

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING
CITY OF CEDAR HILLS
Tuesday, October 21, 2025 6:00 p.m.
Community Recreation Center
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah**

Present: Mayor Pro Tempore Mike Geddes, Presiding
Council Member Laura Ellison
Council Member Bob Morgan (via telephone)
Council Member Erika Price
Council Member Kelly Smith

Absent/Excused: Mayor Denise Andersen

Staff: Chandler Goodwin, City Manager
Charl Louw, Finance Director
Greg Gordon, Recreation Director
Kevin Anderson, Public Works Director
Hyrum Bosserman, City Attorney
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder
Lieutenant Kevin Doyl

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

1. Call to Order, Pledge, and Invocation.

The City Council Meeting of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by Mayor Pro Tempore Geddes.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council Member Price.

The Invocation was offered by Council Member Ellison.

2. Approval of Meeting Agenda.

MOTION: Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE the Meeting Agenda with the addition of a Closed Session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. **Vote on Motion:** Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment.

There were no public comments. The public comment period was closed.

REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS/RECOGNITIONS

4. Youth City Council –Administration of the Oath of Office.

The Youth City Council officers and members who were present introduced themselves followed by City Recorder, Colleen Mulvey administering the Oath of Office.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. **Resolution No. 10-21-2025A, supporting America250 Utah, and forming a local Cedar Hills Utah250 Community Committee.**
6. **Resolution No. 10-21-2025B, appointments to the Cedar Hills Utah250 Community Committee.**
7. **Approval of the Minutes from the August 5, 2025, City Council Meeting.**

The Consent Agenda includes resolutions supporting the America250 Utah Commission by creating a local Cedar Hills Utah250 Community Committee and appointing members whose mission is to commemorate and celebrate our nation's past with local efforts to educate, engage, and unify Utahans and visitors to Utah County.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

CITY REPORTS AND BUSINESS

8. Mayor and Council, City Manager and Staff.

City Manager, Chandler Goodwin reported that the secondary water season has ended. Residents are encouraged to leave their valves open to help drain the system. He said the signs related to winter parking will be going out soon which instruct residents to not park on city streets overnight or during snow events so there is room for the plows to make that a safe operation. He mentioned if residents are having trouble understanding their PI usage they should reach out to the city staff, they are willing to answer questions about the secondary meters and their usage.

Council Member Ellison reported that the Youth City Council is in the process of planning a Fall Festival event for November 13th beginning at 7:00 p.m. They are also working on the Santa night event which will be held on Monday December 8th.

Council Member Price stated that she attended ULCT convention and found the sessions interesting. She reported that the Ghost Stories event was well attended. Next month on November 5th there will be a session related to helping young adults flourish into adulthood.

Council Member Morgan reported that he had his first meeting with residents of the Charleston. He said it was well received, it was engaging, and they asked a lot of questions. He stated that he would be meeting again with them on the first Wednesday of every month at 3:00 p.m. until January and anyone is invited to attend.

Council Member Smith reminded everyone to vote their ballot for the new school board election. She mentioned that the law has changed regarding the post mark on the ballots and suggested everyone drop their ballot in the ballot drop box at the city building on Cedar Hills Drive.

Lt. Doyl reported they have seen a lot of cars being broken into. He reminded everyone to keep their cars locked and valuables out of sight.

Greg Gordon reported that this Friday is the final golf tournament of year, and the golf course will close for the year on November 26th. He mentioned there are plans to discontinue individual season passes which will help increase the green fees. He said that registration for Jr. Jazz is open, and the ski bus is full but there are slots available for those who want to drive themselves.

Kevin Anderson stated that the PI is off. The public works staff has been doing a lot of meter checks and testing. The parks staff is busy working on picking up all the leaves and winterizing the parks. He reported that during the week of Thanksgiving the street sweeper will be sweeping the city streets. He encouraged residents to not park on the street and to keep the garbage cans out of the street while this is taking place.

Charl Louw stated that finances are stable right now. The finance department is busy getting ready for the upcoming financial audit.

SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

9. Review/Action and Public Hearing on Final Plan approval for a Commercial Development at 4773 W Cedar Hills Drive, located in the Cedar Hills Retail Center Subdivision (Jack in the Box).

Mr. Goodwin stated this is the final submittal for the Jack in the Box that will be located at the corner of Cedar Hills Drive and 4800 West. The project encompasses a 2,000 square foot retail building. The drive-thru is designed to accommodate the stacking of up to 12 vehicles. This lot is split with Dutch Bros. Coffee and Jack the Box is going to encumber about 7/10 of an acre on that piece. The landscaping that they are offering is 37% of the lot, which is good because it is at the entrance of the community.

Mr. Goodwin explained that regarding the elevations, staff met with the developers about the commercial code and the need for earth tones, and for it to be mostly brick, to fit in with the colonial style. The latest rendition has red and tan colored brick. There are purple metal awnings over the drive thru area and over the doorway and a red "cube" for the proprietary signage. Staff and the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the final plan, subject to conditions including the final engineering review and the traffic study submittal.

Council Member Price commented that this is very different from the initial renderings. Council Member Smith agreed. Mr. Goodwin stated that he is not a fan of the purple awning, but the overall intent of the building meets the code. He added that the motion should also include the condition of the final building and zoning review.

Mayor Pro Tem Geddes opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing was closed.

MOTION: Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE the Final Plan for a Commercial Development at 4773 West Cedar Hills Drive, located in the Cedar Hills Retail Center Subdivision (Jack in the Box), subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Traffic study submittal.**
- 2. Final engineering review.**
- 3. Final building and zoning review.**

Council Member Price seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Review/Action and Public Hearing on an Ordinance adopting the Water Conservation Element of the Cedar Hills General Plan.

Mr. Goodwin stated that per state code requirements, Utah law now requires cities to have an element in their general plan document that states how land use and water are impacting current development and future development. It also needs to outline what the city is doing to promote conservation. The plan outlines what water rights the city has, both groundwater and surface water, and where our water comes from and how much water we have as a city.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the document goes on to talk about methods of reducing water demand per capita for existing development. We look at our production for culinary water use and pressurized irrigation water use and measure that against our current equivalent residential connections. Although Utah as a whole expects dramatic population growth, Cedar Hills projects minimal household growth (16% increase by 2060) and has recently experienced a population decline. We have found that even with the growth that we have experienced, the existing water portfolio for the city is sufficient to meet future demands.

Mr. Goodwin went on to review the following elements of the water conservation plan:
Conservation Targets and Strategies:

The plan includes a clear conservation goal: achieving a 30% reduction by 2027.

Outdoor irrigation is identified as the primary target for conservation because Cedar Hills is a bedroom community with many homes having large, water-intensive yard spaces.

Practical Conservation Measures Implemented: The City has installed secondary water meters on all end-user connections and implemented a tiered rate structure for PI use. These meters are anticipated to yield water savings similar to other communities on the Wasatch Front, potentially reducing total outdoor water use by 20–33%.

Other Existing Measures: Code promotes the conversion of non-functional grass areas to xeriscape, prohibits grass on steep slopes or narrow pathways, and the City promotes the installation of smart irrigation controllers.

Future Planning: Cedar Hills plans to develop a water shortage plan that reduces the amount of water allocated per user during high or severe drought conditions. The City also plans to pursue efforts to reduce municipal consumption, including installing smart irrigation controllers on City parks and trails (approximately 50 acres) and upgrading the twenty-five-year-old irrigation infrastructure at the 100-acre Cedar Hills Golf Club.

Goals:

1. Developing a clear plan for managing water resources.
2. Adopting and promoting practices to eliminate waste.
3. Putting the plan's recommendations into practice.

Mr. Goodwin pointed out that if the city does not shore up their water rights periodically, we lose them. We want to make sure that that waterline water portfolio, which is very valuable, is protected. We want to develop a capital infrastructure plan for the culinary system as well as the secondary system that takes into account the maintenance and replacement of wells, transmission lines, pumps, tanks, and any other infrastructure needed for the system to operate. The goal is to promote water management practices that meet community needs and eliminate water waste.

Council Member Geddes asked if we supply recommendations or advice to residents to understand what their allotment is. Mr. Goodwin stated that staff will help them understand their allotment, how the meters and the water app work and give them suggestions such as installing a smart irrigation controller.

Mr. Goodwin said that an interesting way the city is working on to try to get more water rights is through a water reuse program. We send a lot of water to the Timpanogos Special Service District (TSSD) as sewage flows, and they treat it to a point and then they dump it into Utah Lake. The city actually owns that water right. We own the water right until it goes through the plant and is dumped into the lake and we no longer own that water right. So there are certain water rights where we have the ability to possibly reuse that water and have it pumped back into the city for irrigation. We are not going to build a pump all the way back from TSSD up the hill to Pleasant Grove or to Cedar Hills. So what we are working on is an exchange with American Fork where we take some of their water out of station and they can take it right out of TSSD. He added that it is a little bit of a fight with the state right now because they have changed some of the state requirements on this. But it is something that the city is working on with other members of TSSD. If the city is able to do this we can probably take less ditch water. Cities are trying to work together to be forward thinking but also try to meet the needs of their residents when it comes to water.

Mayor Pro Tempore Geddes opened the public hearing.

Kristen Trelz, 4064 W Cedar Hills Drive, stated she loves the idea that we are trying to conserve water. She inquired if there is anything in the code about putting artificial grass in our backyard to help conserve.

Mr. Goodwin stated the code was amended to allow artificial turf in the backyard. There is a requirement for the front yard to be landscaped with either a lawn, plants, xeriscape, etc.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 10-21-2025A, an Ordinance adopting the Water Use and Preservation Element of the cedar hills General Plan. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

11. Review/Action and Public Hearing on a Resolution adopting Fiscal Year 2026 Budget Amendments.

Charl Louw explained that staff is proposing an amendment to the Capital Projects Fund to increase the budget for renovations to the old administration/fire station building by \$500,000. These funds are proposed to be drawn from Capital Project reserves previously saved for an addition at the golf course. The building is being renovated into a dedicated City Council Chambers and related offices, as it was severely damaged after nearly 30 years of use. The increase is necessary due to unexpected costs related to grading issues, ice dams, and the need to renovate more spaces than originally planned. Improvements required include extensive demolition, improved insulation and roof vents to prevent ice dams, engineering grading and drainage to prevent current flooding, and significant updates to the basement/garage bays to repair flood damage and create a new large meeting space.

Mr. Louw next shared a breakdown of the costs for the building improvements, renderings of the floor plans and building exterior.

Council Member Ellison inquired about the seating and capacity in the council chambers. Kevin Anderson stated that room has a capacity of 50 people. Council Member Price wanted to verify that there will be cameras installed so the meetings can be broadcast. Mr. Louw stated that three cameras will be installed so you can have a camera on the speaker, the council, and whatever is being broadcast on a screen. There will also be new microphones, and a microphone and audio system throughout the room.

Council Member Smith inquired about \$63,000 line item for the dais and asked if we could look at something less expensive, maybe not wood. Mr. Louw replied the price also includes the podium and a table for staff. He said he looked at other types of materials like particle board and the cost was around \$45,000 but did not include the table. Council Member Geddes commented he thinks this pricing is reasonable. Council Member Morgan commented that we are going to be using this building for a long time and feels we should spend the money now and get it right with things that will last.

Council Member Smith expressed her concern about saving money and asked to confirm that the money for the foyer, artwork and furniture was just a placeholder. Mr. Louw stated it is a placeholder. He said it all adds up, and he is trying his best to get the best deals for the city.

Council Member Smith wanted to clarify that this project is not pulling money from another important project in the city. Mr. Goodwin stated he wants this to be clear that we are not pulling money from another project, the money is coming from reserves, unrestricted funds from the Capital Projects Fund.

Mayor Pro Tem Geddes opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing was closed.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 10-21-2025C, a Resolution adopting Fiscal Year Budget Amendments. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

12. Review/Action on acceptance of the public improvements and release of durability for Cedar Canyon Retail Subdivision Lot 1.

Mr. Goodwin stated this item is for acceptance of public improvements for Cedar Canyon Retail Subdivision Lot 1. The developer has completed construction, and the newly installed public infrastructure has successfully completed the required one-year durability period, which began on September 17, 2024. Inspections confirm the infrastructure meets city standards.

Mr. Goodwin said that the developer ripped out 2 dead trees and replaced them with new ones last week. We have shut off the irrigation water so there is nothing to feed those new trees. He is asking that the council release half of the bond which would amount to \$2,000 until they can verify that those trees remain alive. In the spring, if they are not alive they will have to replace them and then we will release the rest of the bond.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to APPROVE accepting the public improvements for Cedar Canyon Subdivision Lot 1, subject to the following condition:

- 1. Withholding \$2,000 until Spring 2026.**

Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

13. Review/Action on adopting a Resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an amended Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between the City of Cedar Hills and Utah County related to the TIP Project on Harvey Boulevard.

Mr. Goodwin explained this project is the roadway improvement from Canyon Road along Harvey Boulevard up to about Harvey Park. It's being worked on in conjunction with Pleasant Grove. The project initiated in 2020 and was originally funded for \$1,565,700 to construct a roundabout at 4000 North and 4000 West. Due to difficulties, including drainage and property impacts, project costs escalated significantly. Cedar Hills and Pleasant Grove are requesting additional funding and a significant scope change to convert the planned roundabout to a more traditional intersection.

The MAG planning board, which consists of the mayors in the county, approved the scope change and an addition of \$4,675,503, raising the new total project funds to \$6,397,773. When you have these TIP projects the cities are responsible for about 6% of the total cost of the project. Since we are working in conjunction with Pleasant Grove, 6% is divided in half. We are covering 3%, they are covering 3%. This project will be done for Cedar Hills for about \$200,000. We have impact fees that we have to use for this project. If we are not using those funds for this project, we have to give those impact fees back.

Council Member Smith asked what the impetus was, why are we doing this project. Mr. Goodwin said that if you look at the UDOT functional class map, this is a regional collector road. For traffic that is from Canyon Road and going west, this is an important road. It makes it regionally important not only to Cedar Hills, but to Pleasant Grove, Highland and American Fork. If you are looking at just Cedar Hill's interests this road is a school bus route. When a bus is coming down, there is not space to drive a car around, and we are expecting kids to walk or ride their bikes to school on this

road. So it is putting sidewalks on both sides, making it a safe road, opening up those windows of vision so that people can traverse that road in a safer manner.

Mr. Goodwin added that there are only a few projects the city can get TIP money for. The road has to be found on the UDOT functional class map. This money gets allocated throughout the county and most of it gets sent to Lehi, Provo and Orem. This is the first TIP project we have had in Cedar Hills in over 20 years, and we have been paying into this fund through gas tax for years. If there is a chance to take some of this money and do a project that matters to us it is a big win for the city.

MOTION: Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 10-21-2025D, a Resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an amended Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between the City of Cedar Hills and Utah County, related to the TIP Project on Harvey Boulevard. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

14. Review/Action on adopting a Resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an amended Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between the City of Cedar Hills and Utah County related to the TIP Project on Harvey Boulevard.

Mr. Goodwin stated he is asking the council to table this item. The updated agreement with Pleasant Grove is not finalized yet.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to TABLE this item. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

15. Discussion on Traffic Calming Devices.

Mr. Goodwin explained that this discussion should offer some insight on speed humps and other traffic calming measures on residential streets. There have been numerous questions generated by a recent city newsletter article on speed humps. Commonly residents want to know if they can get a speed hump in front of their house or on their street. When looking into each request for a speed hump to be installed, staff will evaluate a road based on a few criteria. These criteria are not set policy, only guidelines to help establish best practices in maintaining road networks, maintaining safe driving conditions for cars and emergency vehicles, and in understanding what conditions must be present for a recommendation to install a traffic calming device.

He stated he wants to go over types of traffic calming measures that you can install in a city. Types of traffic calming measures that can be used include:

Speed humps/tables - Rounded or flat-topped raised pavement sections that force speed reduction. Speed tables (longer and flatter) are gentler on emergency vehicles than traditional humps, though both can delay response times and should be avoided on primary emergency routes.

Chicanes - Alternating curb extensions that create an S-curve pattern, requiring drivers to slow and

navigate around them. Work well on flat terrain but can be problematic on slopes where vehicles may have difficulty stopping or starting.

Curb extensions (bulb-outs) - Widened sidewalks that narrow the roadway at intersections or mid-block, shortening pedestrian crossing distances and creating a visual narrowing effect. Generally compatible with emergency vehicles if designed with adequate through-width.

Raised crosswalks - Crosswalks elevated to sidewalk level, combining traffic calming with enhanced pedestrian visibility. Similar concerns as speed tables for emergency response.

Textured or colored pavement - Visual and tactile cues that signal drivers to slow down without physical barriers. Emergency-vehicle friendly but less effective at actually reducing speeds.

Chokers/pinch points - Strategic narrowing of the roadway to slow traffic. Must maintain minimum width for emergency vehicles (typically 20 feet).

Roundabouts/traffic circles - Small circular intersections requiring yield and reduced speeds. Emergency vehicles can navigate them but with some delay.

Road diets - Reducing lane width or converting travel lanes to bike lanes/parking. Visual narrowing effect is emergency-compatible when adequate width is maintained.

Mr. Goodwin stated there needs to be criteria that a roadway meets in order for a speed hump or any other traffic calming measure to be considered. Discussion was had regarding the criteria for consideration which included posted speed limit, traffic volume, emergency vehicle routes, and physical conditions on the road.

Mr. Goodwin next shared a Speed Trailer Data Study that included data collected over the last 8 years on several city streets. The data measured the posted speed limit of 25 mph, direction, total vehicles, the average speed of each vehicle and the 50 and 85 percentiles. He said that the roads in the study were mostly the emergency vehicle route roads, the ones with the most traffic. The percentiles in the study show you the speed that most people are comfortable with.

Staff has created a formula where it asks a couple questions about whether the road meets certain criteria to qualify for a speed hump. The formula is set at 30 miles an hour on the average pace or the average speed, if it is above 30 miles an hour, if it is in the 50th percentile speed, if it is not an emergency vehicle route, if it does not have slope conditions, if it meets those criteria, then it meets the criteria that we have established for a speed hump. Mr. Goodwin said that according to this formula most roads do not qualify.

Mr. Goodwin said he can share this information with everybody so they can see the average speeds, which are mostly within the range of what you would expect. He added that he is not oblivious to the fact that we do have people that speed in our community, but it is not ubiquitous, it is not widespread.

Mr. Goodwin stated the point he wants to make and what he tells residents is that you cannot put in a speed hump for one bad driver. That is why you have to look at what the community is doing on that road. You've got to look at the number of cars, you have to look at the average speeds, you have

to look at emergency vehicles being able to get through safely and timely and you have to look at the conditions on the road. Discussion was had on speed studies, police presence, criteria and standards.

16. Motion to Go Into Closed Session Pursuant to Utah State Code 52-4-205(1)(c) to Discuss Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to go into CLOSED SESSION Pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-205(1)(c). Council Member Smith seconded the motion. **Vote on Motion:** Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

The City Council was in Closed Session from 8:04 p.m. to 8:48 p.m.

17. Motion to Adjourn Closed Session and Reconvene the City Council Meeting.

MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to ADJOURN the CLOSED SESSION and RECONVENE the City Council Meeting. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. **Vote on Motion:** Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

18. Adjourn.

MOTION: Council Member Geddes moved to ADJOURN the City Council Meeting. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. **Vote on Motion:** Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

Approved:
November 18, 2025

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC, UCC
City Recorder