

Approved October 6, 2015

MINUTES OF THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2015, AT DRAPER CITY HALL, 1020 EAST PIONEER ROAD, DRAPER, UTAH

PRESENT: Mayor Troy Walker, and Councilmembers Bill Colbert, Bill Rapple, Jeff Stenquist, Alan Summerhays, and Marsha Vawdrey

STAFF PRESENT: David Dobbins, City Manager; Mike Barker, Deputy City Attorney; Rachelle Conner, City Recorder; Russ Fox, Assistant City Manager; and Rhett Ogden, Parks and Recreation Director

Study Meeting

Dinner

1.0 Discussion: Recreation Center

6:00:57 PM

1.1 Russ Fox, Assistant City Manager, indicated the Council prioritized the list of amenities at the last City Council. He asked the architect to go over the cost breakdown with the Council.

6:01:19 PM

1.2 Holli Adams, architect, presented the two options to the Council as follows:

- Option 1
 - Leisure Pool
 - \$3,960,000/\$4,750,000
 - Party Room
 - \$136,500/\$154,000
 - Cardio (Machines)
 - \$1,440,000/\$2,340,000
 - Dance/Aerobic/Multi
 - \$432,000/\$520,000
 - Strength (Machines/Free Weights)
 - \$960,000/\$1,560,000
 - Dance/Aerobic/Multi
 - \$432,000/\$520,000
 - Single Gymnasium
 - \$2,079,000/\$2,268,000
 - Track
 - \$434,500/\$434,500
 - Total Net Square Feet
 - \$9,874,000/\$12,546,500
 - Grossing Factor (Circulation, Electric, Mechanical, Telecom, Lockers)
 - \$3,258,420/\$4,140,345
 - Total Gross Square Feet
 - \$13,132,420/\$16,686,845

- Option 2
 - Leisure Pool with Lazy River and Play Amenities
 - \$3,960,000/\$475,000
 - Competition Lap Pool with Diving Well
 - \$4,290,000/\$4,725,000
 - Spectator Seating
 - \$900,000/\$1,200,000
 - Party Room
 - \$136,500/\$154,000
 - Dance/Aerobic/Multi
 - \$432,000/\$520,000
 - Dance/Aerobic/Multi
 - \$432,000/\$520,000
 - Total Net Square Feet
 - \$10,150,500/\$11,869,000
 - Grossing Factor (Circulation, Electric, Mechanical, Telecom, Lockers)
 - \$3,349,665/\$3,916,770
 - Total Gross Square Feet
 - \$13,500,165/\$15,785,770

Ms. Adams indicated she met with the School District, and they do not care about diving at all; however, she recommends they do a diving well because it makes it a multi-generational use. There is a line item in Option 2 for spectator seating, and that is a District requirement. They said they would use the facility six times each year for competitions. The seating is not something that could be added later. The first cost listed is the average cost and the second is the enhanced version.

[6:07:56 PM](#)

1.3 The Council and staff discussed options for taking public comments. They determined to allow for a public comment period on the recreation facility at the October 6, 2015, meeting.

Ms. Adams explained the County may not agree with what the City Council proposes for this facility.

Mr. Dobbins expressed the need to have Ms. Adams go over the details for funding, the process, etc. before the public comment period is opened up. This will clarify that there is not unlimited funding for this facility.

Councilmember Stenquist noted it might be helpful to find the recreation survey results from six years ago. That might give the Council an idea of what the residents want, which is the most important thing.

Ms. Adams advised they will need to make it blatantly clear to the residents that the City is going to present a recommendation and request to the County for the facility, but the final decision will be made by the County. She also expressed her opinion that the County will not consider a facility without a fitness component.

[6:29:34 PM](#)

- 1.4 Peter Federman, resident, indicated one item that should be considered in the budget is the professional fees that will be involved. He is not sure how those costs fit into the proposed break down.

Ms. Adams said it is her understanding that the application is for the amount of the facility. The County holds money back to pay for the professional fees. She does not believe those costs are included in the \$13 million. A \$13 million project would actually cost approximately \$16 million once it is finished. That is not part of the application process because the City does not know what will ultimately be built.

[6:33:33 PM](#)

- 1.5 Rhett Ogden, Parks and Recreation Director, reviewed the results of two surveys that went out to the residents. The 2008 survey has a recreation center as the highest priority. It lists a fitness center with pool, sporting court, tracks, etc. Layne Long did a survey in 2012, and the highest percentage was a leisure pool with slides, lazy river, water spray, and zero-entry pool.

[6:36:39 PM](#)

- 1.6 Mr. Fox noted he met with the School District, and they indicated that Corner Canyon has the most active program of the five high schools in the District. There are seventy-six students that participate in the swim program, and they currently use the Dimple Dell Recreation Center. There is some contention between Corner Canyon and Alta for the use of the facility. The District is willing to participate in the costs of the aquatics center because it would benefit them as well.

[6:40:57 PM](#)

- 1.7 Ms. Adams indicated most recreation surveys will have aquatics and trails as the highest priorities. She said she will present the site plan before the public comments next week and will go over both options with the total cost rather than having it broken down per amenity.

** *The Council took a break at 6:45 p.m.*

** *The meeting resumed at 7:04 p.m.*

[7:04:28 PM](#)

Business Meeting – Special Joint Meeting with Members of the Traverse Ridge Special Service District (TRSSD) Administrative Control Board

1.0 Action Item: Consideration of an Interlocal Agreement with the Traverse Ridge Special Service District

[7:05:01 PM](#)

- 1.1 Mr. Dobbins indicated the Board has a proposal for a comprehensive agreement for road maintenance, street lighting, etc. Mr. Dobbins and Mr. Fox met with members of the Board yesterday. Given the lateness of the year, staff felt it was best to focus on snow

plowing right now. They can continue to discuss the road issues separately. There are a couple of ways to approach this. They could model this year's agreement after last year's agreement. The Mayor has indicated that the City is willing to take over Traverse Ridge Road and SunCrest Drive at some point. It would be the City's responsibility to maintain it, reconstruct, and snow plow. Those lane miles would be removed from the TRSSD baseline. The idea was that once the City received the funding from the State, they would take over those roads. This has not been finalized at this time. The District would be responsible for all other roads in the District's boundaries.

[7:08:21 PM](#)

- 1.2 Mr. Fox advised according to the Lewis Young study, there are forty-six lane miles that are calculated for the TRSSD. The City would remove the lane miles for Traverse Ridge and SunCrest Drive, and it would take that total down to seventeen lane miles.

[7:08:44 PM](#)

- 1.3 Councilmember Stenquist asked whether that would replace the tax credit they have been giving back to the District. Mr. Fox replied it would.

Mr. Dobbins noted the City would take over the responsibility and all costs of those two roads, so no credit for anything would be given back to the District. That is the trade off in the Mayor's proposal. Another option is to just go with the agreement they had last year until the City formally takes over those two roads.

[7:10:32 PM](#)

- 1.4 Mr. Dobbins indicated one of the other things in the agreement is for street lighting. The Board has decided to convert all of their street lights to the standard city street lights. The District will pay the upfront costs involved in the light replacement, and the City would then maintain those lights as they do the rest of the City's lights. The snow plowing and street lights will be on the agreement for Council consideration. The other issues will be discussed at a later date.

[7:11:25 PM](#)

- 1.5 Councilmember Colbert asked whether staff has told the new developers that they should not put in the special street lights.

Mr. Dobbins advised they have not gotten that far into the development plans yet. The City needs to adopt a standard street light.

[7:12:58 PM](#)

- 1.6 Mr. Fox stated they put together a list of items the District and Council could settle on. The group discussed options for snow plowing and street lights. It was decided that the District will contract with the City on the same terms they had last year for snow plowing.

The group then discussed potential problems with cloud cover affecting the GPS systems and salt metering.

[7:27:56 PM](#)

- 1.7 Mr. Fox reviewed the terms of the agreement for those present. This proposed agreement is more detailed than last year's agreement.

Subsequent to discussion, the majority of the Council agreed to provide the snow plowing and street lighting maintenance once the lights are replaced. They plan to use the terms of last year's agreement with some minor modifications.

[7:45:51 PM](#)

- 1.8 Amy Baird, chair, noted she talked with Public Works about fixing the sign at the bottom of SunCrest Drive. They said unless there is a contract in place they would not fix it. She advised the TRSSD is willing to pay the City for the repairs.

Ms. Baird also questioned whether the City could assist with the RFP for the street light replacement. The City might be able to get a better rate than the District could. She advised the District would be willing to contract for those services as well.

The Council agreed to have the snow plow/street light agreement placed on the October 6, 2015, agenda for consideration.

[7:57:08 PM](#)

- 1.9 Ms. Baird asked when the group would be discussing the other District issues, such as road maintenance.

The Board stated they feel that they are responsible for minor maintenance; however, the City is responsible for reconstruction due to the streets being City streets.

Mayor Walker indicated the SunCrest agreement said the District would be responsible for road maintenance in the District boundaries, which includes all maintenance and repair.

Both sides voiced their opinions on what the agreement means. Mayor Walker advised he is not sure either side will come to an agreement on this, so it might be up to a judge to determine.

The group will meet at a later date to discuss the other issues for the SunCrest area.

[8:09:08 PM](#)

2.0 Adjourn to a Closed Meeting to Discuss Litigation

[8:09:14 PM](#)

- 2.1 Councilmember Stenquist moved to adjourn to a closed-door meeting to discuss litigation pursuant to Section 52-4-205 of the Open and Public Meetings Law. Councilmember Rappleye seconded the motion.**

8:09:27 PM

2.2 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Colbert, Rappleeye, Stenquist, Summerhays, and Vawdrey voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

2.3 This meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.