



# HOLLADAY@20 *Preparing for Tomorrow*

## Citizen Advisory Group

**Date:** Wednesday, March 11, 2020

**Time:** 6:00 p.m.

**Location:** Mt Olympus Room (main level), Holladay City Hall, 4580 S. 2300 E., Holladay, UT 84117

### INVITED ATTENDEES:

#### Citizen Members

John Ashton, Chair  
John Norton, Vice Chair  
Kim BlairAlan Eastman (*call in*)  
Brett Graham (*call in*)  
Larry Hoffmann  
Julie (Yujie) McCracken (*call in*)  
Jim Wilson (*call in*)

#### City Council Representatives

Mayor Rob Dahle  
Council Member Paul Fotheringham, District 3

#### City Staff

Gina Chamness, City Manager  
Paul Allred, Director of Community Development  
Jared Bunch, City Engineer  
Holly Smith, Assistant to the City Manager

Fred Philpot, LYRB  
Kyrene Gibb, Y2 Analytics  
Brian Wilkinson, Wilkinson Ferrari & Co.  
Hilary Robertson, Wilkinson Ferrari & Co.

### AGENDA

#### *Dinner Provided*

- I. 6:00 Welcome – John Ashton, Chair
- II. 6:00-6:20 Presentation of Subgroup Outcomes and Draft Options
- III. 6:20-7:00 Group Member Roundtable  
*(Each member will be given the option to have 5 min to share comments on subgroup presentation and provide other potential points of consideration for the recommendation)*
- IV. 7:00-8:00 Pre-Finalization of Recommendation
- V. Determine Next Steps and Action Items
  - a. Next Meeting – March 25, 2020, 6:00 p.m.-8:00 p.m.
  - b. Agenda – Finalize Recommendation and Review Council Presentation
- VI. 8:00 Adjourn

### NOTES

- Chair Ashton began the meeting at 6:05 p.m. with a review of efforts since the last meeting. The subgroup including the Chair, Vice Chair John Norton, Jim Wilson, and Brett Graham, along with support from Mayor Dahle, Gina Chamness, and Holly Smith met two times, on February 26 and March 4. They have prepared draft options for full Group consideration. The Chair along with Vice Chair Norton also attended a recent City Council meeting to provide an update. He also invited members to the April 9 Council meeting when the recommendation is planned to be presented.
- As an introduction to the sharing of the subgroup outcomes and draft options, Chair Ashton reviewed the project needs, touching on the storm water, roads, and bonding details. The subgroup refined 3 options.

## **OPTIONS**

### **1. Status Quo**

- Baseline property tax increase with annual "Cost of Business" increase
- Keeps existing City services as-is – infrastructure at-risk
- No add'l funding for roads
- Decrease in road PCI (61) - at-risk roads start failing
- No funding for unmet capital projects

### **2. Slightly Better**

- Gradual property tax increase with annual "Cost of Business" increase
- Add'l funding for roads
- Modest improvement to road PCI (74) - keeps at-risk roads from failing
- Funding for capital projects

### **3. Biggest Impact**

- Upfront property tax increase with annual inflation increase
- Upfront road bonding produces immediate results
- Increase in road PCI (77) – keeps at-risk roads from failing and lowers future maintenance costs
- Funding for capital projects

The consensus was that Option 1 Status Quo was not acceptable, because it provides essentially no new funding for the unmet CIP needs or road maintenance priorities. There was also discussion about changing the name of Option 1 to Treading Water, as it is truly not a status quo situation. The City's existing revenue sources cannot sustain the status quo, so the additional funding in Option 1 is merely to address the increasing cost of public safety and public works contracts.

Subgroup members asserted that their preference was Option 3 Biggest Impact, as it has the most tangible results, demonstrated financial responsibility and transparency in use of funds to help support the sustainability plan's long-term success. The full group discussed the potential timing and best use of the proposed bonds for the storm, roads, and other capital projects. The group felt that the road bond in particular was most favorable in providing residents with immediate, visible results.

Members discussed the possibility of providing additional options, such as an Option 1.5 that is in between Option 1 and 2, but this would require an adjustment to the timing of project needs and may result in a decline in road quality and inability to meet CIP needs. The group also discussed providing an illustrative option 4 to show what would happen if Holladay matched the property tax rate of other communities that in some cases are double that of Holladay's rate. It was deemed that this was more of a messaging task.

The group discussed incorporating pros and cons into their recommendation along with the data outcomes of the model. It was also suggested that the recommendation should include backgrounds of the group members and connect points back to survey results and other resident feedback. Members also emphasized that more project detail is needed in messaging to residents – what projects, how many projects, how much money is needed, and how much in new revenue is needed. The group also needs to highlight the importance to the City officials in having dedicated staff and resources in place to execute new projects and carry out the success of the plan.

The group determined that from their work over the past year combined with what they've learned from residents Option 3 was the best option. There was consensus that a storm water fee is necessary; two revenue bonds are needed (one for storm and one for roads); a property tax increase is essential; road improvement is critical; and the sustainability plan must be reviewed on an annual basis.