

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

February 4, 2025

Present: Mayor Dawn Ramsey, Council Member Patrick Harris, Council Member Kathie Johnson, Council Member Don Shelton, Council Member Tamara Zander, Council Member Jason McGuire, City Manager Dustin Lewis, Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen, City Attorney Ryan Loose, Director of Planning Steven Schaefermeyer, Director of City Commerce Brian Preece, Director of Strategy & Budget Don Tingey, Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison, CFO Sunil Naidu, City Engineer Brad Klavano, Director of Administrative Services Melinda Seager, Police Chief Jeff Carr, Deputy Police Chief Rob Hansen, Fire Chief Chris Dawson, Director of Recreation Janell Payne, Communications Manager Rachael Van Cleave, CTO Matthew Davis, Senior Systems Administrator Phill Brown, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, Planner Miguel Aguilera, Long Range Planner Joe Moss, City Recorder Anna Crookston

Absent:

Others: Travis Barton, Laurel Bevans, Dan Milar, Lori Harding

4:36 P.M.
STUDY MEETING

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

Mayor Ramsey introduced the meeting and welcomed everyone present.

B. Invocation: *By Council Member, Jason McGuire*

Council Member McGuire offered the invocation.

C. Mayor and Council Coordination

Council Member Shelton mentioned he will be appointed this week to serve as the Chair of the Jordan River Commission.

Mayor Ramsey noted that a few potential discussion items may be addressed at the next meeting due to the full agenda for this session. She also provided an update on her upcoming travel, stating that she will be in Washington, D.C., starting Sunday with the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) to attend the National Association of Regional Councils conference. During the trip, she will meet with the Utah delegation on Wednesday to discuss transportation priorities. She also shared an update regarding her role with the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC). She noted that the full WFRC met last Thursday, during which the nominating committee made its recommendations. That meeting marked the conclusion of her two-year term as chair. However, for the first time in the organization's history, the committee nominated the same

person to serve a consecutive second term as chair, making it her first day of a second term. She emphasized the importance of South Jordan maintaining a strong presence in regional decision-making, ensuring the city remains informed and engaged in key discussions regarding transportation and other priorities.

Attorney Loose asked whether he should plan on voting at the Legislative Policy Committee (LPC) meeting.

Mayor Ramsey said for Attorney Loose to plan on voting in her place as she'll be attending the conference.

D. Discussion/Review of Regular Council Meeting:

Public Hearing Item:

- **Ordinance 2025-06**, Amending Section 17.130.050 (Planned Development Floating Zone) of the South Jordan Municipal Code to include the area east of the FrontRunner rail line in eligible areas for density greater than eight dwelling units per acre.

E. Presentation Item: 4:35 p.m.

E.1. Planning Commission member appointment. *(By Director of Planning, Steven Schaefermeyer)*

Director Schaefermeyer introduced Lori Harding and mentioned that Ms. Harding has been nominated by Council Member Shelton to fill his current vacancy.

Lori Harding noted she has been a resident of South Jordan City for over 20 years. She currently works as a Welfare and Self-Reliance Manager for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. In this role, she supports the entire city of South Jordan and its congregations by helping those in need find resources. She also works directly with the city on emergency response efforts to maintain strong communication. She expressed enthusiasm about the opportunity and welcomed any questions.

Council Member Shelton shared that he first met Ms. Harding through her work and church involvement. He noted that as a self-reliance specialist in his stake, he has personally benefited from her support and found her to be very effective and helpful in her role. He also highlighted her extensive experience serving on various boards and commissions, inviting her to share more about her civic service.

Ms. Harding said she considers herself as a recovering banker, sharing that she transitioned to her current role at the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints after spending over 20 years with Zions Bank. Her background includes extensive experience in real estate, loans, and business funding. She also highlighted her commitment to civic service, mentioning that she currently serves on the board of the YWCA and is involved with Raise the Future, an organization dedicated to finding homes for older children in foster care, a cause close to her heart, as all three of her children were adopted. Additionally, she has previously been involved in various boards and committees, including the Utah State PTA, reflecting her passion for

education and community engagement. While she has shifted her focus more toward the YWCA in recent years, her broad experience in service and advocacy continues to shape her work.

Mayor Ramsey acknowledged Ms. Harding's extensive contributions to the community through volunteer work and her dedication to important causes. She also noted that Ms. Harding had undergone a thorough interview with Council Member Shelton, where she had the opportunity to sit down and discuss her background and qualifications in depth.

Council Member Shelton acknowledged that he had interviewed both Ms. Harding and another highly qualified candidate for the position. He noted that it was a difficult decision given the talent and experience of both applicants. However, Ms. Harding's extensive background in service, along with her experience on various boards and committees, made her an outstanding choice for the Planning Commission. He expressed gratitude for her willingness to serve and remarked on the difference between participating in discussions as a concerned citizen and taking on the responsibility of decision-making in a leadership role.

Mayor Ramsey outlined the process for appointments, explaining that after discussions among the council, a decision would be communicated to the candidate later that evening. She expressed appreciation to Ms. Harding for coming and meeting the Council.

F. Discussion Items: 4:45 p.m.

**F.1. Wheadon Acres Flag Lot Overlay Zone and Development Agreement. (By
Director of Planning, Steven Schaefermeyer)**

Director Schaefermeyer provided background on the flag lot overlay zone application, noting that it was the first request using this tool. The Planning Commission had given a positive recommendation in September. Since the zone requires a development agreement to be utilized, the applicant presented the request to the City Council in October and again in December. The Council approved the rezone in December with a 3-2 vote but did not approve the development agreement, with a 2-3 vote. Since then, a pending ordinance has been passed to evaluate potential changes to the flag lot overlay zone, including a prohibition on detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and a possible shift from a legislative to an administrative approval process. Staff is working on these updates and will seek Council direction after Planning Commission review.

Director Schaefermeyer introduced Miguel Aguilera, the assigned planner, who distributed handouts (Attachment A) outlining the developer's obligations in the agreement, including plat maps. He highlighted a key provision, prohibiting detached ADUs, which was added between the first and second City Council meetings in response to concerns. He stated that the purpose of the discussion was to clarify Council concerns regarding the development agreement. Since the rezone was approved but the agreement was not, staff needed direction on any necessary revisions before bringing it back for a vote. He requested input from the Council to help the applicant understand and address any issues.

Mayor Ramsey clarified that while the rezone has been approved, it cannot take effect or be utilized without an approved development agreement.

Director Schaefermeyer introduced applicant Dan Milar and his consultant Laurel Bevans.

Mayor Ramsey asked the Council if there was a specific issue in the development agreement that led to its failure, despite the rezone being approved. She suggested identifying any concerns and exploring whether adjustments could be made to align with the Council's expectations. She also recalled that the vote on the development agreement was 3-2.

Council Member Shelton noted that the development agreement appeared standard, except for bullet point D3, which prohibits exterior accessory dwelling units (ADUs). He supported this provision because the subdivision's density was already increasing, and allowing detached ADUs could lead to an even greater density increase beyond what was initially planned. He also mentioned wanting to avoid a situation where a future council might take a different approach that significantly alters the subdivision's character. He believed Council Member Zander shared a similar viewpoint.

Council Member Zander sought clarification on the restriction, asking if the prohibition applied only to detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in this specific development. She wanted to confirm that internal ADUs would still be allowed and that this restriction was not being applied citywide. She expressed general support for detached ADUs but was comfortable limiting them to internal units in this particular case.

Director Schaefermeyer explained that the flag lot overlay zone was designed with a development agreement requirement to allow the council to evaluate specific situations rather than applying a blanket approval. The intent was to prevent unintended conflicts with neighbors, especially when subdividing an existing lot into a flag lot. He noted that while the tool had been in place for several years, this was the first time it was being used, prompting a reevaluation of its effectiveness. Moving forward, planning staff is working on more defined standards to address concerns like lot size, accessory structures, and placement of buildings to provide greater certainty for both applicants and the city.

Council Member Zander expressed support for the project, emphasizing that it is a thoughtful and respectful use of the land. She noted that the proposed home is well-planned and that an internal ADU is a better fit for the area, as it avoids adding another roofline. She also pointed out that ADUs are already common throughout the city, with many homeowners having unpermitted units. Given that the applicant, Mr. Milar, was transparent about his intentions, she felt the council should not penalize him for his honesty and supported moving the development forward.

Mayor Ramsey invited the three council members who voted against the development agreement to share their concerns and reasoning. She emphasized the importance of understanding whether changes could be made to address their concerns or if their opposition was firm.

Council Member Johnson asked Attorney Loose whether it would be consistent to vote in favor of the development agreement after having voted against the ordinance. She questioned whether the same logic that led to voting against the rezoning should apply to the development agreement as well.

Attorney Loose explained that the consistency of a council member's votes depends on their reasoning. If someone voted against the development agreement but for the rezone, it suggests they support flag lots at this location but had issues with specific terms in the development agreement, such as detached ADUs or other conditions. In that case, once the agreement is revised to their satisfaction, they could vote to approve it. If someone voted against both the rezone and the development agreement, it implies they don't believe this location is appropriate for a flag lot at all, meaning even a revised development agreement wouldn't change their position. If someone voted for the rezone but against the agreement, they are okay with the flag lot but not with the conditions set in the agreement. If someone voted for both, then they're fine with both the zone change and the agreement's terms. Council Member Johnson confirmed that this explanation aligned with how he felt.

Council Member McGuire agreed, stating that he did not see any major issues with the development agreement itself but did not believe the lots in this subdivision should be converted into flag lots.

Council Member Harris shared his perspective, noting that many residents in South Jordan have large lots that can be difficult to maintain, particularly as they age. He acknowledged that some of these lots are not well-kept and, in some cases, may be considered an eyesore by neighbors. At the same time, he recognized the need for new housing and stated that, when done correctly, flag lots can be a sensible solution. However, he expressed concerns about legislating accessory dwelling units (ADUs) through development agreements, emphasizing that such decisions should be handled administratively rather than legislatively. He noted that in the past, the city has not used development agreements to restrict ADUs, and he felt the approach in this case was somewhat arbitrary. This concern influenced his initial vote against the development agreement. Since then, Council discussions have provided more clarity, and he indicated that he would be willing to approve the agreement if it aligns with the broader administrative direction the city is taking regarding ADUs.

Council Member Johnson pointed out that the new administrative direction regarding ADUs would not apply to this particular case, as it was initiated prior to those discussions.

Council Member Shelton clarified that Council Member Harris is saying he would be okay with approving it if the development agreement is consistent with the direction the Council is now giving staff on an administrative basis.

Attorney Loose confirmed that the goal is to amend the development agreement so that it aligns with what was discussed in the notice of the pending ordinance meeting. Council Member Harris said that is what he is comfortable with.

Mayor Ramsey asked whether potential state legislation on ADUs could override the city's current discussions and decisions. Specifically, if the state were to pass a law allowing detached ADUs broadly, would that render the city's development agreement restrictions irrelevant?

Attorney Loose acknowledges that the potential state legislation on ADUs is still in early discussions and hasn't been fully developed. He compared it to a previous bill on internal ADUs, which initially had broad allowances but was later refined with more restrictions. At this point, he hasn't seen a fully formed proposal regarding detached ADUs and isn't sure how far that discussion has progressed. He explained that if state legislation on external ADUs follows the same pattern as the internal ADU law, it would apply broadly and override existing city regulations. However, since the bill is still in negotiation, its final form is uncertain. It could be narrowed to include restrictions such as minimum lot sizes or specific zoning requirements. Without a passed bill, it's difficult to predict its full impact on local ADU policies.

Mayor Ramsey acknowledges the importance of the decision at hand while also recognizing the possibility that state legislation could override it in the near future. She emphasizes the need to move forward based on the city's current authority and decision-making process while remaining aware of potential legislative changes.

Attorney Loose clarifies that while future legislation may impact ADUs, agreements made through development agreements can still impose specific restrictions, even if state law changes. He explained that property owners can voluntarily agree to limit their use of ADUs in exchange for approval of flag lots, which are not currently being considered in legislative discussions. He also points out that without flag lots, the existing two lots could still potentially have ADUs under new state laws, leading to a similar number of living units but with different zoning controls. However, if flag lots are approved and ADUs become more broadly permitted, the total number of units on the properties could increase significantly.

Director Schaefermeyer added that when the internal ADU legislation was passed, it also invalidated HOA restrictions on ADUs.

Attorney Loose added the legislation states that HOA contracts are not enforceable in this regard. No one has challenged this under contract law, but he noted that the person who included that provision in the legislation has a legal interpretation that he personally disagrees with.

Director Schaefermeyer continued, noting that the legislation did not go as far as addressing development agreements and other similar restrictions. He mentioned that this is a frequent point of debate, citing ongoing discussions with individuals like Daybreak. He emphasized the uncertainty surrounding how these regulations interact with existing agreements and the need to navigate these complexities as they arise.

Attorney Loose clarified that development agreements remain enforceable unless legislation explicitly states otherwise. The internal ADU legislation did not address development agreements, similar to how it impacted HOA restrictions. He noted that if the state were to invalidate development agreements, cities would have little incentive to use them, which could significantly impact planning and negotiation processes. He also mentioned that major

developers rely on these agreements to work through project details and generally prefer having them in place.

Mayor Ramsey acknowledged the additional context provided and emphasized the importance of hearing all perspectives in the discussion. She summarized the council's positions, noting that two members feel one way, two feel another, and Council Member Harris has shared his stance. She then asked staff and the applicant whether they have the necessary information to draft a potential proposal for the council's consideration.

Director Schaefermeyer confirmed that Long-Range Planner Joe Moss has already started working on the revisions, ensuring they align with the discussion. He clarified that the council has not committed to any ordinance changes yet but that staff will translate the input received into a proposed ordinance. The likely approach will be an administrative one with specific requirements, including a provision prohibiting ADUs on flag lots. This provision may be included either as a legislative floating zone with restrictions or as an administrative regulation. He stated that staff plans to present this revised agreement (Attachment A) to the council and will coordinate with the applicant to determine an appropriate time for its inclusion on the council agenda.

Mayor Ramsey emphasized that council decisions should never feel arbitrary. While recognizing that some cases may involve unique circumstances, she agreed that broad policies, such as the one under discussion, are best handled with consistency and clear guidelines.

Council Member Harris acknowledged the value of the city staff's research and the in-depth discussion on how other cities handle similar issues. He noted that many councils face emotional pleas from residents when making these decisions, but he prefers a clear administrative approach where guidelines dictate the outcome. Reflecting on the work session, he reiterated that the discussion narrowed down to an either-or decision: properties could either have a flag lot or an ADU, but not both. He expressed confidence in both this conclusion and the overall process.

Attorney Lewis clarified that if the city allows flag lots without explicitly prohibiting ADUs in the development agreement, future state legislation could override local regulations. If the state later permits external ADUs under specific conditions, and the flag lot or the original lot meets those conditions, external ADUs would be allowed regardless of the city's initial intent.

Director Schaefermeyer explained that the city can advocate for addressing any legislative concerns as they arise. Meanwhile, there are multiple applications at different stages of the process. One application vested before the pending ordinance and contains similar provisions in its proposed development agreement, though it has yet to go before the Planning Commission. Another application in the same neighborhood was submitted after the pending ordinance, leaving it in limbo until the city finalizes its approach.

Mayor Ramsey emphasized that the city should not delay any ongoing processes or hold up applications while waiting for potential legislative changes. She reaffirmed that the council has the authority to make decisions based on the current situation. If adjustments are needed due to

future legislation, the city can adapt accordingly, but in the meantime, the established schedule should continue as planned.

Director Schaefermeyer clarified that no formal vote was taken during the meeting. Instead, the discussion provided direction on what should be brought back for the council's consideration in a future meeting.

Attorney Loose clarified that the bill being referenced throughout the discussion is HB 88, sponsored by Representative Raymond Ward, with the Senate floor sponsor being Senator Lincoln Fillmore.

Applicant Dan Milar expressed his admiration for the work being done by the council and staff. Though he works in the industry, he noted that he has had limited exposure to this process and appreciates the careful thought and effort put into it. While the matter impacts him directly, he is not in a rush and understands that these things take time. He acknowledged the well-reasoned approach taken by Council Member Harris, Council Member McGuire, and others, as well as the guidance provided by Attorney Loose. He concluded by thanking everyone for their work and for allowing him to participate in the meeting.

Mayor Ramsey expressed appreciation for Dan Milar's comments and noted that she wished more people had the opportunity to see how thoroughly the council vets issues. She emphasized that the council is far from a rubber-stamp body, as each member takes the time to carefully analyze, understand, and articulate the reasoning behind their decisions. She thanked Mr. Milar for attending and for his acknowledgment of their efforts.

F.2. Statistical Trends in Law Enforcement. *(By Chief of Police, Jeff Carr)*

Police Chief Jeff Carr reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment B) noting crime reporting changes, highlighting the shift from the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system to the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) in 2021. He explained that prior to 2021, crime rates were calculated based on only eight major offenses, four crimes against persons (homicide, robbery, rape, aggravated assault) and four crimes against property (burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, arson). Under NIBRS, additional crimes are now included in the calculations, making the crime rate more comprehensive but also causing an increase in reported rates across the board. Chief Carr presented 2019 data under the old system, showing a crime rate of 15.26 per 1,000 residents. In contrast, 2021, the first full year under NIBRS showed a rate of 34 crimes per 1,000 residents. He noted that this increase was due to the expanded reporting criteria rather than an actual rise in crime. Similarly, Salt Lake City's crime rate jumped from 63 per 1,000 in 2019 to 152 per 1,000 in 2021, illustrating the broader impact of the reporting change. He also shared that despite searching for updated data, crime reports for 2022 and 2023 have not yet been published. Upon inquiring with the Commissioner of Public Safety, he learned that efforts to create a new crime data dashboard had delayed the release of statewide reports. As a result, there is currently no way to compare recent crime rates across cities in Utah. Chief Carr pointed out that while some key metrics are improving, such as the overall decrease in calls and fewer 911 hang-ups, other areas remain concerning. The rise in arrests over the past four years suggests increased enforcement efforts or potentially more criminal activity requiring

intervention. Similarly, the increase in reckless driving incidents is something the department is monitoring closely. He emphasized that fluctuations in crime data are normal, but the department continues to analyze these trends to determine underlying causes and adjust strategies accordingly. The goal is to maintain a proactive approach to crime prevention while ensuring resources are allocated effectively to address emerging concerns.

Council Member McGuire asked what defines reckless driving.

Chief Carr explained that reckless driving often involves incidents like road rage and typically includes multiple moving violations, usually around three. He noted that laws regarding reckless driving have been strengthened, particularly in relation to road rage incidents over the past year. He then provided an overview of crime trends, highlighting that misdemeanors are up while felonies are down. He expressed a preference for this trend, as felonies generally involve more severe crimes. Additionally, priority one to three calls, such as traffic accidents with injuries or crimes in progress, are decreasing, which is a positive sign. However, he pointed out a concerning trend is an increase in calls requiring three or more officers to respond, which has risen by about 15% from the previous year. These types of calls often involve high-risk situations like active domestic disputes or suspicious vehicle reports.

Deputy Police Chief Rob Hansen added that often, the need for additional officers at a scene is to manage behavior effectively. He explained that in certain situations, one officer may need to actively intervene while another monitors the surroundings or searches for additional concerns.

Chief Carr continued reviewing crime trends, highlighting key statistics from the city's records. He noted that the city's jail bookings have steadily increased over the past few years, rising from 371 in 2022 to 426 in 2024. Among the 43 agencies that booked individuals into jail last year, the city ranked fourteenth. He also pointed out that the average booking process takes approximately 28 minutes, plus travel time, meaning an officer is typically out of the city for at least 90 minutes, sometimes longer, depending on the time of day. In some cases, officers opt for a cite-and-release approach to maintain staffing levels within the city. Moving on to crime trends, he explained that while certain violent crime numbers have increased, the overall figures remain relatively low. For example, kidnapping cases, mostly related to domestic disputes and custodial interferences, rose from three in 2023 to nine in 2024. Reported rapes increased by 24%, while robberies doubled from six to 12. Aggravated assaults were also up, suggesting a slight rise in violent crime, but he cautioned against drawing conclusions from small data sets. On the positive side, some crime categories have seen notable declines. Burglary rates, for instance, have dropped significantly from 148 cases in 2021 to just 54 in 2024. He attributed this to advancements in home security technology, such as smartphones, security cameras, and doorbell cameras, which act as deterrents. He recalled working burglary cases in the late 80s and early 90s, when monthly residential burglary counts were much higher. Regarding shoplifting, he mentioned that the number of reported cases often depends on how actively loss prevention staff at stores like Walmart and Target enforce theft policies. Last year, a noticeable increase in shoplifting incidents at Walmart suggested a change in loss prevention strategies, though the department was not formally informed of any new policies.

Deputy Chief Hansen explained that one of the key concerns was how local crime trends compare to national patterns. He noted that the city's data closely mirrors trends seen across the country, which is largely influenced by shifting demographics. He pointed out that law enforcement traditionally sees higher crime involvement among male's aged 18 to 24, but societal changes have altered their behaviors and living situations. Unlike past generations, when young adults were expected to leave home for college, work, or missions, many now remain at home longer due to financial constraints or personal choices. He highlighted the role of social media in changing youth behavior. In previous years, teens might have attended large gatherings that sometimes led to criminal activity. Now, with digital connectivity, much of their social interaction happens online, reducing incidents like vehicle burglaries and other crimes that were more common in the past. He emphasized that the incentives for certain offenses have diminished, contributing to the downward trend in some categories of crime.

Council Member Harris asked whether data was available on how many of the more serious crimes were committed by residents versus individuals coming into the city.

Deputy Chief Hansen responded that the division of serious crimes between residents and non-residents is approximately 50/50. He explained that in most cases, there is some connection to South Jordan, whether through the victim, the suspect, or other factors. Regarding arrests, he acknowledged that an increase in arrests might raise concerns from a council perspective, but from a law enforcement standpoint, it is a positive indicator. Higher arrest numbers suggest that officers are effectively stopping criminal behavior and addressing issues proactively. He noted that law enforcement efforts in neighboring cities, such as West Jordan, also have a positive impact on South Jordan, as crime prevention and enforcement often extend beyond city boundaries. He emphasized that with officers responding to approximately 40,000 calls per year, the number of arrests and overall crime trends suggest that South Jordan remains in a strong position regarding public safety.

Chief Carr added that even when looking at crime rates from 2021, South Jordan remains in the lower half of the county in terms of overall crime. He noted that as the city continues to grow, and as other areas of the county expand and transition into suburbs, crime trends naturally shift. He explained that crime rates tend to decrease as one moves farther from the center of Salt Lake City, a pattern that has been consistent over time. However, with the rapid development between Ogden and Provo, the entire region is evolving into a larger metropolitan area, which may bring new challenges and considerations for public safety.

Council Member Zander asked how the increased need for mental health support among officers is reflected in the crime data. She acknowledged that while mental health issues may not directly correlate with crimes like robberies, she wondered if there has been an increase in crimes committed between individuals as a result of mental health challenges.

Chief Carr responded that there are not enough mental health resources to meet the growing demand. He mentioned that while initiatives like the 988 crisis line have been beneficial, reportedly resolving 80-90% of calls without police intervention, there is still a significant gap in support. He highlighted the Mobile Crisis Outreach Teams (MCOT), which are intended to assist in mental health emergencies. However, due to limited resources, officers often end up handling

these situations themselves, as wait times for MCOT can stretch to two or three hours. He also discussed the development of receiving centers, which are designed to provide immediate care for individuals in crisis. One such facility is being completed near the jail, operating as a no-refusal center where law enforcement can take individuals who need help, ensuring they receive care rather than being taken to jail. He stressed that this will help in some cases but noted that, nationwide, the availability of mental health resources is still far behind what is needed.

Deputy Chief Hansen added that the department frequently issues what are called pink sheets, a legal process that allows officers to take individuals to a medical facility when they are deemed unable to care for themselves, present a danger to others, or are experiencing suicidal ideation. Officers make many hospital runs, typically to Jordan Valley, the U of U, Riverton, Lone Peak, facilities that are close enough to allow officers to remain available for other calls. He also noted the challenge when individuals refuse treatment. In such cases, officers may not have legal grounds to detain them under a pink sheet, and property owners may instead request that the person be removed. This often results in trespass notices rather than arrests, leaving individuals to continue struggling without immediate intervention. He emphasized that officers do not simply walk away from these situations. In about 90% of cases, if someone is considered a danger, officers will ensure they are taken to the hospital. However, this sometimes results in physical encounters when individuals resist assistance, making it a delicate balance for law enforcement. He highlighted ongoing training efforts to help officers recognize signs of crisis and work effectively with fire and medical personnel, who often assist with transport in these situations.

Council Member Johnson asked whether there is any outreach to the families of individuals in crisis to help connect them with resources.

Chief Carr stated that outreach efforts depend on the type of case. The department's victim advocates assist in certain situations, and officers have information on available programs and resources that they can provide to individuals and families in need. However, access to adequate support systems remains a challenge.

Council Member Johnson noted the importance of providing resources to families of individuals in crisis. She said that while law enforcement may not always have the ability to intervene directly, family members who have ongoing contact with the individual could play a key role in connecting them to available support services.

Deputy Chief Hansen responded that officers do try to connect families with resources when possible, especially in cases where individuals have a history with law enforcement. He explained that family involvement is often the best-case scenario, as it provides a support system for the individual. However, many cases involve people who refuse help or whose families have already exhausted their options, making intervention more challenging. He noted that when individuals haven't committed a crime and refuse assistance, it becomes a difficult balance for law enforcement.

Chief Carr added that as the city continues to grow, ensuring adequate police staffing remains a concern. To address this, the department has implemented several initiatives, including the

Online Reporting System (Case Service), which allows residents to report certain incidents online, reducing officer workload. He also highlighted Draft One, an AI-assisted reporting tool that helps officer's complete reports more efficiently by generating documentation from body camera interactions. Additionally, the department has hired its first Community Services Officer (CSO), who handles parking violations, abandoned vehicles, and other non-emergency issues. This helps free up officers for higher-priority calls and improves response times to community concerns. He emphasized that these efforts enhance efficiency and improve overall service to residents.

Mayor Ramsey expressed appreciation for the data presented, noting that while the city continues to grow, crime rate percentages have remained stable, with several categories showing a decline. She highlighted this as a positive trend, acknowledging that while not perfect, it reflects progress. She reiterated Deputy Chief Hansen's earlier statement that approximately 50% of more serious crimes involve individuals from outside South Jordan who come into the city for various activities. She sought clarification to confirm her understanding of that statistic.

Deputy Chief Hansen confirmed the statistic and acknowledged that as the city grows, law enforcement becomes familiar with new residents over time. He stated that he does not believe the department is behind in addressing crime trends and expressed appreciation for the resources provided. He emphasized the importance of efficiency in policing efforts and noted that proactive enforcement and officer presence play a key role in deterrence. He reiterated that the department's focus is on maintaining efficiency and ensuring officers are available to respond effectively.

Chief Carr emphasized the importance of officer visibility and stated that the department has a program called "On Every Street," which aims to have officers present on every street in the city at least once per quarter. He commended the officers for their efforts in maintaining visibility, noting that their presence serves as an effective deterrent to crime. He concluded by reaffirming the department's commitment to this approach.

Mayor Ramsey expressed gratitude to Chief Carr, Deputy Chief Hansen, and the entire South Jordan Police Department for their dedication and hard work. She asked them to extend the City Council's appreciation to the entire team, recognizing their efforts in keeping the community safe and upholding the law.

F.3. Public Infrastructure District (PID) policy amendments. *(By Director of City Commerce, Brian Preece)*

City Commerce Director Brian Preece provided an overview of Public Infrastructure Districts (PIDs), a financing tool authorized by the state legislature in 2019. PIDs function as special districts, similar to water or sewer districts, and require City Council approval. The city has an established process where a district advisory committee vets applications before they reach the Council to ensure they are viable and complete. He explained that the city has received one application and has been evaluating it while identifying potential improvements to the PID policy. Originally, PIDs were intended for unique enhancements beyond standard infrastructure requirements, such as special features in developments. However, through the current application

process, it became apparent that the policy might need adjustments, particularly for commercial projects. He emphasized that these changes would not apply to residential developments, as he and many Council members believe residential PIDs are problematic due to concerns about inequitable tax burdens among homeowners. He proposed a two-path system, similar to the previous Special Assessment Area (SAA) approach, where commercial properties could continue paying assessments after development, while residential properties would settle obligations before development to prevent disparities in tax rates. For commercial projects, he suggested broadening the scope of eligible infrastructure improvements to include utilities, roads, parking, public transportation, and even potential inland ports. He noted that while an inland port does not currently qualify due to an existing Community Development Area (CDA), it could become viable once the CDA expires in the future, potentially supporting manufacturing growth. He also referenced infrastructure projects related to environmental remediation efforts, such as the shoreline redevelopment, as another possible application for PIDs. He explained that the approval process for PIDs would remain largely unchanged. Applicants would still submit an initial proposal, which the city would vet to ensure it meets established criteria. However, even if a proposal meets the requirements, the city is not obligated to approve it if it is deemed unnecessary or not in the city's best interest. He highlighted how legislative changes, specifically HB 151, have eliminated many of the traditional tools the city previously used for economic development, such as tax increment financing and Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funding. While some of these programs are still active, many are reaching the end of their lifespans. The city can still use certain tools for commercial projects, but retail and sales tax-based developments now have fewer options for financial support. Given the city's limited remaining land for retail development, he suggested that PIDs could help fill financial gaps in projects where some assistance is needed to make them viable. He emphasized that the funding for PIDs comes from self-imposed taxes by the property owners within the district, rather than an additional tax burden on the city. Additionally, financing through PIDs allows developers to access better loan rates without impacting the city's overall tax capacity or credit rating.

Attorney Loose explained that the concept of unique enhancements was a key factor in how PIDs were initially introduced and justified to cities. While the statute itself broadly allows for PIDs, cities were often presented with the idea that these districts would only be used for unique public enhancements, and most cities adopted policies reflecting that approach. When considering PIDs for commercial developments, he pointed out that they offer unique financial advantages compared to residential projects. Unlike residential properties, where the city only receives a portion of property tax revenue, typically around 55%, commercial properties provide the city with the full amount of property tax. Additionally, commercial developments generate sales tax revenue, further benefiting the city. He argued that commercial projects involve sophisticated developers who understand the financial structures they are entering into, unlike residential homeowners who may be confused by varying tax rates. Because of these differences, he suggested that it makes sense to separate the process for commercial PIDs from residential ones, ensuring a more tailored approach that aligns with the distinct financial impacts and benefits of each type of development.

Director Preece explained that whether a commercial property is leased or purchased, potential buyers or tenants will conduct financial analyses, including performance evaluations, before

committing. If the property is part of a PID, those analyses will factor in the associated costs, as the PID creates an encumbrance on the property. This added financial obligation could slightly lower the property's value, as buyers must account for the additional burden when determining whether the investment is viable.

Attorney Loose explained that a previous council used a similar approach with the Special Assessment Area (SAA) for Daybreak, which allowed for the accelerated installation of water and road infrastructure. While the SAA was a different financing tool, it provided access to bond markets. At the time, the council was clear that residential properties should not be impacted long-term. As a result, residential assessments were required to be paid in full at the time of building permit issuance. In contrast, commercial properties continued to pay their assessments over time until the SAA was fully paid off, typically over a 20 to 30 year bond period. He noted that PIDs could follow a similar long-term financing structure.

Council Member Harris commented that it would be interesting to see how the use of PIDs develops in Utah. He noted that the developers utilizing this tool are typically very sophisticated and wondered whether it would primarily be Utah-based developers taking advantage of it or if venture capital groups from outside the state would seek opportunities to maximize their investments in Utah's growing market.

Mayor Ramsey acknowledged that PIDs have been slow to take off, citing Herriman's experience with a few approved PIDs that took time to secure funding. She noted that while some progress has been made, the bond market has not fully opened for these projects. She pointed out that the state of Utah is using PIDs to fund all infrastructure in phase one at The Point and that the statute includes specific language allowing municipalities to use this tool. She recalled a past discussion where the council strongly opposed PIDs in residential areas due to concerns about unequal tax burdens on similar homes. While she remains hesitant about PIDs in general, she recognized their potential as an additional tool for economic development, particularly for infrastructure funding in commercial projects. Given the limited options for economic development financing, she expressed support for adding PIDs to the city's toolbox as a resource that could be considered on a case-by-case basis.

City Manager Lewis emphasized that while the city isn't required to use PIDs, having them as an option allows flexibility. If the right project comes along and a PID is the appropriate tool, it would be beneficial to have it available.

Mayor Ramsey acknowledged the other side of the argument, noting that there are projects where, without a tool like a PID, a developer simply wouldn't have the financial means to install necessary infrastructure. In cases where no existing infrastructure is available, a PID might be the only viable option to move a project forward.

Council Member Harris shared insights from a public sewer board meeting, noting how developers evaluate funding options, including PIDs, reimbursements, and impact fees. He observed that PIDs can provide additional financial leverage, allowing developers to move forward with projects that might otherwise be constrained by existing rules or funding

limitations. This flexibility can help address infrastructure needs while maintaining financial feasibility for developers.

City Manager Lewis compared PIDs to the way the city funds its own projects, by combining various funding sources like general funds, impact fees, federal funds, and state funds. Similarly, developers explore multiple financing options to make projects viable. He emphasized that a PID is just one more tool in that process and reassured the council that they have full discretion over when and how it is used.

Director Preece summarized by comparing PIDs to other economic development tools the city has used in the past. While the city still has tools for office buildings and similar developments, they can no longer be applied to retail. The city has always been selective in granting such incentives, ensuring they meet the city's priorities. He concluded by stating that if the council is comfortable, staff will bring back a resolution to adopt a new or revised policy.

Council Member McGuire motioned to recess the City Council Study Meeting agenda to move to Executive Closed Session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual. Council Member Harris seconded the motion; vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

RECESS CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING AND MOVE TO EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION

G. Executive Closed Session: 6:10 p.m.

- G.1. Discuss the character, professional competence, physical or mental health of an individual.

ADJOURN EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION AND RETURN TO CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

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

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Zander motioned to adjourn the February 4, 2025 City Council Study Meeting. Council Member McGuire seconded the motion; vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

The February 4, 2025 City Council Study meeting adjourned at 6:36 p.m.