

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

August 26, 2025

Mayor Carla Merrill called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

A. Roll Call

Mayor Carla Merrill

The following were present at the anchor location, which constituted a quorum: Brent Rummler, Jessica Smuin, Kelli Law, Chrissy Hannemann, and Jason Thelin.

Staff: Shane Sorensen, Ryan Robinson, Steve Doxey, Chief Brian Gwilliam, Chief Brian Patten, DeAnn Parry

Others: Ed Bush, Maureen Bush, Doug Barton, Robin Barton, Sheryl Dame, Rebekah Schmidt, Rachel Schmidt, Delin Wareham, Andrew Young, Amanda Collins, Steve Burrows, Brant Bishop, Bekah Baird, Rachel Fitzgerald, Jennifer Wadsworth, Will Jones, Gil Greer, Sarah Blackwell, Susanne Peterson, Carwin Peterson, Greg Smith

B. Prayer

Kelli Law

C. Pledge

Brent Rummler

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of Minutes for the August 5 City Council meeting

B. Approval to Declare Equipment as Surplus

C. Award Bid for 24" and 12" Double Eccentric Butterfly Valves up to \$81,000

D. Resolution R2025-19: Approval of Interlocal Agreement Between Alpine City and Highland City for the 4800 West/Canyon Crest Road Improvements

E. Award Bid – ONYX Sealcoat Project, Morgan Asphalt: \$60,300

F. Award Bid – HA5 Mineral Bond Project, Holbrook Asphalt: \$157,882.64

Shane Sorensen explained Item C, butterfly valves. These expensive valves are for the Canyon Crest Road improvement project and require about six months to receive. Our engineer has reached out to various suppliers to get bids. We have received one bid for \$81,000 but are still waiting for the others. Staff proposed that the City Council approve the expense of up to \$81,000 for the valves, and once the bids are received staff can award the purchase and move the project forward.

Motion: Kelli Law moved to approve the Consent Calendar as proposed, with Item C, butterfly valves, having a limit of \$81,000. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes

Jason Thelin

Chrissy Hannemann

Kelli Law

Jessica Smuin

Brent Rummler

No

Excused

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments given at this time. The mayor asked residents who wished to speak about the proposed Lambert Park turnaround to wait until that agenda item.

IV. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

A. Financial Report

Shane Sorensen reported on expenses for July in the new budget year and said that the city has many projects currently in progress. We had a good month with sales tax, at 105 percent of budgeted revenue. Our Finance Director, Dave Sanderson, is preparing to finalize the last fiscal year, and we will have our annual audit during the first week of September.

1. Presentation of Citizen's Budget

Ryan Robinson explained that the Citizen's Finance Committee wanted a concise document so residents can understand where their tax dollars are spent. Ryan presented a draft to the council for feedback. The last page still has numbers from 2023, but we will have the new census results in the middle of September. Ryan invited the council to send him comments or suggestions.

Chrissy Hannemann talked about the distribution of the report. There will be a QR code at city meetings, an insert in the September newsletter, and printed copies will be available at City Hall and at the AYC Meet the Candidates Night. The committee will also submit occasional articles for the *Newsline* to share more details.

Chrissy commented that the Supreme Court changed the way sales tax is collected for online purchases, and this benefits our city by more than \$1 million.

Mayor Carla Merrill agreed that the sales tax from online spending really helps us.

V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Resolution R2025-21 Canvass of Primary Election Results

City Recorder, DeAnn Parry, reported that the Primary Election by mail was held on August 12, and the ballots were processed by Utah County. We received the canvassed results from them this afternoon. The City Council, acting as the Board of Canvassers, must now certify these results. Council members were given printed copies of the election returns by precinct and the canvass statistics which were provided by the County.

Motion: Brent Rummmler moved that the Alpine City Council acting as the Board of Canvassers, approve the Election Canvass Returns to certify the 2025 Primary Election results, and to declare Sarah Blackwell, Jennifer Wadsworth, Andrew Young, and Troy Slade as winners of the Primary Election. Kelli Law seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes

Jason Thelin
Chrissy Hannemann
Kelli Law
Jessica Smuin
Brent Rummmler

No

Excused

After the resolution passed, the mayor and council members were asked to sign the Canvass Report.

B. Approval of Guest House – Newell Whitney

A proposal has been submitted to construct a guest house on the property located at 747 W. Ranch Circle. The property, owned by Newell Whitney, is just over five acres in size. The proposed guest house would be located over 120 feet from the main dwelling, more than 200 feet from the rear property line, with side yard setbacks of 40 feet on the west side and over 216 feet on the east side. These setbacks exceed the minimum requirements established in the Alpine Development Code for a guest house.

The property is within the CR-40,000 zone, where guest houses are permitted through a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Additional requirements and review criteria for such uses are outlined in Section 3.23.060 of the Alpine Development Code.

City staff have reviewed the application under the standards in Section 3.23 and found that the proposal complies with all applicable requirements. Because guest houses are a Conditional Use in this zone, the city may impose additional conditions to mitigate any potential detrimental effects of the proposed use.

If the City Council approves this application, city staff and the Building Department will conduct further review for compliance with setbacks, building height, and all applicable building code requirements during the building permit process.

The Planning Commission reviewed this item during their July 29th meeting. It was mentioned that if the proposal is approved, the property owner would also be required to purchase and submit one half-acre credit of water to the city, as well as pay applicable fees during the building permit process.

Questions from the Planning Commission addressed rules for guest houses, including owner-occupancy requirements, use by a single family, prohibition of commercial use, and restrictions on rentals shorter than 30 days (while allowing long-term rentals). No public comment was given, and no opposition was offered. The wooded location was seen as adequately maintaining privacy and buffering. With no detrimental impacts identified, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposal.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS (CUP)

A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) allows specific land uses listed in each zone that, because of their unique nature, may require additional review and conditions to address potential impacts. Typical impacts may include increased traffic, noise, or environmental concerns. Under Utah Code § 10-9a-507, a CUP must be approved if reasonable conditions can mitigate any anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use.

CITY CODE REFERENCE

- Alpine Development Code 3.04.030 – Conditional Uses
- Alpine Development Code 3.23 – Conditional Uses

NOTICING

A public hearing is not required by State or city code for this item by the Planning Commission or City Council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information provided by the applicant and the review conducted, staff finds that the proposal meets the applicable standards in the Alpine Development Code. Staff will also coordinate with the applicant regarding hookup fees, which are typically collected during the building permit process. Additionally, the City Recorder is working with the applicant to secure the necessary water credit for the guest house. This must be completed before a building permit is issued.

If the City Council identifies any potential detrimental impacts, it may impose reasonable conditions to mitigate those impacts. Note that Alpine City Code already prohibits:

- More than one family residing in the guest house
- Use of the guest house as a short-term rental
- Any commercial use

These prohibitions are automatically enforced and do not need to be added as separate conditions.

The council discussed the following:

- Short-term rentals are currently prohibited by Alpine City code. If this changes in the future the council will need to decide if they will treat all short-term rentals in the same way.
- Parking can be a concern with guest houses, but this home already has a large driveway and sufficient space for off-street parking.
- Chrissy Hannemann visited the property and reported that it is very secluded. The guest home should not cause any problems for the neighbors.

Motion: Kelli Law moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a guest house located at 747 W. Ranch Circle as proposed. Brent Rummmler seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes

Jason Thelin
Chrissy Hannemann
Kelli Law
Jessica Smuin
Brent Rummmler

No

Excused

C. Resolution R2025-20: Approval of Bookmobile Agreement

Ryan Robinson said Alpine City has contracted with Utah County for many years to provide library services through the Bookmobile. As outlined in the agreement, the Bookmobile will stop in Alpine on Tuesdays, every other week (24 times per year) at the following locations:

- River Meadows Senior Living, 10:15-12:00 (1.75 hours) for a total of 42 hours.
- Creekside Park, 12:30-2:30 (2 hours) for a total of 48 hours.
- 100 North Main, LDS Chapel, 3:00-5:00 (2 hours) for a total of 48 hours

This service is provided at a cost of \$13,596, and these funds were included in the FY2026 budget.

The Utah State Library Rural Services Manager, Jami Munk Carter, sent details to the council. She would be happy to come to a meeting if they would like to ask questions.

How many registered patrons have a library card from Alpine?	340 Alpine households have library accounts <i>Note: A single library account often represents a household. Some library accounts represent one person.</i>
How many patrons check out regular books?	139 Alpine accounts checked out 24,544 items (books, audiobooks, DVDs) in 3 years (July 2022 - June 2025)
How many patrons use e-books with their bookmobile card?	2,656 Utah County Bookmobile accounts have entered their library card in Overdrive to check out electronic items. <i>Note: This data includes all accounts from Utah County's Bookmobile Branch. This data cannot be narrowed by stop or specific area.</i>
Have these numbers increased, stayed the same, or declined in past years?	Bookmobile usage in Alpine remains steady. 7970 = CIRCULATION IN FY25 8181 = CIRCULATION AVERAGE OVER 3 YEARS The Alpine community continues to grow & use the bookmobile. This year, new bookmobile accounts in Alpine outpaced the average new accounts. 60 = NEW BOOKMOBILE ACCOUNTS created in FY25 52 = NEW BOOKMOBILE ACCOUNTS is the 3-year average.

How many people go to the Creekside Park and North Main locations?	Alpine area activity is combined by City in our data collection system. This data point would need to be collected manually by the bookmobile librarian/driver.
Are most patrons at River Meadows Senior Living?	Activity and account data are not identifiable in these parameters. This data point would need to be collected manually by the bookmobile librarian/driver.
How many people, on average, come to the bookmobile per day while in Alpine?	We do not have visit count data for Alpine specific visits on the bookmobile. This data may be helpful in picturing regular bookmobile use. In FY25 (July 2024 - June 2025) Alpine residents who visited the bookmobile checked out an average of 111 items each. <i>Note: Automation to count bookmobile visits by area may be available in future.</i>
Have any additional services been added over the past year?	The Utah County Bookmobile branch is expanding its collection from roughly 23,500 to more than 95,000 items! This massive increase will happen with the launch of a sharing program between bookmobiles. Keep an eye out for this change, expected to start in late 2025. In addition to books, movies, and audiobooks in the collection, bookmobile services include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to Utah's Online Library featuring many databases for homework help, in-depth research, genealogy, newspapers, and much more. • Free access to Libby – thousands of e-books, audiobooks, and magazines with our membership Utah's Beehive Library Consortium. • Free interlibrary loan services • Librarian reference assistance every day of the week. • Free access to Book Buzz – book sets for book groups • An expansive Large Print collection in cooperation with the State Library's program for the Blind and Disabled. • Reading challenges to encourage literacy • Public internet access on the truck, including printing.

Ryan Robinson said that this is the same Bookmobile contract as last year, including the cost.

Chrissy Hannemann said that the last part of the agreement addressed expanded services but did not increase the cost, which is unusual.

Motion: Brent Rummmler moved to approve Resolution R2025-20, including an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with Utah County for library services. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes

Jason Thelin
Chrissy Hannemann
Kelli Law
Jessica Smuin
Brent Rummmler

No

Excused

D. Ordinance 2025-10: Pool Structure Amendments

Ryan Robinson said that the current city code regulating accessory structures was written primarily with sheds and similar outbuildings in mind. As a result, other types of structures—including those related to swimming pools—are held to the same standards. This has created challenges when reviewing pool-related facilities, as they do not always align well with the existing code.

The proposed amendment introduces new standards specifically tailored to the variety of structures commonly associated with swimming pools.

The Planning Commission reviewed this item at their July 1st meeting and held a public hearing. After considering which facilities are typically associated with pools, the commission recommended removing pool equipment storage structures from the new standards. They felt that these facilities are generally similar to sheds and can continue to be regulated under the existing accessory structure requirements for setbacks and height.

The City Council first reviewed this item at their July 8th meeting. At that time, it was tabled so staff could make the following revisions to the proposed code amendment:

- Under the heading Swimming Pools and Related Facilities, add the wording: “All swimming pools and related facilities require a building permit.”
- Draft an amendment to allow limited exceptions to the height requirement for pool-related facilities when attached to an existing home. These exceptions would require City Council approval.

In that meeting the council also said that pool equipment sheds differ from typical sheds because of potential mechanical noise levels and wanted to include them in the code adjustment.

These revisions have been incorporated, and a draft version was included in the packet for council review.

ALPINE CITY CODE:

- Alpine Development Code 3.02.050
- Alpine Development Code 3.03.050
- Alpine Development Code 3.04.050
- Alpine Development Code 3.05.050
- Alpine Development Code 3.06.040

GENERAL PLAN:

- N/A

PUBLIC NOTICE:

This item has been noticed for a public hearing as required by city and State requirements. A public hearing was held as part of this review by the Planning Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Because this is a legislative decision the standards for approval or denial are that the proposed application should be compatible with the standards found in the General Plan as well as the current city code and policies. A decision for approval or denial should be based on those criteria.

The council and staff discussed the following:

- Code and setbacks: The current shed code requires measuring from the foundation, which for a pool slide would be the slide supports. The new language will require measuring from the nearest edge of the structure to the property line. The setback for a 10-foot pool structure would be 10 feet. For a 20-foot structure the setback would be 15 feet.
- Landscape screening: This is not addressed in the code additions. If the city required planting greenery as part of the pool structure installation, it would be difficult to determine the type of plants, enforce these requirements, and respond if foliage died or if a new owner wanted to trim or remove them in the future. Neighbors are always welcome to plant their own bushes or trees to create a visual barrier.

- Privacy: Slides and diving platforms are not designed for lingering, as with a deck, but are used to access the pool.
- Measuring from grade: Fill dirt changes the natural grade, and although a pool is usually installed at the lowest point, owners may wish to construct a slide on a slope to make it higher. Some yards have tiered pools, so measuring from the pool deck could also be complicated. The natural grade is likely the best standard for measurement. If there are two pool structures, the natural grade would be the standard used to measure each structure.

Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to approve Ordinance 2025-10 amending relevant sections of the Alpine City Code to establish specific setback requirements for pool-related structures, with the change that Item V. shall read, “The height of any pool-related facility shall be measured from the average natural grade, as established by a survey, adjacent to the single separate facility.” Kelli Law seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes

Jason Thelin
Chrissy Hannemann
Kelli Law
Jessica Smuin
Brent Rummmler

No

Excused

E. Approval to Construct a Box Elder Way Turnaround in Lambert Park

Ryan Robinson said that as part of FY2026 budget projects, council members Jason Thelin and Jessica Smuin have requested the construction of a turnaround area at the west end of Box Elder Way, located within Lambert Park. This turnaround would be similar to the one built at the east end of Moyle Drive, also located in Lambert Park. The goal of the turnaround is to provide additional parking, complete the current stub road, create a safe area for vehicles to turn around, and prevent vehicles from continuing onto the emergency access road. It would also provide additional parking space for visitors wishing to enjoy the park features like the poppy fields.

The proposed turnaround area may be surfaced with either asphalt (preferred) or gravel and would accommodate approximately eleven (11) parking spaces. Existing flexible bollards would be relocated to the end of the new cul-de-sac to discourage non-emergency vehicle access through the park. If the turnaround surface is asphalt, snow would be removed from it in the winter. If the surface is gravel, snowplow drivers would continue to plow through this area rather than attempting to plow the entire turnaround.

The design criteria for roads are outlined in *Alpine Development Code 4.07.090 – Road Grades*. Specifically, the slope leading to a negative grade cul-de-sac should not exceed 4 percent. The existing grade on Box Elder Way is 10.94 percent. This is a field condition that cannot be changed. In addition, negative grade cul-de-sacs should not exceed 3 percent grade for the last 100 feet of the traveled surface. The gravel road through Lambert Park has a grade of approximately 10 percent. With the grades on either side of the proposed turnaround being greater than or equal to 10 percent, a turnaround with a 3 percent grade for the last 100 feet of travelled surface becomes impractical. The depth of fill would increase, which would also increase the footprint of the project to tie into the existing gravel road on the downhill side, since the slope is flowing away from the turnaround to the west. Also, the grade of the road connection between the turnaround and the gravel road increases as the fill depth increases.

Former city engineer, Jed Muhlestein, prepared a plan to try to “meet in the middle” based on the characteristics of the site. His design included a 6 percent grade through the turnaround area, which resulted in a 13.02 percent grade transitioning back to the existing gravel road. Alpine Development Code 4.07.090 (2) requires roads with a grade over 10 percent to be approved by the Fire Marshal. The grade through the turnaround, which exceeds the 3 percent maximum, could be addressed by the City

Council granting an exception to that requirement. The road grade exceeding 10 percent would need to be approved by the Fire Marshal.

Title 4.01 Scope of Ordinances, Variances, and Exemptions specifies in section 4.01.020 *Exceptions from Design and Improvement Standards* that the designated land use authority (City Council as designated in DCA 4.04.110 Designation of Land Use Authority) may grant an exception when the best interest of the city would not be served by the literal enforcement of the design or improvement standards in the ordinance. The recommended exception shall be based on generally accepted planning and engineering design principles.

According to *Alpine Development Code 3.16.040*, any material changes (*A material change shall include, but is not limited to, a change to the park's present and essential defining characteristics, creation of or improvement of roadways or parking lots within the park*) to city-owned property requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission prior to City Council consideration. For a material change, a super majority vote of the City Council (4 positive votes out of 5 City Council members are required). If a paved road is desired, the requirements from the Conservation Easement and Management Plan must also be considered.

In September of 2023, the Alpine City Council approved a Conservation Easement and Management Plan regarding Lambert Park. In the Management Plan, a unanimous vote of all members of the City Council is required to allow the addition of a paved parking area. If the parking area is not paved, Alpine Development Code 3.16.040 requires four (4) positive votes from the City Council to approve a material change to city property.

Two trails will be impacted by the proposed turnaround addition, including Judy's Trail which is roughly thirty (30) feet from the existing end of Box Elder Way, and the Lambert Luge trail which is roughly two hundred (200) feet from the end of Box Elder Way. These trails will only be impacted where they cross the emergency access road. Due to the depth of the fill for the turnaround, Judy's Trail will require the most significant changes to make it walkable.

Fire Chief Review:

Chief Brian Patton has provided the following feedback as part of this review: *I'm good with the turnaround as long as it is built to city specs or the council-approved exception, not to exceed 10 percent. We also need to pay attention to the approach angle, departure angle, and most importantly, the breakover angle for our longer apparatus.*

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this request during their July 29th meeting. The discussion centered on compliance with city code, slope requirements, and the potential impact on the Conservation Easement. Commissioners noted that the proposed grade exceeds ordinance limits and that the Planning Commission lacks authority to grant exceptions. A new section of the code gives the City Council the ability to grant an exception, as referenced previously.

Several commission members expressed discomfort with paving in the park, the loss or alteration of walking trails, and the lack of detailed design elements such as retaining walls and trail integration.

During the Public Comment portion one resident said that the city should seek door-to-door neighbor input. Residents also spoke about potential impacts to trail access, vegetation loss, and increased use by non-residents. Some questioned the necessity of the parking area's location and purpose, suggesting it may serve as more of a visual road terminus than a functional amenity. Skepticism was also expressed about whether the benefits of the turnaround outweighed the potential disruption to the park's character. Ultimately, the Planning Commission recommended denial, citing noncompliance with ordinance requirements, impacts on the park, and the lack of a clear basis for slope exceptions.

CITY CODE REFERENCE

- Alpine Development Code 4.07.090 – Road Grades.
- Title 4.01 Scope of Ordinances, Variances, and Exemptions

NOTICING

This agenda item has been properly noticed in accordance with State and city code requirements. A public hearing was held as part of the Planning Commission's review process.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

This is an administrative action that applies existing regulations concerning material changes to city-owned property.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that residents have reached out and would like to speak on this issue. She was not planning on entertaining public comments but will allow several individuals to address the council for three minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS***Andrew Young – 490 South, Alpine***

Andrew referred to the map included in the packet and said that the slopes are too steep. This proposal breaks the Alpine code requirement of no more than 4 percent, as these slopes would be at 11 percent, 6 percent, and 13 percent, which is dangerous. The real problem is that this 250-foot road is fracturing two neighborhoods. Andrew spoke with groups on both ends of the road, and the neighbors on the south want to keep Lambert Park trails untouched, have light traffic, and enjoy peace. Residents in the north section want fire safety, traffic diversion, and less noise. Andrew asked that the council allow more time to find a better solution.

Amanda Collins – Rosanna Lane, Alpine

Amanda said that the mayor and City Council are very aware of the need to prioritize the spending of tax dollars. The mayor has not received any complaints about cars turning around in the road at the proposed location and Amanda has not heard any complaints either. The City Council should represent all the residents of the city, and there are many more important priorities. This proposal seems to serve the personal interest of protecting council members' own streets instead of representing the city as a whole. Amanda would like to hear from the Fire Chief about the department's willingness to use this access road in emergencies. Judy's Trail is relatively new and is very popular for walking. This proposal would disrupt Judy's Trail. The existing parking lot at Moyle Drive rarely has more than one or two cars parked in it, so it likely was not a prudent way to use taxpayer money. Amanda would like to know what this proposal is trying to solve because the residents who live by the park do not see a problem that needs to be fixed.

Delin Wareham – Bayberry Circle, Alpine

Delin expressed concern over what could happen during poppy season. Will visitors park where they are supposed to? What if they block the road? If there is a fire, the cars in the lot could prevent egress for residents who are fleeing, or fire trucks that are coming in. Delin urged the council to remember what the Conservation Easement aims to do, which is to protect, preserve, and maintain the property predominately in a natural, scenic, and open condition. A parking lot accomplishes none of those and is not needed. The lot at the end of Moyle Drive is sufficient. Delin walks and rides in this area all the time, and there are only a few cars in the existing lot at any given time. Money would be better spent on a traffic study for Grove Drive, where the current traffic flow is more than the road was designed to handle. This road is neglected, overcrowded, and dangerous to bikers and pedestrians. A traffic study, or the re-paving of Grove Drive, would be a better use of funds. She urged the council to vote no.

Brant Bishop – Box Elder Way, Alpine

Brant has analyzed the proposal and has three overall reactions: 1) It looks like a solution in search of a problem, 2) It is a solution that does not solve the problem that is articulated, and 3) This solution requires deviation from other stated objectives and goals of the city. Regarding traffic volume and safety issues, residents never see more than few cars a day, and Brant does not mind when visitors use his driveway to turn around. Even during poppy season there are only a few people in this area. Typically, they park on the public street, which is legal. Brant does not see how this lot would help deter traffic from entering Lambert Park. The current bollards would just be moved 50-100 feet, and moving the turnaround location

does not actually change anything. In contrast, this proposal requires deviation from city slope standards, intrudes into Lambert Park, and spends money to solve a problem that does not exist.

The council, staff, Fire Chief Brian Patten and Police Chief Brian Gwilliam discussed various issues.

- Cost: The estimated cost is around \$180,000 for a paved lot and turnaround. An unpaved option would be cheaper.
- Removing the bollards: It takes about 30-45 minutes to remove the bollards when there are road or utility projects that necessitate additional access.
- Emergency access:
Chief Gwilliam said that the bollards can cause damage to vehicles, so it is easier for the police to drive on the paved roads. They would use the emergency road only if Grove Drive or Box Elder Way were shut down.

Chief Patten said they typically do not use the emergency road for access because they must slow down for the steep grade, which makes it no faster than using the paved roads. Also, the bollards tear up the bottom of the engines and they do not want to break lights or other fixtures. Large apparatus, like an 82,000 lb. fire truck, require at least 20 feet of drivable surface, so the actual road would need to be made wider. The Chief said that it is always best to bring fire trucks in from two directions and to access hydrants from each side. If there were a fire on N. Grove Drive, the fire department would use the emergency access road. However, residents evacuating while emergency trucks are entering could be a problem. The number one use for the road is emergency egress for residents. He thinks that the current situation would work for the fire department in an emergency.

The Chief further explained that the Uniform Fire Code (UFC) limit to a 10 percent slope is especially important for aerial apparatus (ladder trucks). Anything over a 10 percent grade really hinders the use of these trucks and creates problems where roads meet and the back of the truck may drag and cause damage to pipes and drains. Steep angles are very difficult for the large apparatus.

Mayor Merrill asked Jason Thelin to address the safety issues that were mentioned in connection with the proposal.

Jason Thelin said that he wanted this project on the budget, but the parking lot is not the reason for the proposal. The parking lot is on the agenda because a parking lot was created on the south end, and it worked out well. Jason is considering the city ordinances, and we do not want to perpetuate a stub street or a dead end. Jason said that city code defines a stub street as "...a street or road extending from within a subdivision boundary and terminating with no permanent vehicular turnaround." This road meets that definition. In Development Code 4.7.040 (3d) it says that "Any such stub street having a length of more than 150 feet or providing primary vehicular access to one (1) or more lots shall be terminated by an improved temporary turn-around designed and constructed in accordance with the City Standards." If this road is not considered a stub street, then it is a dead end without daily public use, which would require a cul-de-sac by our code. Jason's priority is to finish the road with a turnaround, and have it delineated as not being a through-road. A T-shape or hammerhead would still allow for a turnaround but would not encroach as much into the park. The council needs to determine what the requirements are based on code and what the best solution would be.

The council discussed whether or not this could be considered a stub road because it abuts public property and does not actually end. Instead, the road shifts in purpose but continues on. Similar roads such as Ranch Drive, Lakeview Drive, and Three Falls Drive were mentioned.

Brent Rummler commented that residents think a new parking lot might generate more traffic in the area. Also, Grove Drive bisects Lambert Park and the two trails. He wondered how a parking lot would address safety.

Jason Thelin said he did not think a parking area would increase traffic. There are not a lot of people up there, perhaps three cars per day. The lot might be used during poppy season, but parking is not the number one issue.

Jessica Smuin said she has been studying the issue and meeting with residents, and she appreciates our residents being part of the process. The consensus is that parking is not a current problem. She remembers that when the lower improvement was installed the council discussed finishing off both the stub streets. Now we are at the point where the council has approved a budget to finish the project. Jessica thinks that this is a stub street and requires a turnaround, and the city can look at a hammerhead or other options that are less expensive. Jessica said that as we speak with residents, examine the slope, and talk with our public works staff, we can find ways to finish this project, meet the residents' needs and also follow our code.

Mayor Carla Merrill said she does not remember discussing the need to finish the upper end of the road. If the city embarks on a project that will take significant funds, it should address an issue, whether it is safety, traffic, or parking. This is not finishing off a project but is a brand-new project. As Brent Rummler and Chrissy Hannemann expressed, this is a public paved road which becomes a public dirt road and transitions into a public paved road again, so it is not a stub street. The current road is adequate for emergency egress. If residents feel they need a turnaround, we can look at the options.

Chrissy Hannemann shared an example of a true stub street, which is Frontier Road off Ranch Drive. Frontier Road ends at the border of the Westfield Elementary fields and will never continue. The city worked with the residents to exchange land so they could create a turnaround there and have a permanent solution. Turnarounds are required for safety at the end of a street, but this proposal is not needed for safety because vehicles can still drive through in an emergency. The scope of this solution is beyond what Chrissy envisioned when it was added to the budget, and there are negative implications. One of the recommendations from the Planning Commission was to do a site visit, so she went to the area. It is not easy to see on a map, but the topography really limits the options.

Brent Rummler commented that a line item in the budget does not constitute final approval, as there are still required steps to be taken (details, cost assessments, public hearings). The council approved the overall budget unanimously but not an ultimate plan for this street. The Conservation Easement was put in place to preserve the space in Lambert Park, and this proposal does not seem to be addressing safety or traffic flow.

Kelli Law thanked the residents who attended tonight's meeting and said he appreciated their generally polite behavior. Sometimes the council puts something in the budget and then we have a situation like this where there is a debate. Amanda Collins asked a fair question about whether this was a good use of taxpayer funds. It seems that a lot of land work would be required. Andrew Young pointed out the 13 percent grade, and Delin mentioned the importance of preserving the park in a natural, scenic, and open condition. Brant inquired if this proposal deviated from the other stated objectives of the city. There is also the disruption of the two trails to consider. Perhaps there is a solution that allows a less-intrusive turnaround and does not increase the grade. Maybe we can revisit this issue.

Jessica Smuin asked if we could address the grade, have minimal impact on vegetation, and also meet city code, would we be interested in exploring what it would cost?

Kelli Law said he would be interested in looking at other options, especially if it would not disrupt Judy's Trail, which was built with donated funds.

Mayor Carla Merrill reiterated that the official acceptance of the budget does not mean that specific projects are approved. She was not in favor of the south parking area previously, but the council voted to approve it. The council must evaluate each project to see if it is a prudent use of taxpayer dollars. The spirit of the Conservation Easement is to leave the park in its most natural state.

Chrissy Hannemann commented that if it does not benefit the park, improve access, or enhance safety, it is not a need.

Jason Thelin said that this project is part of finishing off the city. When there were no sidewalks in the Main Street area the residents did not feel the need for them, but the installation turned out to be a good thing. The city received a number of emails about this proposal, most of which mentioned the Conservation Easement and the desire to leave Lambert Park in its natural state. Jason would be in favor of making a motion to table this and bring back a proposal with lower impact.

Chrissy Hanneman said she would instead like to deny the proposal, which would allow the council to follow the entire process, with public hearings and all other required steps.

Motion: Brent Rummmler moved to deny the proposed turnaround at the west end of Box Elder Way and Lambert Park because it does not meet the requirements of the Alpine Development Code, as well as the Conservation Easement and Management Plan for Lambert Park. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion.

Jessica Smuin asked if Brent were willing to remove the phrase, "... it does not meet the requirements of the Alpine Development Code."

Brent asked for a staff or legal opinion.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that because the road would be at a 13 percent grade and current code requires 10 percent, it does not meet the requirements without receiving an exception. Brent Rummmler did not want to alter his motion.

The council voted, and there were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion to deny passed unanimously.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Jason Thelin		
Chrissy Hannemann		
Kelli Law		
Jessica Smuin		
Brent Rummmler		

V. STAFF REPORTS

The first portion of the Staff Reports was devoted to a lengthy discussion of the traffic issues at Mountainville Academy (MVA).

Mayor Carla Merrill asked Police Chief Brian Gwilliam for a report on the traffic situation on Main Street and at the roundabout since the school year began.

Chief Brian Gwilliam said that he has assigned extra officers to help educate drivers. The problems with the traffic in front of the school will continue until we can divert more vehicles off Main Street. Physically directing the traffic is just a band-aid, and it is not safe to have school personnel stepping into traffic to guide the cars. The police have limited officers that can deal with this situation because emergency calls must take priority. The Chief said it would be good to have representatives from the city, the police, and the Academy meet together to create a plan.

The City Council and Chief Gwilliam discussed the following details:

- A median on Main Street would help eliminate left-hand turns and require traffic to move along. A temporary median could be installed to test the effectiveness.

- Having two routes of egress would help move traffic off Main Street, but sending traffic through the neighborhoods would create new problems. The city owns the parcel on 100 South that would be required for a second egress. There are options as to how this land could be used in connection with the proposed new school building.
- Kindergarten drop-offs typically take longer than for older children. Two separate queues might help traffic flow.
- Alpine residents often do not see nor stop for pedestrians or cyclists trying to cross the street. We need to make a concerted effort to educate them on the requirement to stop. The Walk to School Day in October could provide a good opportunity to highlight walking and pedestrian safety.
- It would be helpful to have Chief Gwilliam talk with the MA administration about traffic laws, and to have them send out reminders to the parents.
- The MA traffic study suggested a traffic light, which is not a popular solution.
- Staggering starting times for the three schools that send traffic through the roundabout could alleviate some of the backup there.
- The official review of MA's proposal for a STEM building will determine whether they meet the State and city codes. We need to look carefully at any requests for exceptions. The city can regulate for safety, and the best practice is to follow what a professional study recommends. Ryan Robinson sent MA a memo about a month ago asking for their justification for the exceptions they are requesting.
- Bulk and massing standards do not allow the city to count portables in their calculations. There was also a question about MA's parking situation and whether it is sufficient for their current enrollment.

Shane Sorensen summarized that we have an existing traffic problem at MVA and we have received a proposal for their new STEM building. A traffic study was submitted with that proposal. Staff wanted a third-party review, which is in progress. The Main Street study is also applicable but is not complete at this time. We hope to identify some good recommendations as we consider all the facets of this application. The council will look at State and city ordinances and have an opportunity to make decisions related to this proposal.

Shane Sorensen - On a separate topic, Shane reported that the House passed a bill that allows the Division of Drinking Water to charge cities a fee based on how much culinary water goes through their system and is delivered to residents. Because Federal funding is being cut, this is their revenue solution. It is not a large expense, probably around \$0.03 per 1,000 gallons. Based on our 2024 usage, Alpine's fee would be about \$8,780. The State is working through the process which includes public input, and Shane will attend a meeting about this tomorrow.

Mayor Carla Merrill said that it looks like we would be penalized for the usage of homes above 5,000 feet in elevation because they need to water with culinary. Most of the new development in Alpine right now is above that elevation.

Chrissy Hannemann said that Alpine has a unique situation where we do not receive water from other sources, but we supply our own. She wondered if that would lower our required fees.

Shane responded that the EPA has many requirements for water systems and has given states the option to oversee those programs. Our State divisions can work with cities better than the EPA. The State also oversees plan reviews for new cities or large subdivisions, so their staff has many responsibilities in those situations

Shane reported that work is ongoing at Moyle Park. He requested that the council approve the temporary closing of the park for reservations for September and October so the projects can be completed safely. This is typically a slower time of year for visitors, and this work cannot be done during the winter.

The council agreed with the request to close the park temporarily.

New drinking fountains for the parks arrived today and the steel sign for the roundabout should be finished this week. Work on the pavilion at Burgess Park is ongoing. Because there are evergreen trees near the site, installers will move the pavilion the required distance from the trees.

Paving on our streets will begin on September 8, and sealcoat projects are underway.

Meetings on the fire station remodel began last week and will be held weekly to design a floor plan and options to present to the City Council. The RFP is ready to post, but the State said we need to have a contract before we can post it. This requirement may be tied to their new platform, but we are not sure.

Shane said that 85-90 percent of the projects on our list have some work in progress now.

Brent Rummler asked if the council could see the projects spreadsheet.

Shane said he could send periodic updates to the council.

VI. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

Brent Rummler said that a resident asked him about the initial approval for Mountainville Academy on Main Street and thought that it required bussing.

Shane Sorensen responded that bussing was not required. Promises were made by the school about carpooling, but there was nothing formal in writing. Carpooling happened more often when the school originally started.

Jessica Smuin asked if an update on the PI report was available.

Shane Sorensen said that John Schiess at Horrocks Engineers is working on this task. Parts of the report are ready, but we want to combine the projects with their costs in order to get the biggest return on our investment.

Chrissy Hannemann suggested staggering the starting times for the schools that are near Mountainville Academy. She will attend a meeting at MA this week and will follow up afterwards.

Chrissy also reported that the Citizen Finance Committee's next project will be to look at the audit report before bringing it to the council. Also, the Sculpture Committee is excited about the direction they are heading, and the next phase will be fundraising.

Motion: Kelly Law moved to adjourn the meeting. Brent Rummler seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes

Jason Thelin
Chrissy Hannemann
Kelli Law
Jessica Smuin
Brent Rummler

No

Excused

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.