



**MINUTES OF THE CITY OF WEST JORDAN  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
Wednesday, October 12, 2022 – 7:00 pm.  
Approved October 26, 2022**

Thomas M. Rees Justice Center  
8040 S Redwood Road • West Jordan, UT 84088

---

**COUNCIL:** Vice Chair Kelvin Green, Council Members Chris McConnehey, Zach Jacob, David Pack, Pamela Bloom, and Chair Kayleen Whitelock (electronically)

**STAFF:** Council Office Director Alan Anderson, Council Office Clerk Cindy Quick, Policy Analyst Cassidy Hansen, City Administrator Korban Lee, Mayor Dirk Burton, City Attorney Rob Wall, Public Services Director Isaac Astill, Public Works Director Brian Clegg, Public Utilities Director Greg Davenport, Senior PC Specialist Rodney Glore, Community Development Director Scott Langford, IT Administrative Assistant Rachel Mackay, Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray, Economic Development Director Chris Pengra, Attendee Tayler Jensen

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chair Green called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

### **2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Kolton Winn led participants in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Council Member McConnehey made a motion to suspend Council Rules to take agenda items out of order as deemed necessary by Vice Chair Green. Council Member Jacob seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).**

**Vice Chair Green opened the public comment period at 7:07 pm.**

Citizen Comments:  
None

**Vice Chair Green closed public comments at 7:09 pm.**

### **4. EXECUTIVE REPORTS TO COUNCIL**

#### **a. Mayor's Report**

Mayor Burton reported on the recent ULCT Annual Conference, a recent Wasatch Front Regional Council Active Transportation Committee meeting, a ChamberWest planning meeting, and an EDC Utah planning meeting. The Mayor reported that Maple Hills Park was now open. Vice Chair Green commented that Mayor Burton was selected to serve on the ULCT Executive Board.

**b. City Administrator's Report**

Public Services Director Isaac Astill introduced two new staff members: Events Manager Ashley Dupler, and Parks Project Manager Tyler Crawford. Mr. Astill thanked the Council for support in filling positions.

Vice Chair Green asked those in attendance which public hearing items they were present to participate in, and with an even number present to speak for two of the public hearing items, decided to proceed with the agenda as published.

**5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**a. Ordinance No. 22-25 a petition by Todd Amberry / Canyon Stone Capital for a Master Development agreement for Welby West approximately 11.54 acres of property located at approximately 8945 South 4800 West subject to the approval of Ordinance No. 22-26 amending the General Plan Land Use Map for Welby West from Neighborhood Commercial to Medium Density Residential and rezone from SC-2 Zone (Community Shopping Center) and R-1-10 Zone (Single-Family Residential Zone, with 10,000 square foot minimum lot sizes) to the PRD (M) Zone (Planned Residential Development – Medium Density Zone)**

Todd Amberry, President of Canyon Stone Capital, presented a revised proposal, requesting approval to rezone approximately 7 acres of SC-2 and 4.5 acres of R-1-10 to 11.54 acres of Medium Density (PRD-M), limited to 5.5 units per acre. Mr. Amberry said he was willing to record a covenant against the title to ensure there was no possibility of increasing the density beyond a maximum 63 single family homes. He showed two proposed site plan options (Options 1 and 2) with different placement of the open space, and two alternate site plans (Alternates 1 and 2).

Mr. Amberry shared neighborhood feedback received, with a majority of feedback in support of Option 2. He reported that water and sewer utilities were addressed in the Master Development Agreement and reported the site could be graded without using retaining walls. Mr. Amberry said UDOT reported existing roads would meet the anticipated level of service and said UDOT had indicated willingness to adjust timing of the traffic light. He said the projected demographic for the community was young families and retirees.

Council Member Pack commented that the updated traffic study was not included in the packet for Council and public review. Mr. Amberry said the updated traffic study was submitted to staff. The results of the updated study were materially the same as the initial traffic study, finding no significant impact.

Vice Chair Green asked if the MDA and MDP complied with West Jordan City Ordinance. Mr. Amberry said he believed they did and had been told by City staff they did. Mr. Amberry answered questions regarding the planned sewer connection. Responding to a question from Vice Chair Green, Mr. Amberry said only green space around the perimeter of the lots were included in the open space calculation. Vice Chair Green asked to see a calculation proving the claim. Vice Chair Green pointed out an inaccuracy regarding slope. Mr. Amberry stated the project would include full-length 18-foot driveways. He explained that multiple options were provided for Council consideration because neighbors had preferred a different option from the option recommended by City staff. He said he

wanted to build 63 homes in a great neighborhood and emphasized he had not tried to make the decision more difficult for the Council.

Vice Chair Green pointed out that City ordinance required all open space to be HOA owned and maintained, but the open space in Option 2 presented by Mr. Amberry was explained as HOA owned/homeowner maintained. Mr. Amberry responded that the staff report was clear in explaining that Option 1 met City Code, and Option 2 was an alternative preferred by the neighbors.

**Vice Chair Green opened a public hearing at 7:50 pm.**

Comments:

Troy Mangan, West Jordan resident adjacent to the project, said he wanted the second option with wider lots next to his property. He said he preferred the proposed residential project over commercial.

Steve Peer, West Jordan resident adjacent to the project, said he agreed with Mr. Mangan that Option 2 provided a better transition. He said the worst option was to leave the property how it was currently zoned. Mr. Peer said he preferred Option 2.

Sheryl Rose, West Jordan resident, said she was representing the family that owned the land. She said the property was no longer viable for farming, and was not doing any good for the community or the City as it was. Ms. Rose said she believed Mr. Amberry was trying to develop something good for the area, and said she believed the proposed project would be less impactful to the area than commercial. She asked the Council to consider every option, as well as the opinions of the neighbors.

Wendy said she was attending with her husband, Jeff. She said their lot was adjacent to the subject property, and the thought of businesses on the subject property scared her. She said the thought of nice homes in her backyard pleased her.

Monica Hansen, Murray resident, said her mother was raised on the subject property. She said she and her family would like to see more families living on that land.

Darryl Lehmitz, West Jordan resident, said he was a family member with an interest in the property. He said he believed the current proposal would be preferable for the neighborhood than the commercial alternative.

Jen Hunt, West Jordan resident along the bottom corner of the property where flooding was occurring, said she preferred Option 2. She said she believed commercial would bring in a lot of traffic, noise, and crime.

**Vice Chair Green closed the public hearing at 8:01 pm.**

Mr. Amberry hoped it was evidenced by what was heard that the applicant had worked hard to create a great project.

Council Member McConnehey believed PRD-M fit the property better than PRD-H. Referring to Option 2, he said if he were a homeowner on the north side of the project, he would not want a trail immediately behind his home. Council Member McConnehey commented that a trail with a fence on either side would be a place for garbage and leaves

to be blown by the wind and collect. He said he had thought about the City Code requirement that HOAs must maintain open space and suggested perhaps the Code needed to be adjusted. He applauded the developer for the time spent listening to feedback and answering questions and expressed support for the proposal.

Council Member Bloom said she frequently walked on trails similarly fenced and had never seen any problems. She said she was grateful for the hard work and communication put into the project. Council Member Bloom said she would side with the residents in support of Option 2, and agreed some adjustments needed to be made to City Code.

Council Member Jacob said his concern with Option 2 was that he would not want public HOA property in his backyard. He said he agreed with Council Member Bloom that trails next to homes could be great. Council Member Jacob said he hoped real estate agents would disclose to potential buyers that part of the green space in the backyards was public HOA property.

Chair Whitelock said it was her understanding that staff were advising against Option 2 because it did not meet Code. She said the purpose of Code requirements was to ensure the space was open to everyone for use and expressed the opinion that open space in someone's yard would not be open to everyone. Tayler Jensen confirmed that Option 1 better met Code, and said staff were concerned about future liabilities with Option 2 (code enforcement, police issues). Chair Whitelock said the staff report pointed out the only way water would be available for the development was if the Council voted to change water storage capacity requirements in current Code. Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray confirmed that without the provision for culinary water, the development would not be possible.

Council Member Bloom asked if it would be possible to make minor adjustments to bring Option 2 in line with Code, since the residents preferred Option 2. Mr. Jensen responded that text could be changed regarding HOA open space.

Council Member Pack noted the property was in his district and spoke of time spent answering questions regarding the proposed project. He said he was grateful to hear different opinions and acknowledged that no one could please everyone all the time. Council Member Pack said he wanted to see the land go to the highest and best use and did not believe high density would be the best use. He said he had heard comments from neighbors of the development that they preferred Option 2 but would choose Option 1 over commercial. Council Member Pack said he recognized that lower density often resulted in a higher price point and added that there was perhaps a dearth of starter homes in the area.

Council Member McConnehey said his perspective had switched, and although he liked Option 2, he did not like the idea of open space that was neither open nor public. He said he would be in favor of seeing if the developer could bring Option 2 into compliance with City Code.

Vice Chair Green thanked the residents for being involved. He said many individuals had reached out to him with the thought that "we could do better". Vice Chair Green stated City ordinance encouraged moderate or affordable housing. He said his expectations had

always been that developments comply with City ordinance. Vice Chair Green listed the following issues he had with the application:

- The integrated housing ordinance was 5.5 units per acre, with the possibility of 5.7 units per acre if the developer donated to a community housing trust.
- Ordinance required that an application be filed jointly by all property owners. The Council did not have the original application, and Vice Chair Green questioned if the original application had been valid.
- The City had nothing on file indicating that all property owners agreed.
- The application did not include a statement of how findings were met [13.7.c.8].
- Design guidelines should be submitted with the MDP.
- Design Review Committee and Planning Commission both provided negative recommendations.
- Ordinance required 28-acres minimum for development. Smaller developments approved by the Council were not precedential.
- The burden of proof was on the developer to prove there would be no impact. Vice Chair Green said he believed the developer had provided little to show no impact.
- Vice Chair Green said he disagreed with the claim that the property could be graded without raising the property, based on elevations of the land.
- Vice Chair Green said he disagreed with traffic claims.
- Vice Chair Green questioned why the developer wanted to change the Future Land Use Map to high density but build the development at medium density.
- Potential impact on the City sewer system was not included in the packet.
- The MDP did not fill in gaps between City Code and the proposed development.
- MDA specified multiple phases of development, but the MDP specified one phase. Vice Chair Green said he would not support the ambiguity.
- Unclear grammar in Recital #9 page 2.
- Vice Chair Green said he could not support the Water Master Plan.
- No detail was provided regarding how the development would connect to the City sewer system.
- No definition of project improvements was provided.
- Vice Chair Green said he could not support the 25% completion statement in the MDA.
- Vice Chair Green said he could not support language in the MDA regarding compelling or competing interests (Utah Code 10.9a.509.1a2).
- Vice Chair Green noted that he could not support an MDA that could be amended in whole or in part by mutual written consent of the parties. He said he would not delegate the Council's authority.
- The signature clause on the owner's property was signed by Todd Amberry on August 22, and signed by Darryl Lehmitz, Jana Malmstrom, and William Malmstrom on August 9. Vice Chair Green questioned how the MDA could be executed 4-6 weeks prior to when the MDP was submitted to the City (September 22) and questioned how the signatories could have certified they had reviewed all exhibits.
- The jurat for Darryl Lehmitz referred to Willard Malmstrom.
- Vice Chair Green wanted better than an example of the proposed wall in the MDP.
- The MDP should include a lighting plan as required by City Code.

- Vice Chair Green disagreed with the elevation description, and would not allow ambiguity regarding phases, open space, setbacks, and driveways. He stated an 18-foot driveway was not a full-length driveway.
- Vice Chair Green listed statistics missing from the MDP.
- Vice Chair Green noted he would not allow a contract that delegated certain authorities to an HOA.
- Vice Chair Green believed common areas and open space should be required to be built sooner in the development than specified in the MDP.
- The easement plan did not show a snow storage easement area.
- Vice Chair Green questioned whether a 35-foot house should be allowed in the development.

Council Member Jacob suggested Vice Chair Green submit further issues in writing to be included in the record considering the time and the number of people waiting for the next agenda item. Vice Chair Green responded that he took an oath to uphold the ordinances of West Jordan and continued with a few more issues:

- Ordinance required that open space be usable and dedicated for park-type activities. Option 2 violated the ordinance.
- Vice Chair Green did not agree with language stating landscape designs would be low water use “where possible”.
- Ordinance required a street scape plan when development was on a collector and an arterial.
- Vice Chair Green said the open space calculation submitted was incorrect.

Council Member Pack noted that he appreciated Vice Chair Green’s attention to detail. He believed people could find whatever they were looking for, whether favorable or unfavorable. He questioned whether anything would ever be passed at a certain level of scrutiny and acknowledged the importance of due diligence. Council Member Pack pointed out that the City Attorney and other staff had signed off on approval. He said he had an issue with Option 2 because of the common area HOA/property owner maintenance question.

Council Member McConnehey said he believed the voice of the Council had been overwhelming in support of making sure open space was compliant with Code and not fenced off in backyards. He said he did not want to deny the application but wanted to give the developer more time to adjust Option 2 to meet Code.

**MOTION: Council Member Jacob moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 22-25 and Ordinance No. 22-26, with Option 1. Council Member Bloom seconded the motion.**

City Attorney Rob Wall advised that the Council should address Ordinance No. 22-25 (MDA) first, Ordinance No. 22-26 (Land Use Map amendment) second, and the zone map change last. Council Member Jacob withdrew the motion.

**MOTION: Council Member Jacob moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 22-25 with Option 1. Council Member Bloom seconded the motion.**

Council Member McConnehey said he opposed the motion because Option 1 was not favored by the neighbors and said he would rather get it right. Council Member Jacob commented that the issue had been on the table for almost a year, which he considered ridiculous.

Chair Whitelock said she wished all of the property had been developed as one big neighborhood to begin with. She said she would rather get something right, than get it done now. She appreciated the time the developer had put into trying to find the best use but was sad when she reviewed the MDA and found it did not contain enough information. Regarding water, she said she would deem it inappropriate to approve a development based on a future vote of the Council. She expressed concerns about the sewer hookup and said she had personally heard more comments against the project than in favor. She summarized that most resident comments indicated a desire for the project to be residential, and similar to surrounding development. Chair Whitelock said she believed the Council needed to work on the Code because many developers asked for a density buy-up, which resulted in HOAs and higher cost for residents. She said she was troubled by the proposed 18-foot driveways. Chair Whitelock said the MDA needed to ensure the City would get what they thought they were getting.

Council Member Bloom commented that a developer could not be faulted if the Council had a problem with current Code. She expressed the opinion that Option 1 was beautiful and would bring value to the City and was compliant with City Code. Chair Whitelock responded that Option1 did not meet City Code and would require several exceptions.

Council Member Jacob said individuals wanting a driveway longer than 18 feet would purchase at a different location. He insisted that 18 feet was a standard driveway length across the country. Council Member Jacob stated the City had professional staff for a reason, and staff had signed off on Option 1. He said he was willing to trust that opinion. Vice Chair Green said he felt the personal attack was out of order.

Council Member Pack said he tried to see both sides. He said he did not want to put the cart before the horse and approve something before necessary services were available but noted that the Council frequently approved development noting that an enhancement would be necessary to provide services. He expressed concern regarding the HOA and open space but noted that changes could be made to get it right. Council Member Pack said he did not want to do anything against Code, and trusted staff if they said Option 1 was within Code. He expressed the opinion that the project was close. Vice Chair Green pointed out that the staff report stated details were missing from the MDA regarding water and sewer.

**The vote was recorded as follows:**

**Yes: Zach Jacob, Pamela Bloom**

**No: Chris McConnehey, David Pack, Kelvin Green, Kayleen Whitelock**

**Absent: Melissa Worthen**

**The motion failed 2-4.**

**MOTION: Council Member McConnehey made a motion to table the issue to no later than the second Council meeting in December 2022. Vice Chair Green seconded the motion.**

The Council and staff discussed how to move forward. Council Member McConnehey withdrew the motion, and Vice Chair Green withdrew the second.

**MOTION: Council Member McConnehey moved to table Ordinances No. 22-25 and No. 22-26 to no later than the second Council meeting in December 2022 to allow for a modification of Option 2 to be presented to the Council for consideration. Council Member Pack seconded the motion.**

**The vote was recorded as follows:**

**Yes: Chris McConnehey, Zach Jacob, David Pack, Kelvin Green, Pamela Bloom, Kayleen Whitelock**

**No:**

**Absent: Melissa Worthen**

**The motion passed 6-0.**

Chair Whitelock suggested Vice Chair Green share his page of concerns with staff. Chair Whitelock requested a point of personal privilege, apologizing to the high school students in attendance for the length of the discussion, and commenting that government was messy. Mr. Wall suggested each Council Member discuss with staff which issues they wanted addressed.

**b. *Ordinance No. 22-44 to rename New Bingham Highway (from 7800 S to 5600 W) to Copper Hills Parkway.***

Council Office Director Alan R. Anderson oriented the Council with the request to rename New Bingham Highway to Copper Hills Parkway from 7800 South to 5600 West. He said he visited some of the businesses along the subject portion and no concerns were expressed.

**Vice Chair Green opened a public hearing at 9:32 pm.**

Comments:

Stephanie Southworth, Chair of Copper Hills High School Community Council, said she represented the families and student body of Copper Hills High School. She expressed support for the proposed ordinance and asked the Council to approve the street name change and fee waiver. She shared history of New Bingham Highway and spoke of extreme school pride within the community. Ms. Southworth commented that several schools in the area had roads named after the schools or mascots. She explained reasons for the requested fee waiver, stating the school was a government entity that gave back to the community.

Meg Young, Copper Hills Student Body President, commented that all other neighboring high schools had a road that corresponded with their school. She said it was kind of embarrassing that the name of a rival high school was part of the address of Copper Hills High School. Ms. Young said she thought the name change would increase school pride.



**Vice Chair Green closed the public hearing at 9:40 pm.**

Mr. Anderson referred to a letter in the packet regarding Salt Lake County addressing. He reported there was already a street named "Copper Hill Drive" in Magna and noted that if the proposed name change were approved, the County would provide a letter of non-compliance to the City. At that time, the City could either chose an alternate name, or submit a letter of explanation.

Council Member Jacob shared his son's support for the street name change. Council Member Bloom shared her daughter was also in support, and she was in favor of the proposed name "Copper Hills Parkway," despite the duplicate name within the County.

Council Member Pack said he had been working on the item for nearly a decade with various entities. He disclosed that he had a conflict of interest as a tennis coach at the school, current and former PTA President at the school, and Community Council Board member. He said he would recuse himself from the vote. The Council discussed Council Rules regarding conflicts of interest.

**Council Member McConnehey moved to suspend Council Rules to allow full deliberation and vote of the matter by all Council Members. Council Member Jacob seconded the motion. All voted in favor (5-0), with Council Member Pack abstaining.**

Council Member McConnehey disclosed that he attended West Jordan High School and did not have any sense of rivalry with Copper Hills High School. He asked if the changed name would be a formal or an honorary street name and asked if the same thing could be done for West Jordan High School. Staff responded that the name would be an honorary street name, not a formal street name. Council Member McConnehey said he was comfortable with the proposed name. He commented that not all of the businesses along the proposed two-mile stretch had been in favor and said he would be more comfortable with a shorter stretch (Grizzly Way to 5600 West).

Council Member Pack recommended making the name formal so it could be used on the website, letterhead, and mailings, and suggested extending the name "Copper Hills Parkway" to any future extension of the road. He stated most businesses were in favor, and the change would not have an impact on any residential properties.

Chair Whitelock said she would hesitate to change the name on only part of the road. She said she would vote in favor of the proposed name change. She said she knew the students raised incredible amounts of money, even in a single day, and said she would vote against the proposed fee waiver.

Vice Chair Green said he did not like going against the County and would prefer the name "Grizzly Nation" or "Ursus Way" to "Copper Hills Parkway". Council Member Pack commented that the name change could stop confusion between the current Old Bingham Highway and New Bingham Highway. History would be preserved in the continued name of Old Bingham Highway.

Vice Chair Green suggested the name change, if approved, should not stop at 5600 West, but continue over the 8600 South bridge to U111. Council Member McConnehey said he did not agree and would prefer to limit the change to the streets already there. Staff explained that an honorary name could not be given to a road that already had a name. The change would be a formal name change.

Council Member Bloom said she hoped the school would invite the Council to a celebration if the name change passed.

**MOTION: Council Member Jacob moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 22-44 to rename New Bingham Highway (from 7800 S to 5600 W) to Copper Hills Parkway. Council Member Bloom seconded the motion.**

**Council Member Pack moved to amend the motion to include language stating it was a formal renaming rather than an honorary renaming, and to extend the name to any future extension of the road.**

Staff explained that a future extension of 8600 South would be a much smaller road that would not meet the look of a “parkway”. The motion died for lack of second.

**The vote was recorded as follows:**

**Yes: Chris McConnehey, Zach Jacob, David Pack, Kelvin Green, Pamela Bloom, Kayleen Whitelock**

**No:**

**Absent: Melissa Worthen**

**The motion passed 6-0.**

- c. Resolution No. 22-041 waiving fees related to renaming New Bingham Highway from 7800 South to 5600 West as Copper Hills Parkway.***

**Vice Chair Green opened a public hearing at 10:05 pm.**

Comments:

Stephanie, a Copper Hills parent, commented that funds raised were needed for the students, and said the fund waiver would be appreciated.

Alonzo Alvarez commented there were many other purposes for which the money could be used, such as helping families in need, and asked that the fees be waived.

**Vice Chair Green closed the public hearing at 10:07 pm.**

Mr. Anderson stated the fee waiver amount was \$1,215.00. Council Member Pack said he felt Copper Hills High School provided service to the community. He pointed out that police officers trained at the school. Council Member Pack said he believed the request was valid.

Chair Whitelock said she understood the school's budget and understood the good done with fundraisers. She said the request was essentially for businesses and residents to pay for something the school wanted. She pointed out the name change was not necessary, and said she believed the school should pay for the want. Chair Whitelock said she typically voted no for fee waivers.

**MOTION: Council Member McConnehey moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 22-041 waiving fees related to renaming New Bingham Highway from 7800 South to 5600 West as Copper Hills Parkway. Council Member Jacob seconded the motion.**

Vice Chair Green said he agreed with Chair Whitelock. He encouraged the students to look to the future and consider donating to the City for other projects. Council Member McConnehey said he agreed with Chair Whitelock, and preferred service in lieu of fees, but would vote in favor because he had no doubt there would be service given to the community by the students that would more than cover the cost of the fee waiver. He challenged the students to consider how they could return the favor to the City and spoke of many different ways residents could serve. Council Member Bloom said she echoed Council Member McConnehey's comments.

**The vote was recorded as follows:**

**Yes: Chris McConnehey, Zach Jacob, David Pack, Kelvin Green, Pamela Bloom**

**No: Kayleen Whitelock**

**Absent: Melissa Worthen**

**The motion passed 5-1.**

**At 10:18 pm., Council Member McConnehey moved to recess until 10:25 pm. Council Member Jacob seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).**

Vice Chair Green called the meeting to order at 10:27 pm.

## **6. BUSINESS ITEMS**

### ***a. Resolution No. 22-043 establishing the City Council's Desire To Encourage And Support The Development Of Dine-In Restaurants.***

Economic Development Director Chris Pengra explained the proposed resolution would state the City Council's desire to encourage and support the development of dine-in restaurants.

Council Member McConnehey asked why the language was prepared with a resolution instead of as part of the General Plan. Mr. Pengra responded the General Plan was a robust document not likely to be read by potential businesses. He said the intention was to present the resolution to businesses as part of economic development efforts. Council Member McConnehey commented that the General Plan could also be presented to businesses. Council Member Jacob asked if Mr. Pengra had been approached by an owner of a dine-in restaurant and been told they were not sure West Jordan wanted a dine-in restaurant because there was no resolution. Mr. Pengra said he had not. Council Member Jacob stated he was not opposed to the idea.

Mr. Pengra explained that a developer had approached Chair Whitelock asking for something to indicate the City's interest in supporting the development of dine-in restaurants. He said the resolution did not represent a high-impact economic development strategy in general but was low cost. Council Member Bloom said she did not have a problem with the idea and commented that residents often expressed a desire for more dine-in restaurants in West Jordan.

**MOTION: Chair Whitelock moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 22-043 establishing the City Council's desire to encourage and support the development of dine-in restaurants. Council Member Bloom seconded the motion.**

Chair Whitelock said she asked for the resolution because a developer had said it would be helpful. She expressed the opinion that the more tools available the better. Council Member Pack commented on the need to take into consideration different demographics and economic situations and offer a variety.

**The vote was recorded as follows:**

**Yes: Zach Jacob, David Pack, Kelvin Green, Pamela Bloom, Kayleen Whitelock**

**No: Chris McConnehey**

**Absent: Melissa Worthen**

**The motion passed 5-1.**

***b. Resolution No. 22-048 submitting two names of nominees to Governor Spencer Cox for the Division 4 board seat on the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District Board of Trustees.***

Council Office Director Alan R. Anderson explained that State law required the City to submit two names to the Governor for appointment to the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District Board of Trustees. Policy Analyst Cassidy Hansen explained the voting process arranged for the Council, and the Council voted. Zach Jacob received six votes, and a roll call vote was necessary between Kelvin Green and Bart Barker, with Bart Barker receiving more votes.

**MOTION: Council Member Bloom made a motion to approve Resolution No. 22-048 submitting Zachary Jacob to be the primary name submitted to the Governor for consideration on the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District Board of Trustees. Council Member Jacob seconded the motion.**

**The vote was recorded as follows:**

**Yes: Zach Jacob, David Pack, Kelvin Green, Pamela Bloom, Kayleen Whitelock**

**No: Chris McConnehey**

**Absent: Melissa Worthen**

**The motion passed 5-1.**

***c. Resolution No. 22-046 authorizing the Mayor to execute an interlocal cooperation agreement with Salt Lake County, allocating Corridor Preservation funds towards property acquisition for the 8600 South bridge over Mountain View Corridor.***

Senior Management Analyst Jeremy Olsen oriented the Council with the proposed resolution.

**MOTION: Council Member McConnehey moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 22-046 authorizing the Mayor to execute an interlocal cooperation agreement with Salt Lake County, allocating Corridor Preservation funds towards property acquisition for the 8600 South bridge over Mountain View Corridor. Council Member Bloom seconded the motion.**

**The vote was recorded as follows:**

**Yes: Chris McConnehey, Zach Jacob, David Pack, Kelvin Green, Pamela Bloom, Kayleen Whitelock**

**No:**

**Absent: Melissa Worthen**

**The motion passed 6-0.**

## **7. CONSENT ITEMS**

### **a. Approve Meeting Minutes**

- *September 28, 2022 – Committee of the Whole Meeting*
- *September 28, 2022 – Regular City Council Meeting*

**MOTION: Council Member McConnehey moved to approve consent items as listed. Council Member Jacob seconded the motion.**

**The vote passed by unanimous vote (6-0).**

## **8. CITY COUNCIL REPORTS/REMARKS**

### **a. Council Office Report**

No report.

### **b. City Council Reports / Remarks**

Council Member Jacob –

- Apologized for losing decorum earlier in the meeting.

Council Member Pack –

- Thanked everyone who attended the meeting and recognized that a sacrifice was involved.
- Expressed appreciation for a recent tree replanting, and responses to other issues forwarded to staff.

Vice Chair Green –

- Thanked Chief Wallentine and Mayor Burton for sponsoring the Faith in Blue breakfast.
- Spoke of the recent ULCT Conference and Association of Municipal Councils meeting and said 90% of the discussions had related to moderate income housing.
- Commended Justin Rail in the Public Utilities Department.
- Encouraged the Council to read Chief's Wallentine's speech from the Faith in Blue event and encouraged them to listen to Jennie Tayler's speech.

- Expressed interest in bringing a Gold Star Memorial to West Jordan for a cost of \$60,000.

***c. Council Chair Housekeeping Items***

None.

**9. ADJOURN**

**At 11:03 pm., Council Member McConnehey moved to adjourn the City Council meeting and reconvene as Committee of the Whole. Chair Whitelock seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote (6-0).**

**The meeting adjourned at 11:04 pm.**

*I, Cindy Quick, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on October 12, 2022. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan City Council Meeting.*

Cindy M. Quick, MMC  
Council Office Clerk

Approved this 26<sup>th</sup> day of October 2022