THE SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL, STATE OF UTAH, MET ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2017, FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL AND THE ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COUNCILS TOGETHER (ACCT), PURSUANT TO ADJOURNMENT ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2017, AT THE HOUR OF 5:00:18 PM AT THE SALT LAKE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER, 2001 S. STATE STREET, ROOM N1-110, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

PRESENT: JENNIFER WILSON

RICHARD SNELGROVE

JIM BRADLEY

MICHAEL JENSEN¹

AIMEE WINDER NEWTON

MAX BURDICK

STEVE DEBRY, CHAIR

EXCUSED: ARLYN BRADSHAW

SAM GRANATO

*** *** *** ***

Council Member DeBry, Chair, presided.

*** *** *** ***

Mr. Jason Rose led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of

America.

***** *** *** *** *****

Introductions

Ms. Nancy Carlson Gotts, President, Association of Community Councils Together (ACCT), opened the meeting announcing that in March, ACCT changed its bylaws to say that any community council that was a member of the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (GSLMSD) or received services from the County can be a member of ACCT, which is why some community councils are not members of ACCT. Another reason is that ACCT provides insurance that covers community council activities and volunteers who help with those activities.



¹ Participated electronically.

Community Council Issues and Concerns

Ms. Barbara Cameron, Chair, Big Cottonwood Community Council, read the following statement expressing concerns particular to the Big Cottonwood Community Council:

- Restrooms and Canyon General Plan
- Petition for Feasibility Study/Incorporation

Restrooms and Canyon General Plan. First of all, thank you for agreeing for putting in new year-round restrooms at Silver Lake. Restrooms and potable water are the foundations for improved canyon services. From there we can look at trails and transportation. Also thanks for including us in the Canyon General Plan process. We're looking forward to public meetings and updates.

Petition for Feasibility Study/Incorporation. Five years ago, our community council asked the County for financial information about how much money is being generated from Big Cottonwood and how much is being reinvested. The reason we want that information is that we get very few municipal services, yet we think we contribute a notable amount to that fund. Recently, the infrastructure in the canyon has been failing to keep up with the millions of visitors, and we are desperate for a somewhat predictable stream of income to help out.

A Feasibility Study will give us financial information, and could help us have a better voice for funding for the canyon. We are trying to decide if we will withdraw the Petition for Incorporation after we get the numbers, or if it would go to a vote. We have much to discuss. The petitions are still being gathered, and will probably be submitted by the end of the month. From there, the Lt. Governor has a month to contract with a study consultant, and the consultant has a month to present the study. So it could be January 2018 before the Feasibility Study is presented for public comment.

Some of our meetings have been very heated. But the only topic that presses all my buttons is if someone says the County has not been fair to us. Not only has the County staff and Council been fair, but they have been eager to help, and I feel that each one loves these mountains deeply. This project is not about leaving our friends at the County (because we never will), but it's about bringing some financial information out of the shadows. Going forward, I intend to take every opportunity to tell folks how much this County has done for Big Cottonwood Canyon.

Council Member Bradley asked if the ultimate goal was to incorporate.

Ms. Cameron stated the community council just wanted financial information. If the financial information showed that there could be a stream of income, she did not know what the voters would say.

Council Member Bradley stated the process the community council has embarked on would lead to a vote: submitting signatures allows for a vote. Big Cottonwood's only potential revenue would be ski resorts, but they could probably go to the Legislature and get some exemption, which would leave the residents holding a bag they could not afford. He suggested the community council have discussions with members of the Council before submitting the petition. He did not want it to walk into something heady, and find out it was a mistake. Everyone loves the canyons; no one wants to see mistakes made there.

Ms. Cameron stated love of the canyons is the foundation of this. She expected the feasibility study would outline things that could happen. It will take over a year to come to an understanding of what that self-assessment included.

Council Member DeBry asked how many citizens lived in the canyons.

Ms. Cameron stated there are probably 220 voters, and residents have to be permanent before they can vote. Then, there are probably 1,400 families that are secondary property owners, but they cannot vote. Probably 10-15 percent of them are from out-of-state.

Council Member Burdick stated they pay property tax though.

Ms. Cameron stated ves.

Mr. Gary Bowen, Emigration Canyon Community Council, stated Emigration is now a metro township. However, he has learned that the GSLMSD has zero funding for parks and recreation. Since the whole canyon is a park, it could use the Council's influence to consider spending more money in the canyons. Emigration Canyon is a major destination for bicyclers and hikers, but does not have parking available for the recreational users. It also needs toilets. Canyon users are doing their business behind people's homes and in their garages.

Council Member DeBry stated a couple years ago, the Council worked relentlessly on the shoulder of the road, because bicyclers were riding to two or three abreast not yielding to cars, thereby, causing accidents, etc. He asked if that situation was any better now.

Mr. Bowen stated it really has not changed; it is an ongoing problem. The County just spent pennies up there. A couple years ago, Flood Control Engineering said to fix the bicycle lanes, shoulders, and other problems would cost about \$15 million. The GSLMSD needs to get a federal grant to really solve the problem. As a matter of fact, Council Member Wilson's father, Ted Wilson had an accident there two or three months ago.

Council Member Wilson stated her father hit a massive pot hole in the canyon and collided. At some point, that canyon is going to need an overhaul, but that is a matter of finding the funds. The Public Works Department does its best on a seasonal basis, with the funds it has. Because a lot of bicyclists use that canyon, these incidents will continue to occur.

Mr. Bowen stated Emigration Canyon has a full-time police officer assigned to the canyons. At the last two community council meetings, he informed the community that Operation Rio Grande has forced homeless people into other communities, including the canyons. They are staying in under-inhabited homes. These are people with serious criminal records, and they are scaring residents.

Ms. Jana Helsten, Kearns Community Council, stated Kearns is seeing an increase in the homeless population because of Operation Rio Grande, particularly around the library area. Another concern is some of the metro townships are talking about pulling out of the Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service Association (SLVLESA). The metro townships do not have a tax base, so she wondered how they would be able to afford to contract back with the County for police services.

Mr. Rick Graham, Deputy Mayor of Operations, stated Millcreek has announced it is opting out of SLVLESA, which is an issue for the GSLMSD. The situation will be even more complicated if some of the metro townships opt out. The metro townships really need to stay united.

Mr. Bart Barker, General Manager, GSLMSD, stated SLVLESA is asking for a property tax increase for 2018. It will meet with each of the metro townships to discuss that property tax increase, and they will need to vote on that tax increase. Three cities are withdrawing from SLVLESA – Millcreek, Herriman, and Riverton, but they are still voting members this year, and have said they will vote with the metro townships. If they all vote for the tax increase, it will come to the County Council for a vote. To get that tax increase approved, the Council has to have a two-thirds majority in favor of the tax increase.

Council Member DeBry asked if the townships would be okay financially without the tax increase if they stayed together or if they needed the tax increase to receive the same service they are receiving now.

Mr. Barker stated SLVLESA has said that the tax increase is required to maintain the current level of service, and if it does not pass, it will have to reduce officers or services.

Ms. Helsten stated Kearns has had a lot of gang activity lately, so losing officers is concerning.

Council Member Bradley stated SLVLESA is the taxing authority for all the members that join it, and pays the bills for public safety in those areas. The Unified Police Department (UPD) sets a standard of service that includes the number of officers per thousand people and other such things. Irrespective of whether a member is a city or township, the cost for that standard of service is the same. If an organization wants more services than what that standard is, it can negotiate with the UPD to pay for more services, i.e. additional officers, etc. Cities that choose not to join SLVLESA can come up with their own budget to pay for the

services they need. This year, SLVLESA determined it needed a 5.5 percent tax increase. All board members of SLVLESA have agreed a yearly increase equal to the growth in inflation would be better than losing services, and better than a 10-20 percent increase every 6 or 7 years to provide the same level of service.

Council Member DeBry asked what would happen if the tax increase passed, but some of the other SLVLESA members started to opt out.

Mr. Barker stated he had not studied that possibility. The GSLMSD could impose a property tax, but the amount it could collect would not be sufficient to fund road needs and police services. Going forward, it will be difficult for the metro townships to pay for UPD services, particularly for a metro township that pulls out of SLVLESA. The metro townships do not have property tax authority.

Council Member Newton stated a metro township could get out of SLVLESA and contract back, but that would require a legislative change. Metro townships would need to have property tax authority to do that.

Ms. Nancy Carlson Gotts, President, Association of Community Councils Together (ACCT), asked if the County Council was going to appoint another Council Member to the GSLMSD to replace Jeff Silvistrini, Mayor, Millcreek.

Mr. Barker stated the Council has been reluctant to add another member of the Council to that board because it did not want to dominate it. The state law requires seven members, the purpose of which was to avoid a tie vote. However, voting is weighted by population, so there would not be a tie vote. He would like to include a legislative change in the cleanup bill that Senator Karen Mayne is carrying to eliminate that requirement.

Council Member Snelgrove stated this should be an agenda item on a GSLMSD meeting, so board members can weigh in.

Council Member DeBry asked if the Council should put this on an agenda too.

Mr. Jason Rose, Legal Counsel, Council Office, stated he would recommend that.

Ms. Carlson Gotts stated there has been some confusion by County staff when they get a call regarding townships or community councils. She asked that they pass those inquiries to the appropriate council. County staff may need to be educated so they understand the rules of the metro township councils and the community councils.

Ms. Carlson Gotts stated the County has had a reduction in forces (RIF) in August and will reduce more employees in September. She asked what that would do to the level of service.

Mr. Graham stated when Millcreek opted out, it took about 40 percent of the sales tax revenue with it. While it has chosen to contract with the County for public works and engineering services, it is not contracting for planning and development services. As a result, the County has had to RIF positions. Additionally, the GSLMSD and metro townships have grown, and have had to use sales taxes for other needs, leaving a shortfall.

The GSLMSD has a 6.8 percent deficit in its budget for 2018, and few opportunities to generate new revenue, so it will have to tighten its belt and move money around. That means, there may have to be more reductions in the planning and development work force, and possibly to the public works work force if infrastructure maintenance, i.e. roads, sidewalks, etc. gets cut. There will also be service reductions in community outreach.

The GSLMSD board had considered a property tax, but there was not enough interest to tackle that. It is looking at other options, such as the metro townships imposing a storm water utility fee, which could only be used for storm water infrastructure, but it would free up sales tax that could be shifted to other services.

Ms. Carlson-Gotts stated members of the GSLMSD, metro townships, and community councils are baffled at how this happened.

Council Member DeBry stated it happened because metro townships were formed and Millcreek incorporated. The bill to form metro townships was a leap of fate. Now everyone is doing the best with what it was dealt.

Council Member Wilson stated one can wonder what would have happened had community preservation not occurred, but it was well-intentioned. Now, maybe the metro township councils can empower their communities to make decisions. Metro Township Councils are in a position to know their areas better than the County Council would have.

Mr. Barker stated the growth and development of these councils has been astounding. They are stepping up to their responsibilities, and the communities are pulling together as municipalities.

Council Member DeBry stated community council leaders can contact the Council Office anytime with questions, and the Council will try to get answers.



THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS to come before the Council and the Association of Counties at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00:05 PM.

| DATE | TUESDAY |
|------|---------|
| | 10L0D/1 |

<u>SEPTEMBER</u> 19, 2017

SHERRIE SWENSEN, COUNTY CLERK

By _____ Deputy Clerk

CHAIR, SALT LAKE COUNTY COUNCIL