions based on specific circumstances while still maintaining appropriate safety standards.

Mayor Ramsey expressed appreciation to staff for identifying the need to formally adopt the applicable International Fire Code appendices and strengthen the city's code framework. She stated that the proposed ordinance amendments would improve clarity and consistency by codifying standards and practices the city is already implementing operationally. She thanked staff for proactively recognizing the issue, reviewing the code structure, and bringing forward recommendations that would strengthen the city's legal authority and support continued enforcement of important public safety standards.

Council Member Zander motioned to adjourn the March 3, 2026, City Council Study Meeting. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

The March 3, 2026 City Council Study Meeting adjourned at 6:19 p.m.

UNAPPROVED