

Approved November 14, 2017

**MINUTES OF THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2017, IN THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1020 EAST PIONEER ROAD, DRAPER, UTAH**

PRESENT: Mayor Troy K. Walker, and Councilmembers Bill Rappleye, Jeff Stenquist, Alan Summerhays, Marsha Vawdrey, and Michele Weeks

STAFF PRESENT: David Dobbins, City Manager; Rachelle Conner, City Recorder; Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resource Director; Russ Fox, Assistant City Manager; Rhett Ogden, Recreation Director; Bryan Roberts, Police Chief; Glade Robbins, Public Works Director; and Bob Wylie, Finance Director

---

**Dinner**

**Study Meeting**

[5:58:12 PM](#)

**1.0 Presentation: CPR Program**

1.1 EJ Hinterman, Fire Captain, briefed the City Council on the Fire Department's CPR - Push to Survive Program. Information can be found on the Draper Fire Department webpage.

[6:14:09 PM](#)

**2.0 Discussion: Driveway Lengths and Private Road Widths**

2.1 Russ Fox, Assistant City Manager, indicated the City Council asked staff to look at different criteria for driveway lengths and private road widths. The City Council discussed options, and directed staff to bring back a text amendment that would require all driveways being used for parking to be a minimum of 25 feet in depth. Councilmember Weeks indicated she would like to add 5 feet to all driveways that are only 5 feet in depth, so they have a minimum of 10 feet.

Mr. Fox then gave a brief history of the requirements for private lanes, and how the City came up with the 20-foot width minimum. Subsequent to discussion, the majority of the Council was not in favor of making changes to the private lane widths at this time.

[6:44:04 PM](#)

**3.0 Council/Manager Reports**

[6:44:03 PM](#)

3.1 Councilmember Rappleye questioned the process of getting rid of the Police Substation. There are residents that are anxious to get things moving along.

[6:44:59 PM](#)

3.2 Councilmember Summerhays expressed concern that the new building by Goff Mortuary is too close to the sidewalk. Mr. Fox explained there is no setback requirement in

commercial zones; however, there are landscape requirements of 10 feet. Mr. Fox advised staff will look into it.

[6:50:11 PM](#)

- 3.3 Glade Robbins, Public Works Director, indicated a resident filed a complaint about people speeding on Carlquist from 150 to 300 East. The speed limit is 25 miles per hour (mph). Staff performed a speed study, and the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile showed the speed should be 30 mph. He asked the City Council if they wanted to increase the speed limit to 30 mph. The speed limit east of 300 East is 30 mph. The City Council was not in favor of increasing the speed limit.

## **Business Meeting**

[7:01:43 PM](#)

### **1.0 Call to Order: Mayor Pro Tem Rappleye**

[7:01:52 PM](#)

### **2.0 Thought/Prayer and Pledge of Allegiance**

[7:02:00 PM](#)

- 2.1 Ed Grampp offered the prayer.

[7:02:49 PM](#)

- 2.2 John Maack led the Pledge of Allegiance.

[7:03:25 PM](#)

### **3.0 Public Comments**

To be considerate of everyone attending the meeting, public comments will be restricted to items not listed on this or a future agenda and limited to three minutes per person. Comments which cannot be made within these limits should be submitted in writing to the City Recorder prior to noon the day before the meeting. Comments pertaining to an item on the agenda should not be given at this time but should be held until that item is called.

[7:04:29 PM](#)

- 3.1 Reed Gibby, resident, said there is an intersection at State Street and 12150 South that is very dangerous. In his opinion as a former traffic engineer, the speed limit is too high, and there is low visibility.

[7:07:16 PM](#)

### **4.0 Consent Items**

- a. **Approval of October 3, 2017, City Council Meeting Minutes**
- b. **Approval of Resolution #17-59, Appointing a Parks, Trails, and Recreation Committee Member**

- c. **Approval of Resolution #17-67**, Authorizing the Mayor to sign the support letter for the Multi-jurisdictional Multi-hazard Mitigation Planning Process. Staff: Russ Fox
- d. **Approval of Agreement #17-221**, Interlocal Agreement with Metro Fire. Staff: David Dobbins

[7:07:50 PM](#)

- 4.1 **Councilmember Stenquist moved to remove Item B from the Consent Items. Councilmember Vawdrey seconded the motion.**

[7:08:21 PM](#)

- 4.2 **A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, Vawdrey, and Weeks voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

[7:08:21 PM](#)

- 4.3 **Councilmember Vawdrey moved to approve Consent Items A, C and D. Councilmember Rappleye seconded the motion.**

[7:08:49 PM](#)

- 4.4 **A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, Vawdrey, and Weeks voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

[7:09:00 PM](#)

- 4.5 **Councilmember Stenquist wanted to recognize John Maack for his willingness to serve on the Parks, Trails, and Recreation Committee. He stated that Mr. Maack is an avid runner and a great trail advocate.**

[7:09:45 PM](#)

- 4.6 **Councilmember Stenquist moved to approve Consent Item B. Councilmember Vawdrey seconded the motion.**

[7:09:52 PM](#)

- 4.7 **A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, Vawdrey, and Weeks voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

[7:10:03 PM](#)

- 5.0 **Public Hearing: Evans Square Plat Amendment, Request by Benson Whitney, Representing LF Evans Square LLC, for Approval of a Plat Amendment in the TC (Town Center) Zone**

[7:10:19 PM](#)

- 5.1 Jennifer Jastremsky, Planner, said this property is in the neighborhood commercial land-use designation, and town center zoning designation. In January 2017, the applicant had a site plan for 15 live-work units. This property is currently under construction. They want to plat these units so they can sell them rather than rent them, which necessitates a plat amendment. Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.

[7:12:02 PM](#)

5.2 Councilmember Stenquist asked how live-work units function. Ms. Jastremsky said a live-work unit allows for home occupations, only instead of someone using a bedroom or a living room they have a designated space with a store front for their business that is attached to their residence. Councilmember Stenquist asked if the store front would face the outside with retail parking. Ms. Jastremsky answered affirmatively and used the site plan to demonstrate how this would work. Councilmember Stenquist asked where the residential parking was located. Ms. Jastremsky said each of the 15 units have individual two-car garages attached to the building. She explained that the town center code restricts residential units on the ground floor, but not parking.

[7:14:29 PM](#)

5.3 Councilmember Summerhays stated this would not work out.

Councilmember Stenquist expressed concerns about the zoning. He said having a front façade of retail is helpful, but it could just be a loophole to create a multi-family residential building as opposed to something that is truly retail. Ms. Jastremsky said she cannot speak to how the units may provide retail frontage. It is required in code that the residential units are not on the ground floor. Councilmember Stenquist said this could be purely residential and asked if a retail component will be listed as a requirement. Ms. Jastremsky showed images of store fronts, and Councilmember Stenquist asked if the images of store fronts are in the site plan. Ms. Jastremsky answered affirmatively, and stated store fronts are required. She further explained that multi-family in a mixed-use building is allowed in the town center, which was previously approved. There was further deliberation on the matter.

Councilmember Summerhays asked if 50% of the ground floor needed to be retail. Ms. Jastremsky said no more than 49% of the ground floor can be used for parking. Councilmember Summerhays asked who would monitor this requirement and make sure the property complies with code. Ms. Jastremsky said the building permits are in review for the actual structures. Staff is reviewing the plans to make sure the garages and the retail areas meet code. She explained the code doesn't differentiate between live-work units versus multi-family units located above stores.

[7:18:35 PM](#)

5.4 Councilmember Weeks said they no longer want to rent these spaces; rather they want to sell each unit. If someone bought a unit, and decided they didn't want to use the retail space, the City could not force the owner to rent it out to a business. Ms. Jastremsky said this would be in violation of zoning code for a resident to use the ground floor as living space, and it could become an enforcement issue.

Mr. Fox said there are ways to resolve enforcement issues, if there are violations in a person's home. The City could give a notice of violation, which is one of the strongest enforcement tools. When the owner sells their home, the violation works as a lien on the property. The City has other enforcement measures within code as well; namely, the City could take them to court.

Councilmember Weeks asked about the architectural requirements in the town center. Ms. Jastremsky said the town center requires 80% brick on the building; the ordinance does not require the building to adhere to specific, traditional design.

Councilmember Stenquist said there are a lot of design requirements in the town center zoning, particularly in regards to signage.

[7:21:19 PM](#)

5.5 Councilmember Rappleye requested further review of the design plan.

In response to a question from Councilmember Weeks regarding parking spaces, Ms. Jastremsky said there are 55 total parking spaces.

[7:22:32 PM](#)

5.6 Jeremy Peterson, applicant, said their intent is to build live-work spaces. They are going to be marketing them as such, because these types of units are in high demand. As builders, they will build those spaces out to the purposes of the retail.

[7:23:31 PM](#)

5.7 Councilmember Rappleye asked about the price per unit.

[7:24:44 PM](#)

**5.8 Mayor Walker opened the public hearing.**

[7:24:58 PM](#)

5.9 Randy Fellows, resident, noted he owns the building on the corner of 900 East and 12300 South. He explained the parking requirements on his property are five stalls per 1,000 square feet. Mr. Fellows asked about the size of the retail units. He was concerned with other buildings coming in around his building that are using up parking spaces, because his business tenants require all of the spaces they have. Mr. Fellows also expressed concerns regarding snow removal.

[7:28:00 PM](#)

**5.10 Mayor Walker closed the public hearing.**

[7:28:07 PM](#)

5.11 Ms. Jastremsky said the retail space in each unit is about 500 square feet, and 8,000 square feet total on site between all the units. The code is figuring between the office, retail, and commercial so that shared parking minimum is 46 spaces. In total, the applicant has 55 spaces, so they are over the minimum they are required to have. There are two spaces for each unit. The intent is that these are small businesses with few employees. The homeowner would live upstairs from the business, and would come downstairs to open it. Staff believes the parking is adequate and conforms to code.

[7:29:51 PM](#)

5.12 Councilmember Weeks explained there is not enough parking for retail. Ms. Jastremsky said the normal parking standards of residential, office, and retail is 61 spaces total for all units. The applicant is within those requirements as well with 55 spaces. Councilmember Weeks said there are between one and two parking spaces per business for customers. Ms. Jastremsky said the parking has been approved with the site plan, which is not what is being approved with this motion.

Councilmember Stenquist remarked these are interesting questions, but pointed out that they do not have anything to do with what is being approved this evening.

Mayor Walker asked Ms. Jastremsky to address snow removal. Ms. Jastremsky said there will be an HOA, and they will be required to take care of the snow on site. Furthermore, in regards to enforcement the HOA will be able to state in their documentation that the ground floor is to be used for retail only.

Councilmember Rappleye asked if there is any on-street parking being added, to which Ms. Jastremsky responded in the affirmative. She referenced the site plan to identify where on-street parking would be located.

[7:33:24 PM](#)

**5.13 Councilmember Stenquist moved to approve the Evans Square Plat Amendment. Councilmember Vawdrey seconded the motion.**

[7:33:36 PM](#)

5.14 Councilmember Stenquist said they talked a lot about parking, which is not pertinent to this plat amendment.

[7:34:03 PM](#)

**5.15 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, and Vawdrey voting in favor. Councilmembers Summerhays and Weeks voted no. The motion carried with a majority vote of 3 to 2.**

[7:34:23 PM](#)

**6.0 Public Hearing: Cove at Brown Farm Minor Subdivision, Request by Edward Grampp for Approval of a Six-Lot Single Family Subdivision on 0.75 Acres in the RM1 Zoning District. The Proposed Subdivision is Consistent with the Development Agreement Previously Approved by the City Council**

[7:34:44 PM](#)

6.1 Ms. Jastremsky said the Council saw this motion in May for a rezone and development agreement. The property is in the residential medium high land-use designation, and the RM1 zoning designation. There was a development agreement that was approved with the rezone in May that limits the property to six single family detached lots. The proposed plat is similar to the concept that was within the development agreement. There are six lots averaging 4,500 square feet. The development agreement requires a minimum of 4,000

square feet for the average between all six lots. They have a private street system, and there will be an HOA that maintains that road. It will be between 20 and 26 feet wide per the development agreement. Ms. Jastremsky noted there is a street tree plan in place for the subdivision. There will be a single access off 300 East. In the development agreement, the applicant talked about putting a historical marker on the property. The applicant is proposing the marker be next to the entrance on the 300 East. It will consist of granite foundation blocks and brick from the home, and will have a historic plaque recognizing Brown Farm and the historical home that was on the property. Planning Commission and Staff recommended approval and Ms. Jastremsky stated this is a minor subdivision, which doesn't usually involve the City Council.

[7:37:23 PM](#)

6.2 Councilmember Weeks asked to see a picture of the monument. She asked if there are sidewalks in this development. Ms. Jastremsky said the sidewalk in the picture was the public sidewalk on 300 East. There are no sidewalks throughout the six homes.

[7:37:51 PM](#)

6.3 Councilmember Summerhays asked if the photo displayed a typical home. Ms. Jastremsky answered affirmatively and explained that the development agreement includes architectural standards that will be reviewed with each building permit.

[7:38:18 PM](#)

6.4 Councilmember Weeks asked about the home across the street and commented that the streets were wider. Ms. Jastremsky said the streets are wider across the street. They have 23 feet of asphalt, and they have sidewalk on both sides. Councilmember Weeks asked if they have park strips on both sides as well. Ms. Jastremsky answered affirmatively, and explained they have park strip and sidewalk on both sides, as well as 23 feet of asphalt.

[7:39:10 PM](#)

6.5 Ed Grampp, applicant, said when they put the property under contract, they realized the City did not want commercial use in this location. Therefore, they started looking at residential uses in the City. Citizens and neighbors said they didn't want townhomes or condominiums; rather, they wanted a development similar to what is across the street. He stated the units are detached single-family homes, and they will be happy to implement a historical monument at the entrance of the property. They worked closely with Staff and made changes according to their comments. Mr. Grampp stated the site plan reflects the elements to which they agreed.

[7:43:18 PM](#)

**6.6 Mayor Walker opened the public hearing.**

[7:43:49 PM](#)

6.7 Bob Clark, resident, stated that he is building a house down the street from this development and is concerned Draper is going to continue approving similar developments. He asks the Council to consider what they're doing and stated he would like there to be more consistency throughout the city.

[7:45:41 PM](#)

6.8 Randy Fellows, resident, said he spoke with Councilmember Summerhays years ago about having areas in Draper designated as something their kids can buy. He said there should be subdivisions where younger generations can afford to purchase homes.

[7:47:21 PM](#)

6.9 Lynn Orgill, resident, lives on the acre east of the development, and she approves the development.

[7:47:54 PM](#)

6.10 Tara Clark, resident, expressed concerns with insufficient parking. She was concerned with the direction Draper was moving and stated there needs to be a plan in place. She remarked that she did not want Draper to turn into Herriman.

[7:49:14 PM](#)

6.11 Kristen Mortensen, resident, has followed the developer's work for 25 years, and she supports the development. She said population is going up, and they will need the extra homes. The rising generation has to commute more, and she believes this is a good use of land.

[7:51:01 PM](#)

6.12 Rodney Bruin, resident, is in favor of the development. The affordability of housing in Draper City is rising and the use of the property is appropriate for the City.

[7:52:04 PM](#)

**6.13 Mayor Walker closed the public hearing.**

[7:52:13 PM](#)

6.14 Councilmember Stenquist asked if, as part of the development agreement, the Council is required to approve the minor subdivision as well. Ms. Jastremsky said the development agreement addresses the plat being similar to the concept plan. Councilmember Stenquist said whether or not it is spelled out in the development agreement, if a minor subdivision like this met all code and requirements there wouldn't be a lot of latitude for denial.

Ms. Jastremsky quoted the agreement, saying the City will not reject any minor subdivision plat application submitted by a developer which is generally consistent with the approved concept plan. Furthermore, the developer is meeting the requirements of the development agreement in the text and the concept plan. The changes made to the concept plan have been more engineering changes, not layout and design.

Councilmember Stenquist said there are no grounds to vote against this proposal. The zoning and development agreement have been approved and are in place. This is just an administrative step which the Council has no latitude to deny. Higher density developments like this one depend on location. Being on a busy intersection, this land did not work for large lot residential, and the proposal reflects the best possible compromise.

[7:56:36 PM](#)

**6.15 Councilmember Summerhays moved to approve the Cove at Brown Farm Minor Subdivision. Councilmember Stenquist seconded the motion.**

[7:57:01 PM](#)

6.16 Councilmember Summerhays said he knows this piece of property well. It has been for sale for many years and he thinks this use of the land is appropriate.

[7:58:20 PM](#)

**6.17 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, and Vawdrey voting in favor. Councilmember Weeks voted no. The motion carried with a majority vote of 4 to1.**

[7:58:46 PM](#)

**7.0 Public Hearing: Ordinance #1283, Request for Approval of a City-Initiated Text Amendment to Revise the Conditions Under Which a Secondary Driveway Curb Cut May Be Allowed, and to Make Some Other General Clarifications Pertaining to Driveway Placement**

[7:59:02 PM](#)

7.1 Dennis Workman, planner, said this item came before the Planning Commission on the previous Thursday, and it was unanimously approved with one change. A portion from the existing code has been preserved. The code change was to accommodate a second curb cut on a corner lot for an accessory building. Staff has fixed it to address secondary curb cuts on all lots to restrict driveway curb cuts on classified streets and to make some clarifications. In the current code, a secondary curb cut is not allowed on either frontage when the primary driveway is located on the longest frontage. Staff felt like this was overly restrictive. The new code is very clear about what can and cannot be done with driveways and accesses.

[8:04:17 PM](#)

7.2 Councilmember Summerhays said the examples given were all large lots. He asked if there were examples of small lots that have requested secondary accesses. Mr. Workman responded that there were very few examples.

[8:05:44 PM](#)

**7.3 Mayor Walker opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak, so Mayor Walker closed the public hearing.**

[8:06:05 PM](#)

**7.4 Councilmember Rappleye moved to approve Ordinance #1283. Councilmember Weeks seconded the motion.**

[8:06:36 PM](#)

7.5 Councilmember Rappleye said several years ago there was a situation on Willow Springs Lane where someone fronted onto a cul-de-sac. It was very troublesome, but it did work

out. With these restrictions that are spelled out correctly, there should be fewer requests on particular situations.

[8:07:59 PM](#)

**7.6 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, Vawdrey, and Weeks voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:08:11 PM](#)

**8.0 Public Hearing: Ordinance #1284, on the request of Mike Nielson, Representing West 77 Partners, for Approval of a Text Amendment to Draper City Municipal Code Section 9-18H-030 Creating Private Street Standards Within the DPMU-CSD Zone**

[8:08:39 PM](#)

8.1 Ms. Jastremsky said this is a text amendment for the Draper Pointe mixed-use commercial special district, which has approximately 75 acres. The applicant is proposing to create private road standards, which is something that is not currently within the text. The applicant wants to create a private road through the Academy Mortgage property to access the hotel. They are doing this so they can have an address on this private lane instead of 13490 South. The applicant is not looking to change improvements existing on site, but looking at road designations. The road will have to be a minimum of 26 feet wide, not including parking. Sidewalk should be provided on-site, but not necessarily adjacent to the road. The majority of these properties are large office parks, and there are a lot of parking lots in this zone, thereby ensuring that pedestrians have vehicle access. The maintenance agreement has to be provided for the private road, as well as those who own and access the private road. Ms. Jastremsky demonstrated a concept of what the applicant would like to do, and stated that the Planning Commission and Staff recommend approval.

[8:12:06 PM](#)

8.2 Councilmember Weeks asked if one of the reasons behind this proposal is because people have a hard time finding the hotel, to which Ms. Jastremsky answered affirmatively. She said the applicant believes that a private road will help customers find the hotel more easily.

[8:13:25 PM](#)

8.3 Councilmember Summerhays asked how many units are in the hotel. Ms. Jastremsky said there are 121.

[8:13:39 PM](#)

**8.4 Mayor Walker opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak, so Mayor Walker closed the public hearing.**

[8:13:55 PM](#)

**8.5 Councilmember Weeks moved to approve Ordinance #1284. Councilmember Summerhays seconded the motion.**

[8:14:16 PM](#)

**8.6 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, Vawdrey, and Weeks voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:14:29 PM](#)

**9.0 Action Item: Resolution #17-66, Approval of the Deaf Child Sign Policy**

[8:14:46 PM](#)

9.1 Glade Robbins, Public Works Director, said there has been a request to install a deaf child sign in the City. The manual on uniform traffic control devices does not contain information to allow deaf signs. It is silent on the issue because there have been studies done that these signs do not slow traffic and go unnoticed by drivers, and they give parents a false sense of security. Some publications also state that they are ineffective. However, several cities in Salt Lake County do allow deaf child signs. They prepared a policy that identifies the process and requirements to have a deaf child sign installed. They would only allow these signs on local streets. They would not be allowed on arterial or collector streets. The person requesting the sign would need to submit a letter requesting the sign. With that, they would provide documentation that the child is legally deaf, as well as a proof of residency. The sign would be installed by public works, and when the child reached 18 years of age, the sign would be removed.

[8:16:33 PM](#)

9.2 Councilmember Summerhays said there is another deaf child sign already in the City.

[8:17:00 PM](#)

9.3 Councilmember Stenquist asked what would trigger someone to review how old the child was and know when to remove the sign. Mr. Robbins said this would take place on a yearly basis, and the resident requesting the sign would have to provide proof of residency and verify the age of the deaf child. Councilmember Stenquist asked what would happen if the resident did not submit this information every year. Mr. Robbins said it would be on the GIS system and would bring up an annual alert for review. One of the cities he checked into requires the resident to purchase the sign and the City would then install the sign.

Councilmember Weeks asked how many cities do not request the resident to pay for the sign. Mr. Robbins said he only contacted two cities. One purchased the sign and the other required the resident to purchase the sign. Salt Lake County has a policy, but they make no mention of the resident buying the sign.

[8:19:40 PM](#)

**9.4 Councilmember Weeks moved to approve Resolution #17-66. Councilmember Vawdrey seconded the motion.**

[8:20:23 PM](#)

**9.5 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, Vawdrey, and Weeks voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:20:45 PM](#)

**10.0 Action Item: Resolution #17-64, Annexing Hidden Canyon Estates Phase 2 into the Traverse Ridge Special Service District**

[8:20:52 PM](#)

10.1 Mr. Fox said this item was previously reviewed by the Council twice. He explained the development agreement was to have the Hidden Canyon estates annexed into the TRSSD. This action complies with State code and meets all requirements in fulfillment of the development agreement. An aerial map of the subject property was then presented to the Council for review.

[8:21:56 PM](#)

10.2 Councilmember Summerhays asked if they pay impact fees on Hidden Canyon, to which Mr. Fox responded in the affirmative.

[8:22:20 PM](#)

**10.3 Councilmember Rappleye moved to approve Resolution #17-64. Councilmember Summerhays seconded the motion.**

[8:22:41 PM](#)

10.4 Councilmember Stenquist said he believed adding more residences into the TRSSD was a positive action, because it will help spread out costs.

[8:23:06 PM](#)

**10.5 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, Vawdrey, and Weeks voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:23:22 PM](#)

**11.0 Public Hearing: Resolution #17-65, Amending the Fiscal Year 2017-18 General Fund Budget**

[8:23:40 PM](#)

11.1 Bob Wylie, Finance Director, reviewed the budget amendments as follows:

• **FY18-10 Master Transportation Plan**

- Engineering is preparing to update the Transportation Master Plan. It is anticipated that the process would be completed within a year. Staff is requesting funding to begin the process. Funding for this project will come from the General Fund Balance appropriation. The Amount of the requested budget amendment is \$100,000.

• **FY18-11 Water Dept. Hydro Excavator**

- The Water Department is requesting funding to purchase a Hydro-excavator. This piece of equipment will enable the Water Department to excavate holes and trenches more efficiently. Funding for this project will come from Water Fund, Fund Balance Appropriation. The amount of the requested budget amendment is \$490,000

•FY18-12 **13800 South Storm Drain**

- In the current FY2018 CIP budget, the 13800 South Storm drain project (CIP0099) has an approved budget of \$429,342. In order to get the improvements in place, survey work, right of way acquisition, and widening of the culvert over the canal need to be started, staff is requesting additional funding of \$510,000. The city has received \$240,000 from UDOT for this project and will receive \$270,000 from a development agreement to go towards this project. Total Storm Water portion of the project is \$939,342.
  - Storm Water Fund Balance\$240,000
  - Development Agreement\$270,000
  - Amount of the requested budget amendment is \$510,000

•FY18-13 **Fort Street Storm Water**

- Staff would like to begin work on storm water projects along Fort Street. Currently in the budget, there are two CIP projects funded for the repairs (CIP107 and CIP110) for \$26,000. Staff received one bid for these repairs and the bid was over the budgeted amount. Staff is requesting to combine the two projects and ask for \$25,000 additional budget. The total estimated for the repairs would be \$51,000. Funding source for the requested item will come from the Storm Water Fund Balance Appropriation.

•FY18-14 **Lone Peak Parkway ROW**

- The Lone Peak Parkway Right of Way (CIP0090) project currently has an approved budget of \$1,951,831. Staff is requesting an additional \$1,400,000 to be re-appropriated from the Suncrest Drive Rehabilitation project (CIP0027). This would give the Lone Peak Parkway ROW project a budgeted total of \$3,351,831. Staff will also change the name of this project to Lone Peak Parkway Extension Phase II. Funding for this project will come from CIP0027.
  - Suncrest Rehabilitation (CIP0027) <\$1,400,000>
  - Lone Peak Parkway Extension Phase II \$1,400,000

-0-

8:27:19 PM

11.2 Councilmember Rappleye said the hydro excavator is like a scalpel when they are trying to open a trench. He asked if it is saving potential damage to other lines or debris that could be in a trench. Mr. Robbins said that is correct. Councilmember Rappleye asked about the longevity of that type of system. Mr. Robbins said the City should get 10 to 15 years out of it, and noted that the machine will be used two or three times to week. Mr. Robbins noted these machines are very difficult to rent.

Councilmember Rappleye asked if since they are taking funds from one project to another, the funds are surplus and therefore not hampering other projects. Mr. Wylie answered affirmatively.

8:29:07 PM

11.3 Councilmember Stenquist asked if there are restrictions on the funds appropriated or how they can be used. Mr. Wylie said there would be no restrictions to prohibit this action.

[8:29:40 PM](#)

11.4 Councilmember Weeks requested to review the map; after subsequent discussion, Mr. Robbins identified the canal crossing over the Jordan River.

Councilmember Stenquist said this will be a really nice road connection.

Councilmember Weeks asked if there will be a big road in front of the residences. She asked if these particular residents have been complaining about the construction. Mr. Robbins said this proposal follows the Rocky Mountain Power corridor where the big power lines are located.

Councilmember Stenquist said this connector road will basically be a major thoroughfare that will connect from the prison property all the way to the north. It will be an alternative to I-15 and serve as a large arterial road.

Councilmember Weeks asked if they are now voting on the road connection. Mr. Robbins said this item pertained to the transfer of funds from Suncrest down to this project.

[8:31:41 PM](#)

11.5 Mayor Walker said it is worth noting that the City thought the Suncrest reconstruction was going to be a lot more than it turned out to be. This is all State money the City received, and he felt this was an outstanding use of those funds.

[8:32:25 PM](#)

**11.6 Mayor Walker opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak, so Mayor Walker closed the public hearing.**

[8:32:43 PM](#)

**11.7 Councilmember Rappleye moved to approve Resolution #17-65. Councilmember Summerhays seconded the motion.**

[8:33:16 PM](#)

**11.8 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, Vawdrey, and Weeks voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:33:33 PM](#)

**12.0 Adjournment**

[8:33:35 PM](#)

**12.1 Councilmember Rappleye moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Summerhays seconded the motion.**

[8:33:38 PM](#)

**12.2 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Rappleye, Stenquist, Summerhays, Vawdrey, and Weeks voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

12.3 The meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.