

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL 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, CFO Sunil Naidu, Fire Chief Chris Dawson, Director of Recreation Janell Payne, 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, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, City Recorder Anna Crookston

Absent:

Other (Electronic) Attendance: Ben Crockett, Brown & Seelye Attorney's, Jodee Packer, dt2dt, Mark Thomas

Other (In-Person) Attendance: Troy Teeples, Cody Christensen, Val Brown, Bruce Moffat, Josh Hunsaker, Andrew Ives, Dave Ruecket, Ann Ruecket, Loc Quach, Jacob Jorgensen, Brad Wardle, Greg Jarvies, Pam King, Wayne King, Umu Tafisi, Sophia Cowley, Stacia Peoples, John Moran, Reed Motzkus, Mike Powell, Charles Kimberly, Mike Bellows, Shan Lloyd

6:30 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

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

Mayor Ramsey welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

B. Invocation - By Council Member, Don Shelton

Council Member Shelton offered the invocation.

C. Pledge of Allegiance – By Communications Manager/PIO, Rachael Van Cleave

Communications Manager/PIO Rachael Van Cleave led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

D. Minute Approval:

D.1. January 7, 2026 City Council Budget Meeting

Council Member McGuire motioned to approve the D.1. January 7, 2026 City Council Budget Meeting as published. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

E. Mayor and Council Reports:

Council Member Shelton reported on activities since the last Council meeting, including conducting the Jordan River Commission meeting as chair and participating in initial planning efforts for a 9/11 memorial project kickoff. He also attended legislative policy committee meetings at the State Capitol through the Utah League of Cities and Towns, where he engaged with legislators on issues impacting the city. Additionally, he met with individuals regarding a potential project they are interested in bringing to the community in the near future.

Council Member Zander reported on recent community and legislative engagement. She highlighted the South Jordan Race Series event held on February 14, noting strong attendance and emphasizing the inclusive nature of the program, which accommodates participants of varying activity levels. She commended city staff for their organization, customer service, and positive interactions with residents during the event. She also reported participating in outreach to state legislators regarding pending bills, noting responsiveness from those contacted. Additionally, she met with individuals considering candidacy for upcoming elections and expressed appreciation for those willing to serve in public office.

Council Member Harris reported attending a Jordan Basin Sewer District meeting, noting that operations are running well and that he has been selected as vice chair of the board. He highlighted the low number of sewer backups in the South Valley as an indicator of effective system management. He also attended the South Valley Chamber “State of the Chamber” event alongside other council members and the mayor, commending the Chamber for its support of local businesses. Additionally, he participated in planning efforts for the 9/11 memorial anniversary, noting strong community support for the project.

Council Member Johnson acknowledged members of the Youth Council in attendance and reminded them of their upcoming meeting scheduled for Thursday.

Council Member McGuire reported attending several meetings similar to other council members, including an Arts Council meeting. He noted that the Council would receive an annual report from the Arts Council Chair, including a recap of the past year and information on upcoming events, such as the 2026 play selection. He also referenced the South Valley Chamber “State of the Chamber” event, highlighting the Chamber’s strong support of the community, particularly its willingness to assist with needs related to the upcoming 9/11 memorial event, including accommodations for visitors. Additionally, he encouraged residents to stay informed about legislative activity, particularly housing-related bills that may impact local authority and development decisions and urged the public to engage with elected officials to share their perspectives.

Mayor Ramsey reported on recent activities, including meetings with local small business owners to celebrate anniversaries, welcome new businesses, and discuss their experiences in the city. She also met with residents on various community matters and expressed appreciation for those interactions. She highlighted a recent visit from the Federal Transit Administrator, hosted in collaboration with Congressman Owens, as part of ongoing efforts to influence the federal surface transportation bill currently being developed. She explained that state and local leaders are advocating for funding opportunities to support transit expansion in fast-growing areas, including potential extensions in South Jordan, and emphasized the importance of modifying federal funding formulas to better accommodate such growth. She noted this is a coordinated effort among local, state, and federal partners. She provided an update on legislative activity, noting a significant number of bills impacting local government and ongoing coordination with other cities and the Utah League of Cities and Towns. She clarified that the upcoming America 250, 9/11 memorial project will be supported entirely through volunteer efforts and community partnerships, with no city funds being used. She noted strong support from organizations such as the South Valley Chamber, including assistance with accommodation for visiting participants, and indicated that additional information will be shared as planning progresses.

F. Public Comment:

Mayor Ramsey noted that she had received information prior to the meeting indicating that several residents intended to speak regarding water shares. She asked those in attendance whether they preferred to designate a spokesperson or speak individually, and it was determined that individuals would provide their own comments. Mayor Ramsey also indicated that some of the information circulating may not be entirely accurate and requested that the Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen provide clarifying context prior to opening the public comment period.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen reported that the city has temporarily paused leasing secondary water shares while awaiting a response from the Great Salt Lake Commissioner's Office regarding a proposal to lease unused shares to support efforts to restore the Great Salt Lake. He explained that multiple cities and large shareholders were invited to submit proposals for leasing shares for a period of one to five years; however, no agreements or obligations are currently in place. He noted that if the proposal is accepted, the matter would return to the Council for consideration. He added that a response is expected in the spring, potentially before water is available in the canals. In the meantime, staff have been assisting residents by identifying alternative sources for leasing shares, though the city is not obligated to provide this service.

Mayor Ramsey opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Troy Teeples (Resident) - For over 20 years, I've leased shares with the city, as well as many, many people. I didn't get my letter. I called the city and talked to Mr. Rasmussen. I was very surprised to hear that they were not going to lease shares. When was the city going to let us know this? I still haven't really been informed. It just kind of all happened. Then I asked who made this decision, and Mr. Rasmussen said staff. Are you kidding? A decision of this magnitude that's going to affect this many people, and you folks aren't taking a vote on this, Mayor, where is our water? Then Mr. Rasmussen told me to go to ksl.com and buy a share. I went and looked, there are none. They're over \$5,000. I've got a neighbor who leases three shares. He's retired. What is

he supposed to do? Your own website says the city offers an annual lease of shares to private water users, users that have access to the water via ditches and other private systems. We've also learned that there is an eBay data center in South Jordan that uses approximately 19.5 million gallons of water between October 2024 and September 2025. What is the city's responsibility? The City Council's responsibility, it seems to me, is to protect the citizens. For years, city developers have had to turn their water shares over to the city, and then residents should be the ones to benefit, not the Great Salt Lake. Now my question is; how many shares does the city have? And of those shares, how many have been leased? What is the cost that the city is getting for these shares? Now Mr. Rasmussen told me that whatever cost it was, they're going to put that aside into some sort of a fund to offset future water increase costs. That kind of reminds me of the Social Security fund that's got a great big IOU in it. So we need more answers, and we need them quicker. Those of us that have leased for so many, many years want to continue leasing. Thank you.

Bruce Moffat (Resident) - When we moved here, my wife, our family, we bought a property. It's about 1.2 acres in a subdivision. We looked at doing water shares, and back then it was \$5,000. It didn't make any sense purchasing any when I could lease it for \$30 a year, and it was less than that. Anyway, if I have to go to a different system, I'm probably looking at several thousand dollars that I would have to use to convert over to culinary because I can't use the existing system, because I stand a chance of contaminating the water. It's a fairly big financial amount of money for somebody who's retired. I'm also on the board of the Taxpayers Irrigation. I have to pay them money every year whether I use the water or not, and right now it's about \$300. I would have to drop out of that, but I use that to do irrigation with my sprinkler system. For us, I spent \$500 last year getting my system set up so that it would function properly this year, and that money is all now gone to waste. I would encourage you to rethink that. I've been leasing shares for 15 to 20 years since I moved here, and I would like to continue doing that. I agree it's not fair to just spring this on us, because now we will have to make changes to our system, which can be very costly and time-consuming. I encourage you to rethink this.

Jacob Jorgensen (Resident) - My wife and I moved here specifically looking for a property where we could get water shares. And I'm not speaking on behalf of my job, but I work for Salt Lake City Public Utilities. I set the rates and do the rate proposals, and I'm working with the state commission on the pilot programs for what you guys have been talking about. I'm very familiar with what cities do and what municipalities do. We buy up water shares because we want to secure our own water resources. You mentioned, and I'm glad you gave us the insight, you answered a lot of my questions. One of the issues, though, is that you see this as unused water. It's not unused. We all use it. We use it for a purpose. You have farmers here. You have people like me. I just have an urban garden. My neighbor has horses. He uses it for that. We use it. I understand the city wants to try to contribute. If you, as a city, don't want to use these shares, sell them to us. I know my wife and I would be willing to secure our water future and have those rights secured. If the city sees this as a resource that you don't want to hold on to, that you want to let go of, let it go to us. Let us make that decision on what we can use, because we have uses for this. As was mentioned on irrigation, my system would also cost thousands to convert over, and then thousands more each year in water use and culinary water use, because I don't have access to pressurized secondary water. Lastly, I just want to mention I know all of you care about this. I know you want to do the right thing, and I'm sure a lot of you are surprised by the decision that was made. I know there are a lot of other considerations. I know the state's considerations. I just hope you'll consider the

considerations of those of us who grow, who participate in the economic development and in the food that we eat and share. Most of my urban garden, my wife and I laugh about this, over half of it, we donate to people who can't afford food. It is a great public service of what many of us are doing.

Umu Tafisi (Resident) - I come here as a trained attorney, but more importantly, as a resident of this great city. I have been a resident for eight years and counting. I am speaking tonight as a resident concerned about secondary irrigation access, including for those who need to lease water shares like myself. Many of us appreciate and rely on those lease shares annually and depend on that water to maintain our properties. While those leases may be renewed year by year, our families make long-term landscaping and financial decisions based on the reasonable expectation of continued access. If the city redirects leased irrigation water to the Great Salt Lake, even for an important environmental purpose, that decision directly impacts residents who depend on that supply, residents like myself and my fellow residents here tonight. I want to be clear; supporting the Great Salt Lake and protecting residents' water stability are not mutually exclusive. Participation in water leasing for environmental purposes should be voluntary, transparent, and structured so residents are not disproportionately affected. For many residents, leased irrigation water is not a luxury. It is built into the design, value, and livability of our homes. Property values in South Jordan reflect our green space, which we love, my five children included, maintained landscaping, and neighborhood standards. If irrigation availability becomes difficult to obtain, uncertain, or significantly reduced, that has real financial consequences for homeowners. If reallocation of water leads to significant infrastructure changes or higher rates, those costs will fall directly on families already managing rising expenses. We can support efforts to stabilize the Great Salt Lake, but we must be honest; shifting water away from residential use has economic ripple effects. Reduced irrigation access can impact property values, resale potential, and overall neighborhood appeal. I respectfully ask this Council; what formal economic impact analysis has been conducted specific to South Jordan residents? How will property value impacts be mitigated if irrigation access changes? What guarantees can you provide that residents will not bear disproportionate costs? Will the City hold public workshops outlining impacts before final decisions are made? Residents respectfully request predictability, transparency, and protection of water access. I urge this Council to move forward carefully, with clear communication and better understanding and planning for residents' needs, so we can support the lake without destabilizing the families who live here. Thank you for your time. I appreciate this representative form of government and the time you give to hear us. I hope we can have more transparency going forward. Thank you.

John Moran (Resident) - One of the things that seems very reasonable in this situation is that the water department sends out notices every year that leases are available. I find it odd that nothing was sent out this year, when that list obviously exists, and we could have been notified that there was some kind of a change, that the possibility of leasing water might not happen. I use four shares on my land. One of the reasons I have four shares is not because I have an extraordinary amount of water, but because I have to pump uphill from the ditch at the bottom of my property. I think this is a small ask, just to say something of this importance, especially when a mechanism is already in place to notify the people most affected. It seems, I'm not sure of the word, and I don't want to say anything insulting, but it seems like somebody dropped the ball, and Mr. Rasmussen, not necessarily yourself, but it would have been well to use the letters you already have. The

addresses are there, and I'm sure the postage was already budgeted. Instead of sending letters saying leases are available at this time and for this amount, the city could have notified us that something might be changing. Obviously, water is important to us. Last year, my water was about \$50 per share. When I first started leasing in 2008, I think it was about \$22. It's important to us. You have a mechanism to reach us, let us know. That would make city government feel a lot less distant by bringing us into the conversation. Thank you for your time. It's nice to have a meeting like this and be able to air our concerns. Thank you.

Mike Bellows (Resident) - I would just like to add my concurrence with what has been expressed so far, especially by the speaker who spoke earlier about the concerns she raised. I have lived in my residence for 45 years and have two water shares. Over those 45 years, you can imagine the expense I've incurred to landscape my property, which is just under an acre, including gardens and related improvements. I don't believe I use anywhere near the full amount of water from the shares I have leased, but any excess water has already been going to other uses or ultimately to the Great Salt Lake. When I first moved in, there was an open irrigation ditch. It was about chest deep and, in some places, as wide as from here to that counter, and it posed a danger to the neighborhood and to children. I bore the expense of installing a 15-inch corrugated culvert, professionally installed, along with a weir and a head gate that allows for pumping. At that time, I wasn't even using the water, but I made that investment for safety and functionality. Since then, I have invested further in the infrastructure, pipes, pumps, and all the necessary components to make the system work for my property. Because of that, I have a significant amount of sunk costs, in the thousands of dollars. You can imagine my shock when I learned that there may not be any water available, and that I may not be able to use the water I have relied on for all these years. I am concerned that there was no notification about this change. It seems the communication was dropped somewhere along the way. I'm not here to accuse anyone, but I do believe this is something that should be addressed in your meetings going forward. The communication from this body to residents should be more clear, more concise, and more timely. Thank you for your time and your service. Have a good evening.

Charles Kimberly (Resident) - I came here not to talk, but to listen. I am very interested in how this happened. I was especially interested in what this gentleman said about pausing unused shares. I think if everyone in this room who came here tonight had a chance to express how that water is being used, you would hear that their gardens, their lawns, the thousands of dollars invested in landscaping, their orchards, and their trees all depend on that water. It also provides cooling during the summer months. All of those uses show that the water is essential. Without it, by August, everything will turn brown. I did take heart in what was said, because it sounds like you still have the option to unpause the leases. One last comment; the Utah Lake distribution canal was built three years after the pioneers arrived. They arrived in 1847, and the canal was built in 1850. For 176 years, it has fulfilled its purpose. It was never intended to keep the Great Salt Lake full. The people who settled here understood that this valley is a desert, it always has been and always will be. Water is essential to live here. In my view, no one has made a strong enough case regarding the Great Salt Lake to justify this change. I won't go further than that. Thank you for listening. I do believe you can unpause this just as easily as it was paused. Please consider doing that.

Reed Motzkus (Resident) - As I've been listening to what has been said, I've given some thought to the fact that people have been leasing for decades and have made significant investments in their

properties to take care of these systems. What I'm hearing today is that, if water is sent to the Great Salt Lake, we may end up using culinary drinking water to maintain properties that were previously supported by secondary water. As you consider this decision, I would ask that you take that into account. We may end up using significantly more drinking water than we otherwise would have needed if secondary water remains available. Thank you.

Andrew Ives (Resident) - I appreciate the information that you've presented regarding the water shares. My question is; what does "unused" mean? Does it mean unused to the City? If I am on a pressurized irrigation system, then I am unaffected by this pause. We do use the water, it is not unused. I would be willing to send any water I do not use down Midas Creek to the Jordan River, which then feeds into the Great Salt Lake. I would be willing to share my unused water with the Great Salt Lake. This decision does affect my family. We grow the food we eat, whether that is beef or vegetables. In addition, it helps beautify our city. Without this flood irrigation, my lawn will be yellow this year. I know I will probably receive a summons or a ticket, but I cannot afford to switch to culinary water. The house was built in 1974 with flood irrigation in mind. It is designed and set up for that use. I would have loved to make the change to pressurized or culinary water; however, the lack of communication has put us in a difficult position. I have looked into purchasing shares, which are about \$10,000 per share, if you can find them. At this time, none are available for sale. If the City does have a surplus, and if it is legally and feasibly possible, please consider making those shares available for sale. You have a room full of buyers here. Thank you.

Mike Powell (Resident) - Even though I live on Horseshoe Circle, I grew up in South Jordan, just up across from the high school. I grew up using the water from this canal. One share used to water the acre we had. There are 19 lots in our neighborhood, and they are two-acre lots. I believe we collectively own about 30 shares, and those shares used to water our lots. I know a few people own a few additional shares, and we've had to rent some shares just to get the gate open enough to allow the water to flow. The ground will absorb all the water if we flood without a sufficient head of water behind it. About a year and a half ago, the State indicated that we were using more water than our shares allowed. I don't know if that is accurate, but that is what we were told, and it required us to rent additional shares in order to continue watering our lawns. Now, we don't even have that option available to us in time. We can all adjust, and there may be better ways to water than flood irrigation, but this is something we should be able to work on together. We would also like the ability to buy additional shares, if at all possible. At times, this feels like a bureaucratic decision where we don't matter. It feels like money and larger priorities matter more than the people who live here. For us, this impacts the value and usefulness of our property. It feels like there is a preference for development over homes with land and property. For our part, we would greatly appreciate the ability, at least for now, to continue renting or purchasing water shares. Thank you.

Wayne King (Resident) - I'd like to address a couple of issues. It goes to water access. I moved here in 1992. When I moved here, I bought two acres of land and two shares of water. Over time, I have become aware of several pieces of ground around me. The one most immediately close to me was a place called Jackson Downs. When the buyers purchased that ground from Lee Jackson, I was told there was a ruling in South Jordan that mandated any developer who bought land had to contribute water shares to the city. I do not know if that is true; I believe it to be true, but it is hearsay. The fact is, I do not believe the city has ever paid for that water taken on consignment.

Another issue is that water has not been fluid over the years. By that, I mean it has not been possible to move water from the east side to the west side or elsewhere. The water has been dedicated to specific ground. I have received notices from the canal company asking me to confirm that my two shares were still serving my property, and I had to affirm that because I had no right to transfer that water elsewhere. Over time, the price of water shares has remained unreasonably high. If it is true that the city has taken developer shares, it has created an artificial price. Previously, the canal company allowed transfers of water shares from Salt Lake County to other areas, such as Lehi, where developers could drill wells. That practice has contributed to maintaining higher prices on this canal. When the City refers to unused water, I respectfully disagree. I have always used my shares and have leased additional shares from the city to make irrigation feasible. There has never been a fluid market for shares because excess shares have been absorbed, and water historically had to remain tied to the land. Only in recent years has state law allowed more flexibility for leasing water. Additionally, I am aware that the city provides pressurized secondary water in some subdivisions. I observed properties with both culinary and irrigation meters, indicating continued service in those areas. From my perspective, this water is being used and has always been used. We have paid fair market value and relied on it. I ask the Council to consider that this water has not been freely marketable due to past policies and laws, and to reconsider whether this is the appropriate source for reallocating water. In my view, water has consistently flowed through the canal system toward the Great Salt Lake. We need this water. While I would like to say we have a right to it, I understand we may not be entitled to it. Thank you for your time

Josh Hunsaker (Resident) - My wife and I moved from Saratoga two years ago. We were looking for an acre of ground somewhere within this valley, and South Jordan was our number one choice because it is a beautiful city. We like the area and enjoy being part of the community. The house we purchased was advertised as coming with two shares of water. I repeatedly asked whether that meant two owned shares, similar to owning a car with a title or certificate. I was told yes, all the way through closing. When I asked how the transfer of the water shares would occur, I was told that the owners would simply direct us to go to the city and pay for it. I understood that is not how water shares work. The price of the home reflected two water shares, valued at approximately \$10,000 to \$12,000 each. I went through a dispute over this issue, incurred legal fees, and ultimately lost out financially. Although I was upset, I understood that I could continue leasing shares through the city at what I felt was a reasonable cost. Having only been here for two years, it is very disappointing to now face the possibility of making changes to our property due to this decision, particularly to contribute additional water to the Great Salt Lake. Treatment plants along this corridor already contribute significant amounts of water to the lake. For example, the Central Valley plant alone contributes approximately 45 to 55 million gallons per day to the Jordan River, which flows to the Great Salt Lake. Additional contributions come from Jordan Basin, South Valley, Salt Lake, and northern Davis County treatment plants. Despite these contributions, the lake continues to face challenges. I question whether impacting residents in this way will make a meaningful difference. An acre-foot of water is approximately 325,000 gallons, and when considering the total number of shares, I am not sure the impact justifies the burden placed on residents. Thank you for your time.

Mayor Ramsey closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mayor Ramsey expressed appreciation to those in attendance for their participation. She thanked residents for their thoughtful and respectful input and noted that the Council had taken extensive notes. She stated that further discussions would be held regarding the concerns raised and acknowledged that the next steps had not yet been determined but confirmed that follow-up communication from the City would be provided once additional conversations had taken place.

G. Presentation Item:

G.1. South Jordan Arts Council Annual Report. (By Director of Recreation, Janell Payne)

Director of Recreation Janell Payne introduced Arts Council Chair Shan Lloyd who would be presenting. Director of Recreation Janell Payne introduced Shan Lloyd, Chair of the Arts Council, to present the annual report. She expressed appreciation for the Arts Council's efforts and noted that Mr. Lloyd has provided strong leadership over the past year. Director Payne also stated that he was recently voted to continue serving as Chair for the upcoming year.

Shan Lloyd, Chair of the Arts Council, presented the 2025 annual report and provided an overview of Arts Council activities and accomplishments (Attachment A). He explained that the Arts Council's mission is to promote and expand access to the arts throughout the South Jordan community. He reported that 2025 was a highly successful year, highlighted by two theater productions, including *Annie*, which received strong community support and an additional performance run at the Eccles Theater, and *Forever Plaid*, which also drew strong attendance. He noted that theater productions continue to attract both local participants and regional audiences. He reviewed various art programs and competitions held throughout the year, including events for youth, amateur, and professional artists. These programs featured a variety of artistic mediums such as painting, photography, pottery, and jewelry. Annual events included the art show, quilt show, and gingerbread house displays, all of which experienced strong participation. He also highlighted public art initiatives, including installations at TRAX stations, murals, utility box wraps, and trail enhancements. He emphasized the importance of maintaining access to the arts, particularly as arts programs face reductions in some school settings. Additional programming included year-round art displays at City Hall and the Gale Center, youth art classes, summer camps, historical dance events, and community art activities. He noted that these programs provide opportunities for residents of all ages to engage in creative expression and discover artistic talents. He reviewed special events such as the Art Swap Gala, Arts in the Park, Summerfest activities, dueling pianos, and family-oriented art programs. He also introduced the new Arts Champion Award, with the inaugural recognition awarded to Erin Grimshaw for her contributions to the arts in the community. Looking ahead to 2026, he outlined planned programming, including a series of consecutive art events, public art competitions, and the spring theater production of *Guys and Dolls*. Additional initiatives include continued public art installations and collaboration on the Bingham Creek Trail mural project. Mr. Lloyd also noted his appointment to represent South Jordan on the South Valley Performing Arts group to help advocate for the City's arts interests at a regional level. He concluded by expressing appreciation to the City Council and staff for their continued support of the Arts Council.

Council Member Shelton expressed appreciation to the Arts Council and staff for their efforts and the comprehensive report. He commented positively on the variety of arts programming and activities taking place in the community. He inquired about the location of the planned Bingham Creek Trail mural. Mr. Lloyd confirmed that the mural is planned near 4800 West, and Council Member Shelton noted it would be a valuable addition to the area.

Mayor Ramsey expressed appreciation for the presentation and the work of the Arts Council. She noted the positive progress and strong functionality of the Arts Council compared to prior years and commended the contributions of volunteers and staff. She stated that the Arts Council provides a significant benefit to the community and contributes positively to the quality of life in the city.

Mr. Lloyd expressed appreciation on behalf of the Arts Council for the opportunity to serve the community. He emphasized the importance of supporting and retaining local artistic talent within the city while also attracting participation from outside the community. He noted that the Arts Council is committed to promoting the arts as an important component of the city's future and overall quality of life.

Mayor Ramsey noted that annual resident surveys consistently indicate that the arts are important to the community. She expressed appreciation for the Arts Council's efforts in providing a wide range of arts opportunities for residents with varying interests and abilities, including those who may not be traditional visual artists.

Mr. Lloyd stated that the Arts Council strives to offer programs that appeal to a wide range of interests and encourages residents to participate in various activities, noting that individuals may discover new talents through participation. He thanked the Council and stated he would relay their appreciation to the Arts Council.

H. Public Hearing Item:

- H.1. 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. (By Long-Range Planner, Joe Moss)

City Attorney Ryan Loose reported that there is a typographical error in both the staff report and the ordinance, specifically a reference to code section 17.130.030.030. He clarified that the error was minor and would be corrected, and he apologized for the oversight. He stated that the City is implementing process improvements to prevent similar errors in future ordinance approvals. He noted that the error does not affect the validity of the noticing, and that the information could still be reasonably identified through a review of the City's code. He further explained that the ordinance had been previously considered by the City Council as part of a broader set of amendments but was pulled for additional review related to accessory dwelling units (ADUs). The current version reflects those requested adjustments. He added that the item had also been reviewed during a public hearing and by the Planning Commission, and that there had been no public comments raised on this issue. He stated that the legal risk associated with adopting the ordinance, despite the typographical error, is very low.

Council Member Zander sought clarification from City Attorney Loose regarding whether the amended ordinance had been reviewed by the Planning Commission. She asked if the Planning Commission had reviewed the current version of the ordinance in its edited and amended form.

City Attorney Loose clarified that the Planning Commission reviewed the ordinance as part of a larger, comprehensive set of amendments during the prior consideration. He noted that the provision in question was not separated out at that time but was included within the broader ordinance package previously reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Long-Range Planner Moss stated that the ordinance being presented was an amended version that reflects changes made based on feedback and direction provided by the City Council on the previous version.

City Attorney Loose added that it is typical for ordinances to be revised based on City Council direction without being returned to the Planning Commission for additional review, particularly when the changes are minor and consistent with prior feedback.

Long-Range Planner Moss reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment B). He explained that the ordinance was intended to clarify regulations regarding accessory dwelling unit (ADU) entrances, specifically to address ambiguity in how visibility from the street is interpreted. He noted that the existing ordinance aims to maintain the appearance of a single-family home by limiting ADU entrances that are visible from the street. He stated that the prior version of the ordinance would have prohibited ADU entrances on front elevations or on side elevations of corner lots. Based on feedback from the City Council, the amended version introduces additional flexibility in two circumstances. He explained that ADU entrances would be permitted if they are below grade, defined as at least 75 percent below finished grade, or if they are screened by a six-foot opaque fence. He provided an example illustrating how a side entrance could be placed behind a fence and comply with the updated ordinance. He concluded by noting that the revisions were made in response to Council feedback and that he was available to answer any questions.

Mayor Ramsey opened the public hearing for Ordinance 2026-04. There were no comments. Mayor Ramsey closed the public hearing.

Council Member McGuire questioned the necessity of additional restrictions on accessory dwelling unit (ADU) entrances beyond prohibiting entrances on the primary front elevation. He expressed that he understands the intent to avoid a duplex-like appearance but questioned why regulations should extend to side or upper-level entrances, particularly if they align with the home's architectural design. He noted that similar configurations already exist in various areas of the city and asked for clarification on why further limitations on ADU access are needed.

Long-Range Planner Moss responded that the current ordinance prohibits ADU entrances from being visible from the street in all cases. He explained that under existing rules, even a basement or second-story entrance could be restricted if it is visible from a public street, particularly on corner lots. He stated that the proposed amendment is intended to clarify where ADU entrances are permitted while maintaining the ordinance's original intent to preserve the appearance of single-family homes. Under the revised language, certain side entrances may be allowed, including

on interior lots, while corner lots would have more limitations. Additional flexibility is provided through options such as below-grade entrances or entrances screened by a fence. He emphasized that the changes are meant to balance maintaining neighborhood character with providing clearer and more practical guidance for ordinance enforcement.

Council Member McGuire confirmed that the intent of the proposed changes is to bring the ordinance into better alignment and improve clarity in how it is applied.

Long-Range Planner Moss explained that the proposed amendment is not intended to create a significant policy change. Instead, it is meant to formalize and clarify how the current ordinance has been interpreted and applied in practice, providing clearer guidance moving forward.

Council Member Johnson suggested that both conditions, below-grade entrances and entrances screened by a six-foot opaque fence, should be required together, rather than allowing either option independently.

Long-Range Planner Moss responded that the intent of the ordinance is not to require both conditions simultaneously. He explained that if an entrance is behind a six-foot opaque fence, it meets that requirement, and if it is below grade, it would also be permitted. He noted that the language allows for flexibility, and that a below-grade entrance would not be prohibited even without a fence. He emphasized that the ordinance does not require both conditions to be met together.

Council Member Zander expressed appreciation for Long-Range Planner Moss and staff, noting that they responded professionally to council feedback and returned with a revised proposal that addressed concerns. She stated that the amended version was acceptable and commended staff for their responsiveness and effective resolution of the issue.

Council Member Zander motioned to approve 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. Council Member Shelton seconded the motion.

Council Member Shelton expressed support for adding flexibility to the ordinance's entrance requirements. He suggested that, in addition to a six-foot opaque fence or below-grade access, other elements such as landscaping or architectural features could be considered if they effectively obscure the entrance. He noted that the current language may be too restrictive and stated a preference for allowing additional design approaches, while acknowledging that further changes at this stage may add complexity.

Council Member Harris stated that the purpose of the ordinance amendment is to clarify the existing regulations rather than make significant policy changes. He expressed support for the approach taken and noted that the revisions align with how he envisions the ordinance functioning. He also raised a concern about future ADU development, particularly how both new construction and modifications to existing homes may be impacted as ADUs become more common. He suggested that broader, more in-depth discussions may be needed in the future to address long-

term planning considerations but concluded that the current amendments effectively provide needed clarification.

Council Member Johnson expressed concern that expanding the ordinance to include subjective features such as general “design” or “features” could create too much interpretation and inconsistency. She stated that more clearly defined standards, such as requiring a fence, would be easier to administer and enforce, whereas broader language could lead to uncertainty and differing interpretations.

Council Member McGuire concurred with Council Member Harris, emphasizing that the intent of the current action is solely to clarify the existing ordinance rather than make substantive policy changes. He noted that while future ADU growth might warrant a more comprehensive review and updated standards, the current amendment appropriately codifies the city’s historical interpretation and enforcement.

Council Member Zander indicated agreement with prior comments and suggested that staff may bring future discussions back to the council to explore ADU-related issues more thoroughly. She noted that while the current item is not the appropriate place for broader changes, there is an acknowledgment that additional consideration of ADU policies will be needed moving forward.

Council Member McGuire agreed, referencing examples within the Daybreak community where ADUs are incorporated through architectural and design standards rather than fences or visual barriers. He noted that such approaches can successfully integrate ADUs while maintaining neighborhood character. However, he emphasized that the current discussion is focused on clarifying the existing ordinance rather than making broader policy changes.

Mayor Ramsey stated that the topic presents an opportunity for future discussion, should the Council choose to pursue it.

Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece indicated that future legislative developments would likely prompt the Council to revisit the topic, providing an opportunity to evaluate ADU regulations in a more holistic manner.

City Attorney Loose referenced recent legislative activity, noting that a related bill did not pass and another was considered the previous week. He explained that one of the bills addressed automatic permitted uses and included provisions related to accessory dwelling units (ADUs), particularly those that are external. He indicated that this legislative activity may be relevant to how ADUs are addressed moving forward.

Council Member Harris asked the Mayor whether, in light of current legislative activity, there was a recommendation to proceed with adoption of the ordinance at this time.

Mayor Ramsey stated that while she does not cast a formal vote, she recommends adoption of the ordinance at this time. She expressed support for the proposal, noting that it provides clarity and consistency in how ADU standards are applied. She added that the ordinance balances flexibility for residents with clear, objective standards that are easy to understand and enforce.

Roll Call Vote

Council Member Zander - Yes

Council Member Shelton - Yes

Council Member Harris - Yes

Council Member Johnson - Yes

Council Member McGuire - Yes

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0 in favor.

Mayor Ramsey expressed appreciation for the work completed on the ordinance, noting the additional effort taken to refine the proposal and bring it back for consideration. She thanked staff for their time and efforts.

I. Staff Reports and Calendaring Items:

City Manager Dustin Lewis reminded the council to stay alert for action alerts from the League during the legislative session. He emphasized that these alerts are time-sensitive and should be responded to as quickly as possible. He encouraged members to reach out to City Attorney Ryan Loose or himself if they need additional background or clarification on any alerts. He noted that the alerts will be distributed either via email or text message.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The February 17, 2026 City Council Meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.