

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL BUDGET MEETING

MARCH 4, 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, Associate Director of Recreation Brad Vaske, CFO Sunil Naidu, Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece, Director of Engineering/City Engineer Brad Klavano, Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison, City Recorder Anna Crookston

Absent:

Other (Electronic) Attendance:

Other (In-Person) Attendance:

5:05 P.M.

BUDGET MEETING AGENDA

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

Mayor Ramsey welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

B. Invocation – By Assistant City Manager, Don Tingey

Assistant City Manager Tingey offered the invocation.

C. Discussion Item -

C.1. Fiscal Year 2026-27 Budget and Capital Improvement Projects. (By City Manager, Dustin Lewis)

Mayor Ramsey introduced the primary discussion item and turned the meeting over to City Manager Dustin Lewis, noting the discussion would be complex and involve multiple components.

City Manager Dustin Lewis explained that the purpose of the meeting was to review the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and determine how to prioritize projects within the tentative budget. He emphasized collaboration between council and staff and stated the goal was to identify a clear path forward for project funding. He then transitioned the presentation to staff.

Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen Assistant reviewed prepared handout of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) (Attachment A). He explained the structured process used to develop the

project list. He stated that a technical team representing multiple city departments initially compiles project needs into a single document and prioritizes them objectively. The recommended list is then reviewed and refined by senior staff, with budget parameters provided by CFO Sunil Naidu. He highlighted that the majority of proposed investments align with the City's strategic priority of maintaining reliable public infrastructure, emphasizing the importance of ongoing maintenance to prevent costly replacements. The second largest category of investment focuses on desirable amenities and open spaces, reflecting continued commitment to community-valued features. He explained that the CIP is organized by funding sources, including the general fund and enterprise funds such as water, storm water, and sanitation. Some projects are funded across multiple sources to distribute costs appropriately. For the current year, approximately \$3.9 million in general fund investments are proposed for infrastructure, facilities, and parks. Key general fund projects include replacement of the City Hall boiler due to the end of its lifecycle, upgrades to Fire Station 62, and funding for the Shields Lane multi-use path. The latter includes a \$210,000 local match to leverage approximately \$2.7 million in grant funding to support construction of a multi-use trail connection.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification regarding the source of the grant funding associated with the Shields Lane multi-use path project.

Director of Engineering/City Engineer Brad Klavano clarified that the grant funding for the Shields Lane multi-use path project is provided through the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and may also include CMAC funding. He noted that the intent is to pursue similar funding opportunities annually to complete improvements in phases, such as intersection upgrades, over time.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen highlighted the Towne Center paver replacement project, explaining that existing pavers west of City Hall have begun to settle, creating maintenance issues and potential trip hazards. He noted that previous sections were replaced with concrete as a more durable solution, and the city plans to extend that approach further west in the Towne Center to improve safety and reduce ongoing maintenance concerns.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification regarding ownership of Towne Center.

City Manager Lewis clarified that the city owns the Towne Center area from building edge to building edge and is responsible for all maintenance within that space.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen clarified that the city owns and maintains the public infrastructure within the Towne Center, including the roadway, center areas, and islands, while the surrounding buildings are privately owned.

Council Member Shelton inquired whether there had been a prior Redevelopment Agency (RDA) arrangement related to the development of the Towne Center area.

City Manager Lewis explained that the Towne Center area was previously associated with a Redevelopment Agency (RDA), which has since been terminated and is no longer collecting funds. He also clarified that the estimated project cost presented is lower than the total actual cost due to efforts by the Public Works team. He commended staff for utilizing internal resources to complete

demolition and preparation work, reducing the need for contracted services and resulting in significant cost savings for the project.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen continued to review the prepared handout (Attachment A). He explained that projects listed below the designated line in the CIP represent ongoing funding allocations rather than one-time expenditures. He noted that these items include routine infrastructure investments such as cemetery maintenance, park and playground replacements, wall and canal culvert replacements, park improvements, and sidewalk hazard mitigation. He emphasized that while these projects may be less visible, they are essential to maintaining the City's infrastructure and preventing system failures. He stated that funds are allocated annually, with some projects completed immediately and others accumulating funding over multiple years to support larger improvements. He concluded by inviting questions from the Council regarding the general fund projects.

Council Member Shelton inquired about the fleet replacement allocation, noting that it represents a significant portion of the ongoing funding in the CIP.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that the fleet allocation includes funding for 17 vehicles. He noted that the city follows the practice of reallocating used police vehicles to Public Works after their initial service life. This approach extends the usefulness of vehicles and results in cost savings, while still meeting operational needs across departments.

Council Member Shelton clarified that repurposed vehicles are modified as needed, including repainting or other adjustments, before being reassigned for use in Public Works.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen confirmed that repurposed police vehicles are modified for Public Works use by removing decals, light bars, and internal police equipment, and replacing them with appropriate features such as amber lights. He noted that this practice is both cost-effective and practical, allowing the city to extend the life and utility of its fleet.

Council Member Harris asked how long the city has been utilizing the practice of repurposing police vehicles for Public Works use.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen stated that the city has been repurposing police vehicles for Public Works use for approximately five to seven years. He noted that while some cities utilize similar practices, South Jordan has benefited from a well-maintained fleet, allowing vehicles to remain in good condition after police use. He added that this approach not only reduces replacement costs but also saves staff time associated with disposing of old vehicles and procuring new ones.

Council Member Shelton asked for clarification on what a mini skid steer is.

Associate Director of Recreation Brad Vaske clarified that the referenced equipment is a Toro Outcross, a tractor designed for turf maintenance on larger fields. He explained that while effective for larger areas, the equipment is difficult to maneuver in smaller or tighter spaces, such as parks and certain golf course areas. He noted that the city plans to replace it with a smaller, more suitable tractor for golf course use, while reallocating the existing equipment to parks where it is better

suited. He also added that lighter equipment helps reduce damage to infrastructure, such as sprinkler heads, improving overall maintenance efficiency.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification on whether the new piece of equipment would be designated exclusively for Mulligan's.

City Manager Lewis explained that while specific equipment is assigned to individual departments for stewardship, it is considered a shared resource for the entire City. He noted that departments coordinate with one another to utilize equipment where it is most needed. He provided examples, including the use of police personnel carriers for City operations and the sharing of equipment such as skid steers and golf carts between departments. He emphasized that this collaborative approach maximizes efficiency and ensures City resources are used effectively across all departments. He further emphasized the City's collaborative approach to resource management, noting that departments regularly share equipment and tools as needed. He highlighted that staff are aware of available resources across departments and maintain strong working relationships that allow for efficient coordination. He provided examples ranging from shared vehicles and equipment to occasional use of specialized office tools, reinforcing that City resources are collectively utilized to meet operational needs.

CFO Sunil Naidu noted that when equipment is repurposed from one fund to another, such as being reassigned to the general fund, a corresponding financial transaction is completed to account for the transfer.

City Manager Lewis added that when equipment is reassigned between departments, such as police vehicles being transferred to Public Works, internal financial transactions are recorded to reflect the reallocation. He noted that the Finance Department tracks these adjustments to ensure accurate accounting of City assets.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen continued to review the prepared handout (Attachment A). He presented projects within the culinary water fund, highlighting the remaining section of the Beckstead Canal that has not yet been piped. He explained that completing this section will connect existing trail segments to surrounding trail systems, including the Jordan River Trail, providing recreational and connectivity benefits for residents and nearby businesses. He noted that the estimated cost for the project is \$450,000 and emphasized the value it would provide to the area. He also stated that the City has applied for a state grant to fund the project, and if awarded, the project cost would not impact the City's culinary water budget. He indicated that the city expects to receive a decision on the grant within the next few months.

Mayor Ramsey asked for clarification regarding the specific state entity to which the grant application for the Beckstead Canal project was submitted.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that the grant application for the Beckstead Canal project was submitted to the Great Salt Lake Commission. He noted that piping the canal would reduce water loss from seepage into the ground. Under the proposal, the city would quantify the conserved water and direct that amount to the Jordan River, which ultimately benefits the Great Salt Lake. In exchange, the Commission would fund the piping project, allowing the City to complete the improvement without reducing its overall water supply.

Mayor Ramsey asked for clarification regarding the administrative oversight of the Great Salt Lake Commission, specifically whether it falls under a particular state department or leadership structure and who is responsible for decision-making on grant applications. She indicated interest in understanding whether the determination would be made by the Commission's staff or another governing entity.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen stated that the Great Salt Lake Commission is assembling a group to review grant applications for available funding. He noted that he was unsure of the specific members of the review group.

Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison noted that the Division of Water Rights (DWR) will be a part of the review process.

City Manager Lewis noted that the Beckstead Canal project will complete a trail loop in the area, creating a nearly ideal 5K route. He stated that this will enhance opportunities for the City's race series and provide a recreational amenity that minimizes impact on vehicle traffic.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen noted that, in addition to trail connectivity, the Beckstead Canal piping project provides an opportunity to improve 1055 West, which currently has narrow sections. He stated that the city will coordinate with adjacent landowners to widen the roadway where feasible, enhancing safety and accessibility. He continued to review the prepared handout (Attachment A). He presented the central control irrigation maintenance project, explaining that it supports water conservation efforts for parks and park strips. He noted that the project will expand and upgrade the City's existing central control system, allowing staff to more precisely monitor and manage water usage. He stated that the system enables staff to remotely control irrigation, including shutting off sprinklers during rain events or when watering is unnecessary. He emphasized that this improves efficiency and helps address resident concerns about visible overwatering during storms.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the central control irrigation system still requires manual operation.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen stated that portions of the irrigation system are still operated manually, but the city has implemented central control in many park areas. He explained that the current project aims to expand the system further, increasing the number of parks and park strips that can be managed remotely through central control.

City Manager Lewis clarified that without a centralized system, staff would need to physically visit each irrigation location to make adjustments. He explained that the central control system consolidates irrigation management into a single platform, allowing staff to control and monitor multiple sites remotely, improving efficiency and responsiveness.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that while automated irrigation systems based on weather data, such as evapotranspiration (ET) systems, are available, the city has experienced challenges relying fully on automation. He noted that due to the variety of landscapes and conditions across City properties, manual oversight through a centralized control system has proven more effective. He stated that having a single operator manage irrigation remotely provides

greater efficiency compared to previous methods, which required staff to visit multiple sites. He added that while automation may be explored further in the future, the current approach offers better reliability and control.

Council Member McGuire asked for clarification regarding the SCADA system, inquiring what the system is and how it functions.

Director Garrison explained that the SCADA system is used to monitor and control the City's water infrastructure, including water tanks and distribution levels. He noted that the current system is radio-based and becoming outdated, and the city is planning to upgrade it to a more modern system.

Council Member Shelton asked how frequently the city upgrades systems such as the SCADA system.

Director Garrison clarified that the communication portion of the SCADA system, particularly the radio-based components, has not undergone a major upgrade in a significant period of time. He noted that aside from routine maintenance such as battery replacements, this represents the first substantial upgrade to the system's communication infrastructure.

City Manager Lewis emphasized the critical importance of the SCADA system, noting that it directly controls water distribution throughout the city. He explained that the system regulates when pumps operate and ensures consistent water availability to residents.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen continued to review the prepared handout (Attachment A). He reviewed the city park strip water-wise landscaping program, noting a proposed investment of \$350,000 as part of ongoing water conservation efforts. He explained that replacing traditional landscaping in park strips reduces the amount of water the city must purchase from Jordan Valley. He also highlighted that reducing summer water usage lowers the City's "peaking factor," which represents the highest level of water demand. He stated that lowering this peak demand can help reduce future increases in wholesale water costs, resulting in long-term financial savings for the City.

Mayor Ramsey noted that projects such as the park strip water-wise landscaping efforts demonstrate the City's commitment to water conservation. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that state officials and decision-makers are aware of these initiatives when considering grant funding. She indicated her intent to communicate directly with relevant state leadership to highlight the City's ongoing efforts and strengthen its position for future grant opportunities.

City Manager Lewis noted that the city has been successful in securing grant funding for water conservation efforts, including projects along 11400 South. He stated that the State has shown strong interest in supporting these initiatives and has been willing to provide funding to assist with the City's conservation efforts.

Director Garrison explained that the State proactively reached out to the city regarding available federal funding that needed to be allocated within a specific timeframe. In response, the city submitted its park strip master plan as a qualifying project. He stated that the city was initially

awarded \$2 million in grant funding, which was later adjusted to \$1.5 million as other cities participated, and subsequently restored to \$2 million. He noted that the funding is provided on a reimbursement basis, with the city invoicing the State as project work is completed.

City Manager Lewis noted that South Jordan was prepared to proceed with projects when funding became available, unlike some other cities that were not shovel-ready. He stated that the city was the first to begin receiving reimbursements and intends to fully utilize all available grant funding.

Mayor Ramsey noted that she shared a video of the City's water conservation project with state leadership, including the Speaker of the House, to highlight the City's efforts. She emphasized the importance of demonstrating successful project implementation as a model for others and as a means to secure additional funding. She stated that maximizing available funding ensures that taxpayer dollars are reinvested in the community while supporting responsible and effective conservation practices.

Council Member McGuire commended staff for having shovel-ready projects, noting that this approach positions the city well to receive available funding. He referenced that similar strategies are used by agencies such as UDOT, where readiness to proceed is a key factor in securing federal funds.

Council Member Zander asked for an update on the status of the project along 11400 South.

Staff provided an update on the 11400 South project, explaining that existing park strips are being removed and replaced with water-wise landscaping. The project includes removing grass and rock, retaining existing trees, and installing drought-tolerant plants. Staff noted that the improvements extend along 11400 South, from approximately 3600 West to Redwood Road, and emphasized that the project is expected to result in significant water savings.

Director Klavano noted that the 11400 South project was designed in-house by the City engineering staff, eliminating the need for external consultants. He highlighted this as a cost-saving measure and credited staff expertise for successfully completing the design work internally.

Council Member Shelton asked for clarification regarding how much of the \$350,000 allocated for the park strip water-wise landscaping program is being reimbursed.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that the \$350,000 allocation represents an ongoing annual investment, noting that the need for park strip conversions exceeds current available funding. He stated that the city plans to continue budgeting this amount each year to systematically complete the remaining park strip improvements.

City Manager Lewis clarified that state grant funding has allowed the city to accelerate progress on park strip conversion projects, completing several years' worth of work in a shorter timeframe. He noted that the city will continue to budget the annual \$350,000 moving forward, and once grant funding is no longer available, the city will continue advancing remaining projects using its own resources.

Director Klavano shared that during the permitting process with UDOT for the 11400 South project, concerns were raised about the use of rock materials near the roadway. After elevating the issue to the regional director and noting similar existing conditions elsewhere, the concern was resolved and the permit was approved.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen reviewed several smaller, ongoing projects within the culinary water fund, including replacement of commercial meters, pressure-reducing valve upgrades, and water tank cleaning. He explained that these are routine maintenance efforts performed annually, with the city addressing portions of the system each year to ensure reliability and proper function.

Council Member Zander asked how many water storage tanks the city currently operates.

Staff stated that the city currently operates nine functional water storage tanks and is in the process of constructing a tenth.

City Manager Lewis noted that when a water storage tank is taken offline for cleaning, Council Members are welcome to participate in a tour to observe the process.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that the secondary water fund includes an ongoing annual allocation of approximately \$100,000, funded entirely through user fees. These funds support maintenance and replacement of pump houses serving approximately 500 pressurized irrigation customers. He then reviewed storm drain projects, noting that there are no major items this year. He highlighted the Lampton waterway removal and storm drain project, which involves addressing roadway dips and extending piping to improve drainage and roadway conditions.

Director Klavano explained that the Lampton waterway project addresses areas where streets are connected by large valley gutters, which function similarly to speed bumps. He noted that these features can cause wear and damage to asphalt, particularly from trailers and heavier vehicles, and the project aims to improve those conditions.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that ongoing stormwater costs include periodic drilling of new down wells in the Daybreak area, as existing wells can become clogged with silt over time. While the City attempts to rehabilitate wells, when possible, replacement is occasionally necessary. He also noted that the stormwater fund includes fleet equipment replacement and a long-term capital plan. The City maintains an approximately 10-year plan to address stormwater infrastructure upgrades and improvements, and funding projects incrementally each year to ensure the system remains in good condition.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification regarding duplicate listings for Public Works projects, specifically noting that items such as the camera upgrade and yard repairs appeared in both the one-time and ongoing sections with the same cost.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen clarified that the items mentioned are part of the same project but are funded through multiple sources. He explained that costs are distributed across the general fund and applicable enterprise funds, allowing each to contribute its proportional share. This approach reduces the burden on the general fund and aligns expenses with the departments or services that benefit from the project.

Council Member Zander asked whether the total cost for the Public Works camera upgrades is approximately \$100,000, noting that the project appears multiple times in the CIP across different funding sources.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen confirmed that the total cost for the Public Works camera upgrade project is approximately \$100,000, with funding distributed across multiple sources. He then reviewed (Attachment A) sanitation fund items, noting similar shared project funding and fleet vehicle replacement. Moving to transportation sales tax projects, he highlighted the Beckstead Canal trail project, which includes paving the final segment following canal piping to complete the trail loop. He also described the emergency alert signal project, clarifying that it is not a traditional traffic signal, but a system designed to alert drivers when emergency vehicles, such as fire engines, are exiting stations.

Director Klavano explained that the emergency alert signal functions similarly to a HAWK signal but operates more like a traditional traffic signal to stop traffic when emergency vehicles exit Fire Station 61. He noted that the need for this improvement has been discussed for several years and has now been incorporated into the budget. He added that staff is working to secure funding for the design phase so the project can move to bid and begin construction as early as the upcoming summer.

Fire Chief Chris Dawson explained that increased traffic on Redwood Road, now functioning as a seven-lane roadway, has made it difficult for fire apparatus to safely enter and exit the station. He noted that the proposed emergency alert signal will significantly improve response times and enhance safety for both emergency personnel and the public.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen noted that the Shields Lane project appears again within the transportation sales tax fund, with an additional \$400,000 allocated to support construction of the multi-use path. He then invited Director Klavano to provide further details or highlight any additional transportation-related projects.

Director Klavano discussed ongoing efforts to expand trail connectivity along canal corridors, noting challenges in obtaining permission from a certain canal company, particularly where ownership differs from other areas. He explained that some canal companies control the roadway, while others require easements from adjacent property owners, which can complicate project progress. He added that these trail extensions are intended to connect with previously completed projects, such as the Midas Creek trail, and improve neighborhood connectivity. He also highlighted ongoing transportation priorities, including upgrades to traffic signals to meet ADA requirements, such as adding audible pedestrian features. Additional recurring investments include pavement preservation, traffic signal maintenance, signage and striping, and trail maintenance, all of which support the City's overall transportation infrastructure.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen transitioned to the Class C Road Fund, explaining that it represents the City's share of gas tax revenue used to support roadway-related projects and maintenance.

Council Member Shelton asked for clarification on the difference between transportation sales tax revenue and gas tax (Class C Road Fund) revenue.

Staff explained that the transportation sales tax is a portion of general sales tax collected on purchases, while the Class C Road Fund (gas tax) is generated from a tax on each gallon of fuel sold. These are separate revenue streams, with the sales tax tied to overall economic activity and the gas tax specifically tied to fuel consumption.

Mayor Ramsey provided an update on recent legislative activity related to the gas tax. She explained that a proposed bill initially failed in committee but was later reconsidered and passed unanimously. The current version of the bill includes a temporary reduction of approximately six cents per gallon for a six-month period. She noted that this reduction would decrease funding for transportation, including an estimated \$28 million impact to UDOT and approximately \$12 million reduction to Class B and C road funds allocated to local governments. However, the State has indicated it will backfill the local government portion using general fund revenues to ensure cities are held harmless. She further explained that the State's overall budget bill has already been passed, including provisions to cover this backfill. She added that while the legislative process is still ongoing, it is anticipated that the measure will move forward, with mechanisms in place to address funding impacts on local jurisdictions. She provided additional context on the gas tax legislation, noting she attended a press conference with state leadership, including the Speaker of the House, Senate President, Governor, and bill sponsors. She explained that significant negotiation occurred with fuel producers, who had initially opposed the proposal due to potential cost impacts. She also highlighted regional concerns, including opposition from Idaho officials, which led to further negotiations and a memorandum of understanding to continue discussions on shared water resources. She reiterated that the final proposal includes a temporary gas tax reduction of a few cents per gallon for six months. While the State has committed to backfilling approximately \$12 million in Class B and C road funds to protect local governments, she noted that UDOT will still need to address an estimated \$28 million reduction in its transportation budget.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that Class C Road Fund revenues are directly reinvested into roadway maintenance. He noted that the City conducts regular evaluations of pavement conditions using a standardized rating system, where 0 represents failed pavement and 100 represents a new road. He reported that the City's most recent assessment resulted in an average pavement condition rating of 84.6, indicating that ongoing annual investments are effectively maintaining road quality and preventing deterioration.

Council Member McGuire asked how often the City updates its pavement condition ratings and conducts roadway condition assessments.

Director Garrison stated they currently update the pavement condition assessments approximately every two to three years. He noted that staff are exploring new software that would allow for annual evaluations and provide additional capabilities, such as generating pothole repair plans and improving overall maintenance planning.

Mayor Ramsey emphasized the significance of maintaining strong pavement condition ratings, noting that some cities in Salt Lake County have failing road systems. She referenced Salt Lake City as an example, explaining that they had to issue a substantial bond to address deferred maintenance, underscoring the importance of consistent investment in road infrastructure. She

emphasized the financial benefit of proactive road maintenance, noting that staying ahead of infrastructure needs reduces long-term costs for taxpayers.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen stated that, based on the City's consistent investment and maintenance practices, South Jordan's road conditions are likely among the highest rated in Salt Lake County. He noted that while some areas may still experience localized issues such as potholes, the overall pavement condition reflects strong systemwide performance. He noted that while some roads still require attention, the City's overall roadway system remains in strong condition due to consistent annual investments. He emphasized that continued funding authorized by the Council plays a key role in maintaining and improving infrastructure. He also highlighted upcoming improvements at South Jordan Parkway and 4000 West, funded in part through road impact fees. The project includes a significant external funding component, with approximately \$4.7 million secured through grants from the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) and UDOT, providing a strong return on the City's investment.

Director Klavano provided an update on planned improvements at South Jordan Parkway and 4000 West, explaining that initial concepts included dual left-turn lanes in all directions. Following further environmental review and traffic analysis, he indicated that the current plan will likely focus on a dual left-turn lane for the southbound to eastbound movement, where congestion is most significant. He noted that this area experiences regular backups, particularly during peak hours, and can impact access to the nearby fire station. He added that while additional widening may still be constructed to accommodate future needs, the final configuration may be adjusted to reduce overall project costs while still addressing critical traffic concerns.

Council Member Zander sought clarification on the specific intersection being discussed, confirming it was at South Jordan Parkway and 4000 West (approximately 10600 South). During the discussion, it was noted that 11400 South presents separate and more significant safety concerns, particularly due to traffic backing up toward Bangerter Highway. She emphasized the potential danger at that location, highlighting the risk of serious accidents caused by congestion and limited traffic flow.

Director Klavano explained that long-term plans for the 11400 South corridor may include implementing a continuous flow or "through U-turn" intersection design in coordination with UDOT. He noted that this improvement is likely to be tied to a future widening project for 11400 South. He added that if safety or traffic conditions require earlier action, the City may need to advance the project ahead of the full corridor improvements, though he emphasized that it would be a complex and costly undertaking.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the planned widening at 4000 West and South Jordan Parkway can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way or if additional property acquisition will be required.

Director Klavano explained that the widening project at 4000 West and South Jordan Parkway will require acquisition of some property, including portions of the fire station site and adjacent landscaping. He noted that coordination will also be needed with nearby businesses, such as Holiday and 7-Eleven, to accommodate the improvements. He added that efforts are being made to minimize impacts, particularly on the northeast corner of the intersection, and that the project is

currently in the environmental review phase. Once that process is complete, the city will move forward with the next stage of design and implementation.

Council Member Shelton asked if construction will happen this year.

Director Klavano responded that construction will likely occur next year. He explained that projects involving federal funding require additional processes, including extensive paperwork and compliance requirements, which can increase both the timeline and overall project costs by approximately 30 to 40 percent.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that Community Development Area (CDA) funds are being used to support road maintenance projects within designated areas, reducing the need to rely on general fund or gas tax revenues. He continued to review the prepared handout (Attachment A), highlighting parks and recreation impact fee projects, including improvements at Jordan Ridge Park. He noted that the City previously acquired a residential property adjacent to the park, which will be demolished to create additional parking. This improvement is intended to address long-standing parking shortages, reduce congestion from on-street parking, and improve traffic flow. He added that the project will also include a new connection to 2200 West, enhancing access to the park.

Council Member Johnson raised concerns regarding the proposed connection to 2200 West, noting that it may result in increased traffic both in front of and behind nearby homes. She referenced the current cul-de-sac configuration and questioned how the connection could affect existing neighborhood traffic patterns and resident experience.

Assistant City Manager Tingey clarified that the current roadway configuration includes cul-de-sacs, and the proposed connection would primarily impact one home that would experience traffic both from 2200 West and into the new parking lot. He noted that while this may shift traffic patterns, the change is intended to alleviate existing issues, as park visitors currently park throughout the surrounding neighborhood, creating congestion along residential streets.

Council Member Johnson expressed concern that the proposed connection to 2200 West would introduce new traffic patterns behind homes that currently experience limited activity. She noted that while the front-facing streets are accustomed to park-related traffic, the rear of these properties, where residents currently have a degree of privacy, would be impacted by the addition of a roadway and increased vehicle use. She indicated this change could create concerns for affected homeowners.

City Manager Lewis explained that a design study will be conducted to evaluate options for the proposed connection to 2200 West. He acknowledged that residents on the east side may have concerns about increased traffic and changes to their neighborhood, while noting that residents on the opposite side are currently experiencing impacts from park-related traffic. He emphasized that the study will help balance these concerns and identify the most appropriate solution.

Assistant City Manager Tingey stated that residents on the west side of the park have historically expressed concerns about on-street parking and have supported expanding the parking lot and creating a circulation pattern to reduce congestion. He noted that many of those residents are aware

of the City's property acquisition and proposed improvements. He added that while outreach has been more limited on the east side, feedback from west-side residents has generally been supportive, as the changes would alleviate existing parking impacts in their neighborhood.

Council Member Johnson expressed surprise at the reported support from some residents and noted that feedback may differ among neighborhoods. She indicated that residents in the newer subdivision have shared concerns with her, suggesting that perspectives on the proposed changes vary depending on location and potential impact.

Assistant City Manager Tingey stated that he has spoken with residents in the newer subdivision, noting that they are interested in understanding the final design of the project. He explained that, at a minimum, the plan will include construction of a parking lot for the park, and additional details will be clarified through the design process.

Council Member Johnson asked whether residents in the newer subdivision fully understand that the proposed project may include direct access from their street to the park, raising concern about how this change could impact neighborhood traffic and resident expectations.

Assistant City Manager Tingey stated that residents in the newer subdivision have already asked about the future use of the property. He explained that they were informed the city plans to expand the park, with at least an extension of the existing parking lot into the newly acquired area. He noted that addressing parking demand has been a primary concern expressed by the neighborhood. He noted that several nearby residents contacted the City after the property was purchased to inquire about future plans. He explained that while a final design has not yet been completed, staff shared preliminary concepts and committed to providing updates as plans are refined. He added that a primary concern expressed by residents was completion of the roadway and cul-de-sac to improve vehicle maneuverability, allowing drivers to turn around more easily without needing to back out.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen stated that as the Jordan Ridge Park project moves into the design phase, additional discussions will occur to better understand and address potential impacts. He continued to review the prepared handout (Attachment A), introducing a separate project involving City-owned property located on 10200 South between Bangerter Highway and 4000 West. He explained that a previously considered plan for the site is no longer being pursued, and the city is now exploring alternative uses. The proposed \$400,000 allocation would fund planning and design efforts to determine how best to utilize the property, which is currently undeveloped.

City Manager Lewis noted that work will begin on the site to construct stormwater detention basins, which will involve initial grading and earthwork. He explained that while this infrastructure project will move forward, the proposed funding will allow the City to plan for additional future uses of the property beyond stormwater management.

Director Klavano explained that the site currently includes an older stormwater detention basin that no longer meets system needs, particularly after additional upstream areas were connected to it. He noted that the existing basin is excessively deep and requires reconfiguration. He outlined plans to reconstruct the current basin and construct an additional basin on the opposite side of the canal, including installation of piping beneath the canal and development of a storm drain outlet.

He added that funding for this work has already been included in the storm drain fund for several years, and construction is anticipated to move forward this year. He emphasized that while stormwater improvements will occur first, the City will continue evaluating long-term uses for the remainder of the property.

Council Member Shelton asked for clarification on whether the proposed stormwater improvements would connect into the existing storm drain system within the nearby subdivision or be routed elsewhere.

Director Garrison explained that the proposed stormwater system will connect into the existing storm drain infrastructure within the subdivision. He noted that water will then continue through the system, ultimately flowing to another downstream detention pond.

Director Klavano added that the stormwater system will ultimately connect into the UDOT drainage system. He noted that water will first be detained within the City's basins and then released at a controlled, slower rate to prevent downstream impacts.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the proposed stormwater improvements will require additional processes or coordination, likely referencing permitting, easements, or agreements associated with connecting into existing systems and downstream infrastructure.

Director Klavano confirmed that the necessary easements for the stormwater project have already been acquired.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen introduced the next set of projects funded through Mulligan's revenues and invited Associate Director Vaske to provide additional details or highlight any notable items.

Associate Director Vaske provided an update on ongoing improvements at Mulligan's, noting that multiple construction projects are underway to enhance amenities and overall visitor experience. He highlighted upgrades to the mini golf course, including restoration of water features such as waterfalls and fountains, as well as the addition of themed rock structures and enhanced lighting to create a more immersive environment. He also announced construction of a new pavilion, expected to begin within the coming weeks, which will replace smaller existing structures and accommodate larger group events. He noted strong demand for group rentals, including corporate events and private parties, and indicated the new pavilion will help meet that need. From a financial standpoint, he reported that Mulligan's has experienced steady revenue growth, increasing from approximately \$2.0 million three years ago to an anticipated \$2.5 million in the current fiscal year. He stated that the operational budget remains below \$1.7 million, with efforts focused on maintaining efficiency while reinvesting in improvements. He added that the department aims to allocate approximately \$350,000 to \$400,000 annually toward capital improvement projects while continuing to build reserves for future needs. He noted that as construction progresses, additional underlying issues are often discovered, and staff have adopted a proactive approach to address those issues immediately rather than deferring maintenance.

City Manager Lewis clarified that the reserve fund referenced by staff is intended to support larger, long-term capital projects at Mulligan's. He explained that while annual investments are made for

ongoing improvements, the reserve is being built to fund more significant future needs, such as replacement of the driving range, which would require substantially more funding than the typical annual capital allocation.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the existing facilities and infrastructure at Mulligan's are currently in sound structural condition.

City Manager Lewis stated that while Mulligan's facilities are currently operational, portions are nearing the end of their service life. He explained that the city is relying on increasing revenues to build reserves and prepare for necessary future replacements and major capital improvements.

Associate Director Vaske stated that with the recent capital improvements and operational efficiencies, he anticipates this may be the final year requesting \$350,000 to \$400,000 in CIP funding. He explained that the facility is transitioning toward a more sustainable model where ongoing needs can be managed through routine maintenance rather than large capital investments. He noted that improved maintenance practices have significantly reduced long-term costs by addressing issues proactively. Additionally, he highlighted efforts to convert underutilized areas of the golf course to water-wise landscaping in coordination with City staff. These changes have already reduced water usage while improving overall course conditions. He added that future planning includes designing a more efficient irrigation system that aligns with water conservation goals, which is expected to further reduce operational costs and support long-term sustainability.

Council Member Shelton suggested exploring potential funding opportunities through the Great Salt Lake Commission or related entities to support water conservation efforts at Mulligan's, particularly projects focused on reducing water usage and implementing water-wise landscaping.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen stated that the staff will continue to pursue funding opportunities through the Great Salt Lake Commission and other state sources as they become available. He emphasized the intent is to secure funding for water conservation initiatives, including projects that reduce turf and replace it with water-wise landscaping.

Associate Director Vaske noted that coordination with staff, including Water Conservation Coordinator Connor Oswald, has helped position Mulligan's projects to align with state water conservation funding opportunities. He explained that these efforts ensure planned improvements, such as converting turf to water-wise landscaping, meeting eligibility requirements for potential reimbursement or grant funding.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification on whether the water-wise landscaping efforts discussed apply specifically to the golf course, the mini golf area, or both.

Associate Director Vaske reiterated that water-wise landscaping efforts will be applied across the Mulligan's facility. He emphasized that on the golf course, many out-of-play areas are currently being irrigated unnecessarily. By converting these areas to more drought-tolerant landscaping, the city can significantly reduce water usage. He added that incorporating these changes may also enhance course design by introducing natural hazard features, while ensuring irrigation is focused only on areas essential to play.

Council Member Zander referenced the use of traditional turf, such as Kentucky bluegrass, in relation to water use and then asked for clarification on where the mini golf aesthetic improvements, such as repairing waterfalls and enhancing visual features, are reflected within the CIP budget.

Associate Director Vaske explained that the aesthetic improvements to the mini golf course, including waterfalls, lighting, and structural enhancements, fall under the broader mini golf improvements category. He noted that funding for these upgrades has been ongoing over the past two years, with investments already made in features such as a pergola and continued enhancements currently being implemented.

Council Member Zander asked whether additional seating, such as benches, could be added at Mulligan's, noting that there appears to be limited seating available for guests waiting in line for activities like mini golf.

Associate Director Vaske responded that additional seating is being incorporated into current improvement projects at Mulligan's. He explained that the city is working with a specialized contractor to create themed seating elements, such as benches designed to resemble natural features like logs or integrated rock structures. He noted that some recently installed rock features are intentionally designed at seating height, allowing guests to sit while waiting at mini golf holes. These enhancements aim to improve both functionality and aesthetics, providing more seating opportunities while maintaining the themed environment of the facility.

Council Member Zander expressed concern regarding the lack of seating and shade at the mini golf course, noting that visitors, particularly those with mobility or health considerations, may struggle while waiting between holes. She emphasized the need for additional shaded seating areas to improve comfort and accessibility, especially given the facility's growing popularity. She voiced support for incorporating more opportunities for guests to rest throughout the course and encouraged staff to prioritize these enhancements as part of ongoing improvements.

Associate Director Vaske emphasized the high level of usage at the mini golf course, noting that from April through October, nearly every hole is consistently occupied, often with additional groups waiting between holes. He highlighted this sustained demand as further justification for enhancements such as increased seating and shade to improve the overall guest experience.

Council Member Zander asked if the mini golf course closed at any point during the year.

Associate Director Vaske clarified that Mulligan's mini golf course has remained open throughout ongoing construction. He explained that staff manage impacts by temporarily closing individual holes or sections as needed, allowing improvements to continue while maintaining overall operations.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen commended Associate Director Vaske and his team for improvements at Mulligan's, noting significant progress and positive momentum. He then invited Council Members to provide feedback on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), asking whether there were any additional projects, infrastructure needs, or facility improvements not currently

included in staff's proposal that should be considered. He emphasized that the list presented reflects staff recommendations but welcomed input to ensure all priorities are addressed.

Council Member McGuire asked whether the proposed level of investment in road maintenance is sufficient to maintain the City's current average pavement condition rating of 84.6.

Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen responded that the current level of road maintenance funding is sufficient to maintain the City's pavement condition rating in the near term. He noted, however, that as the road network continues to expand and age, particularly in areas like Daybreak, where infrastructure is now over 20 years old, the city will likely need to incrementally increase funding in the future. He explained that while preventive maintenance has been effective, more intensive treatments such as overlays will be needed over the next decade, which will require additional investment to sustain current road quality.

Council Member McGuire noted that he did not see specific items addressing IT needs and commented that it seems the city frequently encounters larger, ongoing needs in this area.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen acknowledged that there are IT infrastructure needs included within the CIP, noting that funding has been allocated as part of the general CIP budget. He stated that additional details can be provided to clarify how those funds will be used and indicated that the information is likely documented in the supporting materials.

Mayor Ramsey asked for follow-up regarding previous discussions about landscaping improvements at freeway exits, specifically referencing the 11400 South interchange. She noted that similar exits in Washington County appear to be fully landscaped upon completion and questioned how those improvements are funded. She requested clarification on whether responsibility for such landscaping lies with UDOT, the city, or another entity, and asked whether staff has engaged with UDOT to better understand funding mechanisms and responsibilities for these types of improvements.

Director Klavano explained that historically, any enhanced landscaping at freeway interchanges is considered a "betterment" by UDOT, meaning it is an added feature beyond standard construction. As a result, the cost for those improvements is typically the responsibility of the city. He added that in such cases, the city would also enter into an agreement to maintain the landscaping after installation, making it both a capital and ongoing maintenance commitment for the city.

Mayor Ramsey expressed interest in verifying whether cities in Washington County, such as Washington City and St. George, directly funded the enhanced landscaping at freeway interchanges or if alternative funding arrangements were used. She noted that those exits appear to be fully completed with dryscape landscaping at the time of construction and questioned whether those cities bore the cost or if UDOT or other partners contributed. She emphasized the need to confirm how those projects were funded.

Director Klavano stated that he has an upcoming quarterly meeting with UDOT and will inquire about how landscaping improvements at freeway interchanges in those Cities were funded. He noted that, based on past experience, such enhancements are typically treated as betterments

funded by the local entity, with a maintenance agreement in place. However, he acknowledged that he does not have confirmation and will seek clarification.

Mayor Ramsey observed that freeway interchanges in Washington County appear to have been fully landscaped at the time of completion, suggesting a coordinated approach to design and construction. She noted uncertainty about whether those improvements were funded by local municipalities or through UDOT and expressed interest in confirming the process. She indicated a willingness to reach out directly to officials in Washington County for clarification but suggested first coordinating with UDOT to determine whether those projects followed the standard betterment and maintenance agreement model or a different funding approach.

Director Klavano stated that based on his experience with projects along Bangerter Highway and Mountain View Corridor, any enhanced landscaping or aesthetic improvements have consistently been treated as a cost to the city. He indicated that these types of upgrades are typically not included in standard UDOT project scopes and therefore require local funding and ongoing maintenance commitments.

Mayor Ramsey expressed interest in the I-15 interchanges at 10600 South and 11400 South and requested that staff specifically evaluate how improvements and landscaping enhancements at those locations are handled, including potential opportunities for future upgrades.

Director Klavano noted that the 10600 South I-15 interchange has previously been discussed for potential improvements. However, he indicated that UDOT may be planning a full reconstruction of the interchange as part of future frontage road projects extending from Bangerter Highway to I-215. He suggested that, given this possibility, the city may want to evaluate timing and coordination before pursuing any independent improvements at that location.

Mayor Ramsey reiterated her interest in understanding how other regions can complete high-quality landscaping at freeway interchanges at the time of construction. She noted that interchanges in areas such as Washington County, Las Vegas, and Phoenix appear to be fully landscaped upon opening, and questioned how those improvements are funded and coordinated. She emphasized the need for staff to investigate who is responsible for these enhancements, whether it is the state, local jurisdictions, or a combination, and how similar outcomes might be achieved for interchanges within South Jordan.

City Manager Lewis explained that all projects discussed thus far in the CIP are aligned with available revenues and are fully funded within the current proposal. He then introduced the next agenda item regarding the future of Fire Station 65, noting that a decision is needed on project timing. He explained that if the Council desires the station to be operational by 2028, planning and funding efforts, including a potential bond, would need to begin immediately. If the timeline is extended, those actions could be delayed. He invited Fire Chief Chris Dawson to provide a brief presentation to inform the Council's discussion and decision regarding the bond proposal and timing for the project.

Fire Chief Dawson presented prepared presentation (Attachment B). He provided an overview of increasing service demands and the need to evaluate timing for Fire Station 65. He noted that while a 2028 opening had been discussed, a more realistic timeline, accounting for planning and construction, would likely place completion closer to 2029. He reported significant growth in call volume, with the majority (approximately 80–82%) being EMS-related. The department experienced a 12.25% increase in calls in the past year, a 30.84% increase since the opening of Station 64, and a 106% increase since Station 63 was established. He emphasized that call volume growth has exceeded initial projections. He explained that prior to Station 64, the city experienced increasing response times, which improved after its opening. However, with continued growth, response times are again beginning to trend upward due to higher demand. He described a “leapfrog” effect, where busy stations require coverage from neighboring units, leading to systemwide impacts. He also noted an emerging shift in mutual aid usage. While South Jordan still provides more assistance to neighboring jurisdictions than it receives, there is a gradual increase in outside units responding within the city, driven in part by service gaps in neighboring areas.

Council Member Zander asked for confirmation that Herriman City does not have ambulance service after 7:00 p.m., resulting in South Jordan providing coverage during those hours.

Fire Chief Dawson confirmed that South Jordan does provide ambulance coverage in Herriman City during certain hours. He explained that while the city receives transport revenue for those services, the operational costs of deploying units, such as staffing and resources, are not fully reimbursed. He noted that the department is working with neighboring agencies to improve coordination and balance service demands, acknowledging that while some revenue is generated, it does not entirely offset the cost of providing coverage.

Council Member Harris asked for clarification on whether providing ambulance service to neighboring areas, such as Herriman, results in a net positive revenue for the city.

Fire Chief Dawson confirmed that providing ambulance service to neighboring areas currently generates a net positive revenue. However, he cautioned that this balance is likely temporary. He explained that as call volumes continue to rise, the city risks reaching a point where its own units are unavailable, resulting in increased reliance on mutual aid from neighboring agencies. This would shift revenue away from the city when outside units respond to calls within South Jordan. He also expressed concern about staff workload and burnout, noting that while operations are currently manageable, personnel are already operating at a high pace. He anticipates that continued growth will exacerbate these challenges in the coming years. He added that increasing call volume is limiting the department’s ability to engage in community outreach and education, often requiring overtime staffing to maintain those services. He emphasized that call demand has significantly exceeded projections, with the city surpassing 9,000 calls last year, well ahead of earlier forecasts. He noted that all stations are consistently busy, with no single station experiencing lower demand, underscoring the systemwide need for additional capacity.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the Fire Department tracks call volume and response times by individual station.

Fire Chief Dawson confirmed that the department tracks call volume and response times by station. He noted that response times vary depending on how the data is analyzed but identified the west

side of the city as the primary area of concern. He explained that in the proposed Station 65 service area, particularly on the far west side, response times are significantly longer. While some areas experience response times exceeding eight minutes, it is not uncommon for calls in that region to reach 10, 12, or even 15 minutes. He emphasized that these extended response times highlight a critical service gap and support the need for an additional station in that area.

Council Member McGuire asked for clarification on the response time.

Fire Chief Dawson clarified that response times in the proposed Station 65 service area typically range from 8 to 15 minutes, with more common response times around 12 to 13 minutes under normal conditions. He noted that these times assume Station 64 is available to respond. He explained that when Station 64 is already on a call, response must come from a more distant station, such as Station 62, adding an additional 5 to 6 minutes to response times. He emphasized the critical impact of these delays, stating that for medical emergencies such as cardiac arrest, choking, or difficulty breathing, response times within 6 to 8 minutes offer a strong chance of survival, whereas response times exceeding 15 minutes significantly reduce the likelihood of survival. He also noted that delayed response times affect fire incidents, where faster response can contain a fire to a limited area, while delays increase the risk of the fire spreading to additional structures. He added that increasing density on the west side of the city further heightens these risks.

Council Member McGuire asked what the Fire Department considers to be the ideal response time from the moment a call is received to when crews arrive on scene.

Fire Chief Dawson stated that the department's ideal response time, from dispatch to arrival, is approximately 5 to 6 minutes, with an acceptable target range of 5 to 7 minutes. He noted that current performance across much of the City typically falls within 7 to 8 minutes, depending on location and conditions. He explained that several factors impact response times, including geographic distance from stations, traffic calming measures, road design, and the availability of units. When primary units are already on calls, response times increase significantly as coverage shifts to more distant stations. He added that improvements in dispatch technology and internal processes have reduced turnout times (from notification to departure), saving approximately one to one-and-a-half minutes in some cases. However, once crews are enroute, travel time is constrained by safety and roadway conditions. He emphasized that while the system is currently functioning adequately, continued growth in call volume, already exceeding projections, will soon outpace existing capacity. He noted that the city is approaching 10,000 annual calls and that service gaps, particularly on the far west side, are becoming more pronounced, reinforcing the need for additional infrastructure such as Station 65.

Council Member Zander asked why the service area shown in purple on the map (Attachment B) extends significantly into Herriman rather than being reoriented to provide more coverage toward the west side of South Jordan, where growth and demand are increasing.

Fire Chief Dawson clarified that the response area shown on the map is based on travel time along the existing road network, not designated service boundaries. He explained that the purple area extends into Herriman because major roadways, such as Mountain View Corridor, allow for faster travel in that direction. He emphasized that this does not represent South Jordan's primary service area in Herriman, but rather illustrates how quickly units can reach locations based on current

infrastructure. He added that both cities provide limited mutual aid across boundaries, but official response areas remain defined separately.

City Manager Lewis explained that current gaps in coverage, particularly in recently annexed areas, are due to a lack of roadway access. He noted that without established roads, emergency vehicles are unable to reach those areas, which is reflected in the response coverage map. He added that future infrastructure improvements, including roadway extensions such as U-111, will help improve access and allow for more effective emergency response coverage in those areas.

Fire Chief Dawson explained that the proposed location for Station 65 was selected based on projected future road networks and anticipated growth patterns. He noted that staff conducted planning analysis to estimate how response coverage would improve as infrastructure develops, particularly with planned roadway connections such as U-111. He stated that the selected site is expected to provide strong coverage to the southwest portion of the city, including areas that are currently underserved. He added that while future annexations could require additional evaluation, the proposed location adequately meets current and near-term needs within existing boundaries. He also emphasized that there is currently limited emergency service coverage on the far west side from neighboring jurisdictions, including West Jordan and Herriman City. He noted that coordination has occurred with those cities regarding their future plans, and based on that information, South Jordan's proposed station location is strategically positioned to fill a critical service gap.

Council Member Johnson asked for clarification regarding areas on the map (Attachment B) that appear to have homes but are not shaded within the response time zones. She questioned whether those areas fall outside the modeled response time ranges shown, indicating longer response times than those highlighted.

Fire Chief Dawson explained that areas on the map without shading, particularly in the north-central portion, are not included in the modeled response zones due to limited road access. He noted that in some cases, neighboring agencies, such as West Jordan's Station 54, can reach those areas more quickly and may provide primary response coverage there.

City Manager Lewis added that if neighboring jurisdictions' coverage areas were included on the map, those unshaded areas would fall within their response zones. He noted that West Jordan's station coverage "bubble" extends into that area, demonstrating how regional coordination helps ensure service coverage despite local gaps.

Fire Chief Dawson noted that, in addition to constructing Station 65, long-term planning includes relocating Station 61 further west to improve systemwide coverage. He explained that moving Station 61 would help close existing service gaps and create better overlap between response areas, resulting in more consistent coverage across the city. He added that as the road network continues to develop, particularly in underserved areas, response capabilities will improve. He also noted that travel times tend to be faster on the east side of the city due to wider roads and fewer traffic-calming features, which contributes to more efficient response in those areas compared to the west side.

Council Member Zander asked for additional detail regarding coordination with neighboring jurisdictions, specifically inquiring whether cities to the north and south have plans to build new fire stations in the west-side area or if they are currently budgeting for future coverage expansions.

Fire Chief Dawson explained that neighboring jurisdictions are actively planning for future fire service expansion in the west-side area. He noted that West Jordan is considering a new station along U-111, likely positioned farther north near 9000 South, while Herriman has discussed adding coverage for the Olympia Hills area. He stated that these planned locations align well with South Jordan's proposed Station 65, creating effective spacing between agencies. He added that South Jordan intentionally positioned its proposed station slightly farther north to better serve its own residents while avoiding overextension into neighboring service areas. He also highlighted additional considerations, including rising construction and equipment costs. He noted that the apparatus for Station 65 has already been purchased in advance to manage cost increases and will be delivered this year. The unit is designed to handle both structural and wildland fire responses and may be deployed in the interim to generate revenue before the station becomes operational.

Council Member Shelton asked if the new apparatus was being stored at Station 64.

Fire Chief Dawson noted they will take delivery in June 2026 and start deploying it. He continued to review prepared presentation (Attachment B). He provided additional details on operations, staffing, and the anticipated benefits of Station 65. He noted that the new apparatus for the station will be delivered this year and deployed in the interim to support operations, provide training opportunities, and generate revenue through regional deployments. The unit is designed to handle both structural and wildland fire responses, aligning with anticipated needs on the west side. He emphasized the increasing workload on firefighters, with each station averaging approximately 2,300 calls annually. He highlighted that staff handle a wide range of responsibilities, including EMS, fire response, technical rescue, hazardous materials, and ongoing training requirements exceeding 100 hours per employee each year. He also noted the added strain of nighttime calls and the department's efforts to manage fatigue and maintain staff safety. He cautioned that while the department is currently managing demand, continued call volume growth will likely lead to increased burnout if additional resources are not added. He outlined the anticipated benefits of Station 65, including improved response times on the west side, more balanced workload distribution across stations, reduced reliance on mutual aid, and increased EMS-related revenue. He reiterated that geographic coverage, not just staffing levels, is the primary driver for adding a new station, noting that simply increasing personnel at existing stations would not adequately address response time challenges. He added that the department does not anticipate needing a second company at Station 64 for at least a decade and proposed a phased staffing approach over multiple budget years to help manage long-term personnel costs associated with Station 65.

Council Member Harris asked how the proposed size of Fire Station 65 compares to the existing Station 64.

Fire Chief Dawson explained that Fire Station 65 will be slightly larger than Station 63 but smaller than Station 64, at approximately 75% of the square footage of Station 64. He noted that the design includes additional bay space to address current equipment storage needs, as some apparatus and equipment are currently stored outdoors. The station will include four apparatus bays, though they

will be shorter in length than those at Station 64. He added that the station is being designed to accommodate approximately “one and a half” companies, rather than the two full companies at Station 64. This approach provides flexibility for future growth, allowing space for additional units such as a squad or medic unit as demand increases over time. He emphasized that this forward-looking design would help meet long-term needs with only a modest increase in upfront costs.

Council Member Zander asked whether the planned capacity of Fire Station 65 accounts for future development on the Rio Tinto property, or if the station is intended primarily to serve remaining growth within Daybreak. She questioned whether additional infrastructure, such as Station 66 would be needed to accommodate long-term expansion beyond current projections.

Fire Chief Dawson clarified that Fire Station 65 is being planned to accommodate all currently annexed areas, including anticipated development such as the Rio Tinto property. He stated that, based on current projections, the station will provide adequate coverage for existing boundaries well into the future. He noted, however, that if the city were to experience significant additional annexation beyond current plans, such as expansion toward Butterfield Canyon or other areas, that would require a separate evaluation and potentially additional infrastructure.

Council Member Harris asked whether the city anticipates receiving any specific funding contributions from the Rio Tinto development, such as impact fees or other revenue sources, to help support infrastructure needs like Fire Station 65.

City Manager Lewis explained that if the Council decides to move forward with Fire Station 65, staff will return with a detailed funding plan. He noted that portions of the cost would be allocated proportionally to development areas such as the Rio Tinto property and other impacted properties. He emphasized that the key decision for the Council at this stage is whether to include the project in the current budget cycle. If so, staff will complete additional financial analysis and present a breakdown of funding sources and cost allocations at a future budget meeting.

Council Member Shelton asked for clarification on whether the estimated \$23 million cost for Fire Station 65 includes the total cost.

City Manager Lewis explained that repayment of the bond for Fire Station 65 would depend on how project costs are allocated and recovered. He noted that portions attributed to development could be repaid through impact fees or other developer contributions, depending on how and when those funds are collected. He added that any remaining costs not covered by development would be the City’s responsibility and could be funded through various mechanisms, such as property taxes, a public safety district, or a general obligation bond. He stated that if the Council chooses to move forward, staff will return with a comprehensive breakdown of funding options and repayment strategies for consideration.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the estimated \$23 million represents the full project cost, including all associated expenses.

City Manager Lewis responded that staff would return with a detailed breakdown showing how costs are allocated, including portions attributed to development and how those contributions would be collected over time. He noted that the timing of those revenues would influence the

amount the city needs to bond upfront and how repayment would be structured. He added that any remaining portion not covered by development would require a city funding source, such as property taxes or other mechanisms, which staff would outline in future options.

Council Member Harris then asked about the timing of issuing a bond, specifically whether current conditions are favorable compared to waiting.

City Manager Lewis responded that while interest rates are uncertain, construction costs are currently experiencing a relative dip. He noted that locking in construction costs at a “not-to-exceed” amount could be advantageous, suggesting that from a construction pricing standpoint, the timing may be favorable.

CFO Naidu explained that interest rates have recently declined slightly and may continue to trend downward, which could be beneficial for timing a bond issuance. However, he emphasized that the overall cost of borrowing will depend heavily on the funding source and security pledged for the bond. He noted that if repayment is tied to uncertain or unproven revenue streams, such as future development-related revenues without an established collection history, bondholders and rating agencies may view that as higher risk, resulting in higher interest rates. In contrast, he explained that more stable and predictable revenue sources, such as sales tax, would result in more favorable rates, while general obligation bonds, backed by the full faith and credit of the city, would typically offer the lowest interest rates. He concluded that the city would need to evaluate these options carefully, as the choice of funding mechanism will significantly impact borrowing costs.

Mayor Ramsey asked whether staff could provide a preliminary estimate of the City’s portion of the \$23 million project cost, even at a high level, and what that amount might translate to in terms of financial impact.

City Manager Lewis explained that the \$23 million estimate for Fire Station 65 is based on an architectural projection and recent comparable projects. He noted that prior stations varied significantly in cost, Station 62 being smaller, while Station 64 was more expensive due to additional components such as a police annex and office space. He clarified that Station 65 is planned as a standard fire station without those added elements, which should help control costs.

Staff also referenced a recently constructed station in Sandy, which cost approximately \$21–23 million, though it was larger in scope. Chief Dawson added that the current estimate may be slightly conservative, with the hope that final costs could be lower depending on construction market conditions.

Council Member Shelton then asked whether the City currently has bonding capacity available through sales tax revenues to support the project.

CFO Naidu confirmed that the City does have bonding capacity available based on sales tax revenues. He explained that capacity is determined using a formula that considers total sales tax revenue and subtracts existing debt obligations already pledged against it, such as the public safety building, prior fire stations, and the Jordan Gateway project. He noted that while capacity exists, rating agencies also evaluate how much of the City’s sales tax revenue is already being used for

ongoing operations. This can influence how much additional debt the City can reasonably take on and may affect borrowing terms.

Mayor Ramsey asked for clarification on the funding source for Fire Station 64, specifically questioning whether that bond is supported by property tax rather than sales tax revenues.

CFO Naidu clarified that the bond for Fire Station 64 is funded through a combination of sources. He explained that while a significant portion of the debt service is covered through existing revenues, there was a remaining gap that required a property tax increase to fully fund the obligation. He noted that this resulted in a hybrid approach, where both existing revenue sources and a portion of property tax are used to meet the annual debt service.

Council Member Shelton expressed concern about pursuing a general obligation bond, indicating a lack of support for that funding approach. He noted that, from the perspective of bonding agencies, existing debt is effectively viewed as being supported by sales tax and suggested a preference for structuring future bonding similarly rather than relying on property tax-backed general obligation bonds.

City Manager Lewis clarified that the immediate decision before the Council is whether to include Fire Station 65 in the current budget cycle. He emphasized that staff are not seeking approval of a specific funding mechanism at this time, but rather direction on whether to move forward this year. He explained that if the Council chooses to proceed, staff will complete additional analysis and return with detailed options for funding, bonding structures, and cost allocations. If not, the project would be deferred for consideration in a future budget cycle.

Council Member Johnson summarized the decision as whether to move forward now and incur costs sooner or delay the project and potentially face higher costs in the future, including increased construction expenses and interest rates.

Council Member Shelton expressed that it is difficult to determine whether to move forward this year without a clearer understanding of the financial implications. He noted that making a decision to include the project in the budget is challenging without more detailed information on costs, funding structure, and overall impact.

City Manager Lewis reiterated that staff could develop and present detailed financial information, including cost breakdowns, funding options, and impacts, at the next budget session. He asked the Council whether they would like staff to proceed with that additional analysis to support a more informed decision.

Council Member Zander summarized that the Council could direct staff to prepare detailed financial analysis and funding options for Fire Station 65, return with that information at a future meeting, and then make a final decision as a body based on those details.

City Manager Lewis acknowledged that directing staff to bring back detailed information is one approach but emphasized that the Council will ultimately need to decide whether to take on the project.

Council Member Johnson noted that the purpose of starting the budget process early is to allow time for collaboration, evaluation of priorities, and determining next steps together.

City Manager Lewis asked the Council to consider what direction they would like to take moving forward regarding Fire Station 65 so staff can proceed accordingly.

Council Member Zander stated that it would be prudent for the Council to review detailed financial information before deciding. She indicated that evaluating the numbers is a necessary and responsible next step prior to determining whether to move forward with the project.

CFO Naidu explained that staff is seeking direction now due to tight budget timelines and uncertainty at the state level, which may impact when decisions must be finalized. He noted that developing a full financial plan for Fire Station 65 requires significant analysis, including coordination with consultants, evaluating proportional cost shares from developments, and structuring repayment strategies. He emphasized that if the Council is interested in moving forward, staff needs that direction now so they can begin the detailed work immediately. This includes analyzing how development contributions would be collected over time and determining how the city would front initial costs through bonding or other means. Conversely, if the Council is not ready to consider the project this year, staff could defer the analysis and take additional time to refine the financial details for a future budget cycle.

Council Member Shelton expressed mixed feelings regarding the proposed Fire Station 65. He acknowledged concern about current response times exceeding the ideal range, particularly given the impact during emergencies, and indicated sensitivity to the need for improved service levels. However, he also expressed frustration with the prior investment in Fire Station 64, noting that it had been presented as a long-term solution with capacity to accommodate future growth. He stated concern that the facility has not been fully utilized as originally anticipated, which makes consideration of an additional station more difficult.

City Manager Lewis responded that the design and capacity of Fire Station 64 were intentional, based on anticipated future growth. He noted that approximately 5,000 additional homes are expected to be developed nearby, which will significantly increase demand in that area. He explained that the station's larger size allows for a second company to be added when that growth materializes, and that the facility will be fully utilized as development intensifies.

Council Member Shelton acknowledged that anticipated growth near Fire Station 64 has been slower than expected, resulting in the facility currently being ahead of demand. He noted that while the capacity may eventually be needed, the City is presently ahead of the curve in terms of infrastructure at that location.

City Manager Lewis explained that Fire Station 64 was intentionally constructed ahead of full development to avoid the challenges of building critical infrastructure after the area is fully built out. He noted that the planned development of approximately 5,000 housing units on nearby acreage will result in higher-density growth, including taller buildings, which will significantly increase service demand in the future.

Mayor Ramsey expressed concern that the long-term need for additional fire stations may be evolving beyond what was originally presented. She noted that the level of future development now being discussed was not anticipated at the time prior decisions were made and indicated unease with the possibility of needing additional stations, such as a future Station 66, beyond the current proposal.

City Manager Lewis clarified that the need for a future Fire Station 66 would depend on additional annexation. He explained that if the city does not expand beyond its current boundaries, another station would likely not be necessary. However, if significant new areas are annexed in the future, the need for additional fire service infrastructure could arise.

Council Member Shelton expressed concern about constructing infrastructure significantly ahead of actual need, noting that doing so places a financial burden on current residents. He stated that building facilities decades before they are fully utilized may not be advantageous, even if construction costs rise over time. He suggested that delaying expansion until closer to when the capacity is needed could be more financially beneficial, allowing the City to align costs more directly with actual demand and growth.

CFO Naidu explained that one way the city manages long-term infrastructure costs is through bond structuring. He noted that bonds are typically issued for up to 20 years, which allows future residents, who will benefit from the infrastructure, to share in the repayment over time. He added that when refinancing opportunities arise, the Council may consider whether to shorten or extend the repayment period. Extending the term can increase total interest paid but spread the costs across a larger population over a longer period, including future residents. He emphasized that these decisions involve balancing total cost with fairness in distributing the financial burden across current and future taxpayers.

Fire Chief Dawson clarified that Fire Station 64 is already operating at full capacity in terms of apparatus space, with all bays currently in use. He noted that the station is effectively functioning at “one and a half” companies, including multiple medic units, to support increased service demands such as interfacility transport (IFT). The remaining unused space consists of a small number of bedrooms. He also clarified that discussions of a potential Station 66 were tied to earlier scenarios involving expansion into areas such as Butterfield Canyon. Based on current City boundaries and known development, he expressed confidence that Station 65 will adequately serve existing and anticipated needs. He added that Station 65 is being designed with modest flexibility, including a few additional bedrooms, to allow for future expansion, such as adding another ambulance unit, without requiring a new facility, thereby providing a cost-effective long-term solution.

Council Member Shelton referenced Draper Mayor Troy Walker, who stated that their EMS response times are approximately three minutes. He questioned the accuracy of that claim and whether it reflects actual performance or may be overstated, noting the contrast with South Jordan’s current response times.

Fire Chief Dawson responded that a three-minute response time is not realistic for fire and EMS services in Salt Lake County. He explained that response time includes multiple components, beginning with dispatch and turnout time, noting that crews are typically required to leave the

station within about 60 seconds during the day and up to two minutes at night. He emphasized that, given these factors, along with travel distance and road conditions, achieving a full response time of three minutes would be physically impractical. He added that he is highly sensitive to response time concerns, acknowledging both the stress experienced by residents waiting for assistance and the pressure on responders who recognize the urgency of reaching emergencies as quickly as possible.

Council Member Harris expressed concern about increasing service demand due to an aging population, noting that EMS calls are likely to continue rising as residents age. He emphasized the importance of being proactive in addressing future needs and stated that the city has a responsibility to explore options. He indicated support for moving forward with further analysis this year to better understand the feasibility of Fire Station 65 and determine whether the project can be implemented.

Mayor Ramsey expressed support for obtaining detailed financial information before deciding on Fire Station 65. She noted that the Council does not yet have enough clarity to commit to moving forward, as the full scope of the financial obligation is not yet understood. She emphasized that reviewing the numbers is a necessary step to make an informed decision, while also noting the Council's commitment to addressing important issues proactively rather than deferring them indefinitely.

City Manager Lewis asked the Council to confirm whether staff should continue developing the detailed financial analysis for Fire Station 65 or if there was an alternative direction they preferred to take moving forward.

Council Member Johnson expressed support for ensuring adequate emergency service coverage but emphasized concern about the cumulative financial impact on residents. She noted the importance of being mindful of increasing tax burdens and the broader economic pressures facing the community and encouraged careful consideration of how additional costs may affect residents.

CFO Naidu stated that staff will evaluate a full range of funding options for Fire Station 65 and present those to the Council. He noted that previous discussion included both worst-case and best-case scenarios but emphasized that there are many potential approaches in between. He indicated that when staff returns, they will provide a more refined analysis with multiple options to help the Council understand and compare the financial impacts before making a decision.

Council Member Johnson emphasized that the primary concern is finding a reasonable balance between maintaining essential public safety services and minimizing additional financial strain on residents. She noted that community members are already expressing concern about rising costs and broader economic pressures and stressed the importance of being mindful of that context when considering new expenditures.

CFO Naidu stated that staff will explore a variety of funding strategies, including potential internal financing options, to minimize the need for tax increases. He noted that the City may be able to utilize existing fund balances or other internal resources and structure repayment over time. However, he cautioned that state legislative actions could impact available resources, including

potential changes to fund balance policies or revenue streams. He emphasized the importance of evaluating multiple options while remaining adaptable to external factors.

City Manager Lewis noted that the meeting time was concluding and asked if there were any additional questions regarding the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects presented. He asked for confirmation that the Council was comfortable with the proposed projects and indicated that staff will follow up by incorporating additional details, including IT-related items, into the plan.

Council Member McGuire requested follow-up on the I-15 betterment improvements.

City Manager Lewis confirmed that staff will follow up on the improvements question raised and provide additional information. He noted that the item will be addressed as part of ongoing discussions rather than requiring a formal addition to the CIP at this time.

Council Member Harris asked about long-term facility planning as the city continues to grow, including potential needs for additional public works facilities and other infrastructure. He inquired whether there may be opportunities to co-locate services, such as incorporating police functions within Fire Station 65, similar to past projects, and requested a broader view of future facility needs across departments.

City Manager Lewis responded that co-locating police services within Fire Station 65 is not currently planned, as recent investments, such as the public safety building and Station 64, already provide adequate coverage for police operations. He explained that police deployment differs from fire services, as officers are distributed throughout the city rather than operating from fixed response locations, making co-location less critical.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen added that the city is planning ahead for future facility needs by reserving land near the Public Works building for a potential public safety training facility. While this project is not currently funded, the space has been set aside to accommodate future training needs as the city continues to grow.

Council Member Harris requested a high-level overview of anticipated future capital needs as the city approaches buildout. He expressed interest in understanding potential “big ticket” items, such as major facilities, locations, and infrastructure, at a conceptual level, noting that a detailed analysis is not necessary at this time but that a general outlook would be helpful for planning purposes.

City Manager Lewis noted that if no additional annexations occur, the city is generally on track to have the infrastructure needed for buildout. However, he identified future facility considerations, including the eventual replacement or relocation of Fire Station 61. He explained that Station 61, as the City’s oldest fire station, is approaching the end of its useful life and will likely need to be rebuilt within the next 15 to 20 years as part of long-term capital planning.

Mayor Ramsey asked for clarification on the projected timeline for rebuilding Fire Station 61, questioning whether the estimate is truly in the 15–20 year range and expressing hope that replacement would not be needed sooner.

City Manager Lewis explained that the city intends to maximize the useful life of Fire Station 61 for as long as possible, noting that extending it to a 60-year lifespan would be ideal. However, he emphasized that replacement timing will ultimately depend on the building's condition as it ages. He added that when the station is eventually rebuilt or relocated, it will also present an opportunity to improve service coverage, as reflected in the response coverage analysis. He added that the City has already acquired property for the future relocation or replacement of Fire Station 61. He noted that securing the site now ensures the city is prepared whenever the need arises, whether in 5, 10, 20, or more years, allowing flexibility in timing while preserving the option for improved service coverage in the future.

Council Member Zander asked about the status of a new public works facility.

City Manager Lewis clarified that the new public works facility is already funded and currently in progress. He noted that the site is located just north of Mountain Creek Middle School, indicating that the project is actively moving forward rather than being a future or unfunded need.

Mayor Ramsey proposed organizing a field trip for Council Members to visit key infrastructure sites across the city. She suggested that seeing locations firsthand, such as future project sites and facilities like water tanks, would provide valuable context and improve understanding of current and planned investments. She indicated that touring these sites together could help the Council better visualize infrastructure needs and support more informed decision-making.

City Manager Lewis expressed support for organizing a Council site visit to review infrastructure projects. He also stated his intent to reconvene the compensation committee, noting that additional cost-saving opportunities have been identified and warrant further discussion. He indicated that staff would coordinate scheduling for the committee meeting prior to the next upcoming budget session to ensure those discussions inform the overall budget process.

Council Members expressed concern that the need for Fire Station 65 differs from what had previously been communicated during planning for Station 64. Several noted that earlier discussions suggested Station 64 would serve as a long-term solution, and the introduction of an additional station represents a shift from those expectations. Council Members acknowledged that increased density and growth help explain the evolving need but emphasized that this change may be difficult to communicate with residents given prior messaging. The Council also noted that future development decisions, particularly related to potential increases in density of large properties such as Rio Tinto, could further impact service demands, response times, and long-term infrastructure needs. Council Members emphasized that these uncertainties should be considered as part of ongoing planning and decision-making.

Council Member McGuire motioned to adjourn the March 4, 2026 City Council Budget Meeting. Council Member Zander seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.
ADJOURNMENT

The March 4, 2026 City Council Budget Meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.