

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

FEBRUARY 17, 2026

Present: Mayor Dawn R. Ramsey, Council Member Patrick Harris, Council Member Kathie Johnson, Council Member Don Shelton, Council Member Tamara Zander, Council Member Jason McGuire, City Manager Dustin Lewis, Assistance City Manager Jason Rasmussen, Assistant City Manager Don Tingey, City Attorney Ryan Loose, Police Chief Jeff Carr, Director of Administrative Services Melinda Seager, Director of Human Resources Teresa Robinson, Fire Chief Chris Dawson, Director of Recreation Janell Payne, Associate Director of Finance Katie Olson, Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece, Director of Engineering/City Engineer Brad Klavano, Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison, PIO/Communication Manager Rachael Van Cleave, CTO Matthew Davis, Senior System Administrator Phill Brown, City Recorder Anna Crookston

Absent:

Other (Electronic) Attendance:

Other (In-Person) Attendance: TyAnne Crook, Nate Shipp, Kyrene Gibb, Tatiana Gilchrist

4:42 P.M.

REGULAR MEETING

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

Mayor Ramsey welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

B. Invocation – By Director of Planning & Economic Development, Brian Preece

Director Preece offered the invocation.

C. Mayor and Council Coordination

City Attorney Ryan Loose provided a legislative update, noting that the session has been slower than usual but is expected to become very active in the final 14 days. He indicated that several significant infrastructure-related bills have recently been numbered or are still pending, some containing concerning provisions. He expressed appreciation for council members' outreach efforts and ongoing engagement with legislators.

Mayor Ramsey acknowledged the significant effort being made during the legislative session, noting that City Attorney Ryan Loose is consistently present and serving as a trusted resource. She thanked council members and staff for their time and engagement on issues related to their areas of responsibility.

D. Discussion/Review of City Council Meeting

Presentation Item:

- South Jordan Arts Council Annual Report.

Public Hearing Item:

- Ordinance 2026-04, Amending Section 17.130.130.030 (Prohibitions in the ADU Floating Zone) of the South Jordan Municipal Code to clarify Development Standards.

Mayor Ramsey reviewed the upcoming regular meeting agenda, stating she looks forward to the annual report from the Arts Council. She confirmed that Shan Lloyd is currently serving as chair of the Arts Council and will be presenting the report. She also noted there is one public hearing scheduled regarding amendments to a section of the code related to prohibitions in the ADU floating zone, which will be presented by Long-Range Planner Joe Moss. She mentioned that the city has received word that members of the public may attend to comment on an issue related to secondary water shares, although that item is not on the agenda. She indicated that there may be some misinformation circulating and that Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen is speaking with individuals to help clarify and provide accurate information.

City Manager Dustin Lewis explained that the city owns several secondary water shares and has the option each year to lease some or all of those shares. In response to requests from the Governor and state legislature to support conservation efforts for the Great Salt Lake, the city has explored the possibility of leasing some shares for that purpose. While the city's application is under review, it has temporarily paused, leasing its shares to determine if they may qualify for the Great Salt Lake initiative. He clarified that the city has not prohibited residents from leasing or purchasing shares. Individuals may lease or buy shares from other private owners, and staff have assisted property owners in finding alternative shares to lease. If the city's application is not approved, it will resume leasing shares to individuals as it has in previous years. He noted that the exact number of shares the city owns is not readily available, as they are distributed across multiple canals, but confirmed the city retains them for potential future needs, including drinking water, while currently putting them to productive use.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification regarding secondary water, specifically whether residents who do not currently own secondary water shares can request to lease some on a yearly basis.

City Manager Lewis explained that owners of water shares do not need to lease shares. Residents who do not own water shares may choose to lease from the city in a given year, or they may lease from other sources. There is no obligation for the city to lease shares to anyone, nor for residents to lease specifically from the city.

Mayor Ramsey noted that a resident had communicated that the watermaster announced the city was removing the ability for residents to lease secondary water shares, which has caused frustration. She acknowledged that there may be strong public reactions during the meeting and emphasized the city's intention to provide assistance where possible.

Council Member Johnson asked whether there is a clearinghouse or some entity that supervises, regulates, or helps residents manage secondary water shares.

City Manager Lewis responded that, to his knowledge, there is no central clearinghouse for secondary water shares. He explained that if a resident owns shares and another wants to lease them, arrangements can be made directly between the parties.

Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison noted that while water brokers exist, they primarily facilitate the purchase of water shares. He added that the city was able to locate a majority of shares in all but one canal to assist residents, with only one canal still lacking available shares.

City Manager Lewis added that the city has not yet received a response on its application, but it is possible that a decision could come before water is distributed in the canals, allowing the city to act accordingly.

E. Presentation Item:

E.1. Y2 Analytics – Community Survey Results. (By Assistant City Manager, Don Tingey)

Assistant City Manager Don Tingey noted that the survey was completed earlier in the year and introduced Kyrene Gibb and Tatiana Gilchrist with Y2 Analytics to present the results from the survey.

Kyrene Gibb reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment A). She explained the results of the annual resident survey, highlighting overall high levels of satisfaction among South Jordan residents with their quality of life and the direction of the city. She noted that while there were minor shifts in perceptions, particularly after municipal election cycles or panel refreshes, there were no major concerns. Approval ratings for the City Council increased significantly, up 10 points from last year. Residents continue to rate city services highly, with an average score of 73 on a 0–100 scale, though a few services remain lower-rated. Key areas of resident concern were growth and traffic impacts, with some attention to housing and development. About 30–31% of residents directly contacted the city, primarily regarding public works, with code enforcement inquiries increasing and police-related inquiries decreasing. She outlined the survey methodology; fielded from January 5–19, with 1,112 residents starting and 807 completing the survey. She noted increasing survey fatigue and suggested potentially splitting the survey in future years to reduce the burden, keeping core questions in January and additional questions later in the year to maintain data quality while easing respondent fatigue.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification of the 807 residents who completed the survey, had they also been invited to participate the previous year, asking if the responses came from a consistent panel rather than a newly sampled group.

Ms. Gibb explained that the survey largely included the same panel of residents as the previous year, though about a third of invitations were sent to newly sampled households from last year's utility list. She noted that the 807 completed surveys represent a three-percentage-point margin of error, providing a robust and comprehensive sample overall. She added that the survey was slightly shorter than in prior years, and the lower completion rates are likely due to general survey fatigue among residents.

Mayor Ramsey noted that some residents who completed the survey indicated it was too long. They expected it to be quicker and reported feeling fatigued by the end, which may have affected the generosity of their responses.

Assistant City Manager Tingey noted that many of the verbatim survey responses were lengthy, indicating that residents wanted to provide detailed feedback rather than just brief answers.

Ms. Gibb noted that the city has an engaged group of residents who provide detailed feedback in the surveys, which can extend interview times. She suggested considering adjustments to the survey methodology in the future to make participation less burdensome for respondents.

Council Member Johnson asked whether responses from residents who did not complete the full survey were still counted in the analysis, and if partial responses were included in the data. Ms. Gibb confirmed that partial responses are still included in the survey analysis.

Ms. Gibb continued to review prepared presentation (Attachment A), reviewing the survey methodology and results. She explained that the survey begins with broad benchmark questions to gauge overall city health, followed by more specific items. Respondents were distributed across council districts, with 140–200 panelists per district. Key findings included that 57% of residents feel the city is headed in the right direction, 27% declined to respond either way, and 15% feel the city is headed in the wrong direction. The “don’t know/unsure” category declined slightly from last year, indicating increased resident engagement. When removing neutral responses, 79% of residents expressing an opinion feel the city is headed in the right direction, which is lower than in recent years. She noted that fluctuations may relate to municipal election cycles, panel refreshes, or the perspectives of longer-tenured residents. Overall, she indicated that no major shift in attitudes or quality of life was evident, though there was slightly more polarity in responses, reflecting broader regional trends rather than city-specific issues.

Mayor Ramsey asked whether residents’ concerns about federal or state government might be influencing survey responses. Ms. Gibb responded that, yes, some of residents’ concerns about higher levels of government appear to be influencing their survey responses.

Council Member Zander asked whether other municipalities are seeing similar shifts. Ms. Gibb explained that several cities are seeing statistically significant changes, so South Jordan’s seven-point dip is not unusual. She noted that if such a decline were observed in consecutive years, it would be concerning, but historically similar dips have rebounded quickly. She emphasized that overall quality of life remains stable, with an average rating of 81 on a 0–100 scale, consistent with the past five years, indicating no significant change in residents’ overall perception of the city.

Ms. Gibb continued to review prepared presentation (Attachment A), reporting that overall approval ratings for city elected officials remain strong, with 62% of residents indicating they approve of their performance. Ratings by council district are generally consistent with prior years, though districts one and two showed the most positive movement, while district four experienced a slight decline. Regarding perceptions of the city compared to five years ago, approximately one-third of residents feel conditions are about the same, 40% feel things have improved, and 24% feel things have worsened. Only 10% indicated they had not been in the city long enough to respond. Overall trends remain consistent with prior years, showing stability in resident sentiment.

Residents continue to cite the sense of community, safety for raising a family, accessible location, and recreational trails as key strengths of South Jordan. She added that 70% of residents rated overall value for their tax dollars as excellent or good, with district one showing a slight increase in satisfaction, though no changes were statistically significant. When asked about recommending the city as a place to live, nine out of ten residents indicated they would do so, reflecting high overall satisfaction and positive word-of-mouth perceptions. Across specific city services and priorities, residents gave the highest ratings for opportunities to participate in city events, community safety, and accessible recreation, with more than a third giving “excellent” rating. Areas such as establishing orderly laws, developing reliable utilities and transportation, and communicating effectively received about a quarter of residents rate them as excellent. Long-term growth continues to be the area of most concern, though a majority still rated the city’s response positively. When asked about the most important issues facing the city today and over the next three to five years, residents consistently cited growth, traffic congestion, housing, infrastructure, and water as top priorities. These responses indicate ongoing resident awareness of issues interconnected with city growth and development. She noted that when residents were asked about the most important aspects of life in South Jordan, traffic flow was the highest priority, with 28% identifying it as the most important issue, followed by quality of life at 18%. Safety was also noted as important, reflecting residents’ interest in maintaining the community’s existing standards rather than initiating major changes. Residents indicated that housing options, public transit, economic development, and environmental concerns were of comparatively lower importance. City service ratings remained strong overall. Fire and emergency medical services, along with garbage collection, received the highest ratings at 86 on a zero-to-100 scale. Police services scored 80, parks 79, and a three-way tie for community events, city parks, and drinking water followed closely. Services with the lowest ratings were city code enforcement at 63 and planning, zoning, and building at 58, which she noted may reflect resident frustration with growth and development management.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification on the ranking of police services. Ms. Gibb confirmed that police services ranked third, following fire and emergency medical services and garbage collection. Council Member Zander noted that it was encouraging to see police rated so highly, reflecting strong resident appreciation for public safety personnel.

Ms. Gibb noted that South Jordan’s city service ratings have consistently ranked emergency responders and trash collection at the top, with scores above 80 on a 0–100 scale, reflecting strong resident approval. She explained that residents’ comments about city services have historically been scattered, making traditional word clouds less effective. Using AI tools, the city categorized responses and conducted sentiment analysis, finding that the largest volume of comments came from planning and zoning (56) and police (40). Overall, sentiment was positive, with only minor negative feedback for services like snow removal, which represented a very small number of comments. She added that city code enforcement has become the service area residents most frequently contact, alongside public works. She noted that this may reflect a broader catch-all category for neighborhood-related frustrations. She indicated interest in tracking whether the type or sentiment of code enforcement contacts shifts over time, emphasizing that this new analytical lens will help the city monitor trends and improve responses moving forward.

Assistant City Manager Tingey noted that each department receives the verbatim survey responses relevant to their division. Departments review the comments, identify those that pertain to their services, such as police, water, or streets, and respond accordingly. Many of the comments are straightforward, such as reporting streetlights that are out or similar service issues.

Ms. Gibb continued to review prepared presentation (Attachment A), reporting on communication patterns and resident preferences, noting that most residents currently receive city information through email or the city newsletter, with a strong preference for these digital formats. About 10% of residents indicated they would prefer text message alerts, presenting a potential opportunity for more direct engagement. Residents generally prefer one monthly email, with some indicating interest in more targeted or less frequent communications. Two-thirds of residents felt the current level of communication was appropriate, while about one-third suggested slightly less communication would be acceptable. Regarding city services, most residents visit the city website for utility payments, program registration, garbage services, or reporting problems, with high satisfaction overall. Smaller shares use the site for dog licensing, facility reservations, or permit applications, where satisfaction varied slightly. Social media engagement is limited, with Facebook being the most followed platform, followed by Instagram and X (formerly Twitter); users reported high satisfaction with content. Direct outreach to the city remains low at 31%, primarily concerning public works, code enforcement, and utility billing, with fewer police-related contacts compared to prior years. Most resident inquiries were resolved on first contact; about 20% required multiple interactions, and roughly 10% reported unresolved issues. Residents were aware of multiple contact channels, with the “Contact Us” form being most used. Overall, residents reported being treated with courtesy and professionalism, with satisfaction slightly lower than previous years (80 compared to 83 in 2025). Ms. Gibb suggested the decrease may reflect a smaller, more polarized cohort of residents reaching out with complex issues rather than a decline in service quality.

Council Member Zander noted that residents are generally resolving issues online through the city’s digital channels. She added that those who do escalate to direct contact tend to have more complex or unresolved issues, which may contribute to the slightly lower satisfaction rating. Ms. Gibb responded that as the overall number of residents reaching out directly to the city continues to decline, it is unsurprising that the interactions they do have are more emotional. She noted that awareness of the Urban Center development project in downtown Daybreak has increased, reflecting the project’s completion and full functionality.

Mayor Ramsey noted that 17% of residents are still not aware of the Urban Center development project in downtown Daybreak and expressed surprise at that level of unawareness.

Council members and staff discussed that it was noted that some residents may not realize the Urban Center development is within the city. Residents were provided the same preamble as in previous years, explaining the area around the ballpark, but the survey question itself asked only whether they were aware of the downtown Daybreak Urban Center development.

Ms. Gibb continued to review prepared presentation (Attachment A), reporting that residents’ primary concerns regarding the downtown Daybreak Urban Center development continue to focus on traffic, followed by housing, crime, and parking, all largely related to increased congestion.

When asked about the development's impact on the city, approximately two-thirds of residents expect a positive effect on quality of life, 62% anticipate improvements to public transit, and 53% expect positive impacts on infrastructure. Traffic flow was the only area where a majority of residents predicted a negative impact. Over the past three years, the share of residents who believe downtown Daybreak will positively impact quality of life increased from 59% to 67%, representing the only statistically significant change observed. Ms. Gibb concluded the presentation and noted that additional details are available for follow-up questions.

Council Member Johnson motioned to recess the City Council Study Meeting and move to executive closed session for the discussion of the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property. Council Member Zander seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

RECESS CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING AND MOVE TO EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION

F. Executive Closed Session: 5:15 p.m.

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

ADJOURN EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION AND RETURN TO CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

Council Member Harris motioned to adjourn the executive closed session and move back to the City Council Study Meeting. Council Member Shelton seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

Council Member McGuire motioned to adjourn the February 17, 2026, City Council Study Meeting. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

The February 17, 2026 City Council Study Meeting adjourned at 6:36 p.m.