

## ALPINE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

March 10, 2026

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 in attendance at the anchor location, which constituted a quorum: Sarah Blackwell, Chrissy Hannemann, Andrew Young, Brent Rummmler, and Jessica Smuin.  
 Staff: Shane Sorensen, Ryan Robinson (Zoom), Steve Doxey (arrived later because of closed freeway), Chief Brian Gwilliam, Chief Brian Patten, Heidi Smith, and DeAnn Parry  
 Others: David Mortensen, Dan Jimenez, Mario Jimenez, Jake Wilder, Charlie Thurston, Sheryl Dame, Steve Burrows, Sullivan Love, Dave & Keri Witbeck, Bryan Irving, Jeff Gaptill, Michael & Darcy Kennedy
- B. Prayer** Sarah Blackwell
- C. Pledge** Andrew Young

### II. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approve Minutes from the February 24<sup>th</sup> City Council Meeting**
- B. Approval of 300 North Well Modifications – Delco Western: \$114,037.39**
- C. Resolution R2026-12: Appointing a Committee Member and an Alternate Committee Member to the Mountainland Association of Governments Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**

Shane Sorensen explained that last bid for the 300 North Well came in around 4:00 pm today. This is one of our smaller wells and supplies water to the PI system in the middle zone. The water level has dropped significantly over the years, so it needs a new pump and motor. When running efficiently, it can pump about 600 GPM (the Healey well pumps around 3,200 GPM).

City Engineer Jason Judd said considering the issues, staff think it is best to install a new 200 HP motor now. The old motor is over 20 years old and is 300 HP, so it will be more cost effective to replace it now rather than paying to remove and install a new motor separately in the future. A Variable Frequency Drive (VFD) will also be installed, which will allow the motor to utilize different rates and flows. Delco Western has done good work for us in the past and they provided the lowest bid.

Council and staff discussed related issues:

- The current well pump is worn out from pumping sand. A sand separator will be installed to help preserve the new pump, and the VFD with a reduced flow will help with longevity. The old motor can be sold as surplus.
- Repairs and modifications should be completed as quickly as possible because we will need all our water sources this summer.
- An electrical contractor will connect the components and could do some work while parts are being shipped.

Regarding Item C, Andrew Young asked if a legislator could serve on the MAG TAC committee.

Mayor Merrill and Shane Sorensen explained that the Technical Advisory Committee is made up of city administrators and engineers. Recommendations from the TAC are then sent to the Executive Council, which is a group of elected mayors.

**Motion:** Chrissy Hannemann moved to approve the Consent Calendar and to accept the Delco Western bid for well modifications. Brent Rummmler seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

### III. PUBLIC COMMENT

**Mario Jimenez** – *Whitby Woodlands Drive, Alpine*

Mario previously sent information to the council in an email and thanked them for their dedication to serving our city. Mario is seeking to have the Municipal Code updated for golf carts on public streets. Current code is vague and ambiguous about what is and is not allowed. The number of golf carts on streets are likely to increase, as they have lower carbon emissions and are easy to maneuver and park. Many communities encourage the use of golf carts, which are especially helpful for senior citizens. Highland City has an ordinance (10.08.060) which was updated in 2025 and effectively mirrors the language from Utah State Code. Because the Lone Peak Police Department provides enforcement for both cities, it would be ideal if the codes were equivalent. Mario met with Code Enforcement Officer Don Quigley last week and he expressed support for the code updates.

**Dan Jimenez** – *City Council Relations Chair for Mountainville Academy, Coventry Lane, Alpine*

Dan said that Mountainville Academy (MVA) supports the recommendations in the traffic study by Fehr & Peers. The use of the city's property on 100 South along with other improvements would increase the capacity for on-site drop-offs and pick-ups and provide a better staging area for students and cars. They are happy to test the Red Pine Drive staging suggestion, explore the addition of a sidewalk on the south, and move the Main Street crosswalk to the south. The school is ready to allocate funds to optimize this plan.

### IV. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

#### A. Main Street Traffic Study Review – Fehr & Peers

Shane Sorensen explained that the idea of moving the crosswalk near Mountainville Academy (MVA) was mentioned during Council Communications at the November 11, 2025, City Council meeting. The required warrant study for this type of change was discussed briefly at the special meeting on November 18, 2025. At the January 13, 2026, meeting the council approved the proposal for Fehr & Peers to conduct a study for the Main Street crosswalk and related items. Michael Adamson, engineer with Fehr & Peers, is attending by Zoom tonight to provide information and answer questions.

Michael Adamson (on Zoom) said that the purpose of the study was to warrant whether the crosswalk could be moved, explore how it would impact routing, and to evaluate ways to further mitigate traffic issues and safety concerns related to MVA during pick-up and drop-off times. The pedestrian crossing is the source of a great deal of congestion for north and southbound traffic during these times. Parents are currently staging primarily on Main Street, 100 South, and Center Street. Cars pulling into traffic from the shoulder, shooting the gap, and making illegal U-turns create a safety hazard.

One of the main recommendations from the Hales Engineering study was to shift the crosswalk south to align with the onsite pedestrian area. This would remove conflicts with vehicles turning right out of the parking lot and move the queue more quickly. If left turns were eliminated, it would result in the rerouting of 190 vehicles in the morning and 130 vehicles in the afternoon. Potential choke points with rerouting would be the Canyon Crest Road and Ridge Drive intersection, and the Main Street and 200 North intersection to Westfield Road. In analyzing these points, Fehr & Peers did not see any issues that were not already being addressed by larger city plans.

The studies predict that staging on Red Pine Drive would operate acceptably and allow vehicles to move off Main Street and away from the areas by City Hall. However, it would also increase pedestrian traffic to the south and affect that neighborhood. A pilot program is the best way to evaluate actual results.

In summary, the recommendations from Fehr & Peers are to:

- Construct a north egress consistent with Option 2A of the original traffic study,
- Relocate the crosswalk to align with the onsite pedestrian walkway,
- Restrict left turns at the main school campus during pick-up and drop-off periods,
- Restrict staging on Main Street, 100 South, and 120 South,
- Shift pilot staging to Red Pine Drive. If this is successful, an on-site pedestrian route and a sidewalk along the south edge of the school would be needed.
- Maintain the queue storage along the shoulder on northbound Main Street, as it does not seem to affect the non-school northbound traffic.

Mr. Adamson invited questions from the council.

- 1) *How would moving the crosswalk north of the MVA exit affect right turns?*  
Fehr & Peers received this option yesterday, so there was no time for a formal analysis. It appears that moving the crosswalk to this point would essentially net the same result we see now, which is when the students are crossing, no right turns can occur. We would experience similar storage issues on site.
- 2) *Red Pine Drive is home to many of our senior citizens, so EMS responses will likely be more frequent. How would this factor in?*  
Fehr & Peers engineers visited the site and observed the seniors out walking in the neighborhood. This is one reason they recommend a pilot program before making a permanent decision to allow staging there. We can observe emergency response situations and see if the neighborhood is comfortable with this solution.
- 3) *Some engineers have suggested a median to restrict left turns. MVA is concerned about this as a permanent solution.*  
A median would block access to the businesses on the west side of the street and is a large intervention for a problem that happens only twice a day. Temporary blocking with cones during high-volume times would allow evaluation of the traffic flows.
- 4) *What about traffic calming measures like curb extensions?*  
More traffic calming around a crosswalk is always good, but the city would need to consider the trade-offs. With curb extensions there are additional considerations like accommodating bicycle lanes on one or both sides of the street. The plans for Main Street as a whole need to be considered. Snowplow drivers would need training to navigate the extensions properly, and curbs must be designed so they do not negatively impact emergency response.
- 5) *Can a crossing guard legally stop cars trying to enter the school site from Main Street so students could walk south to the Red Pine staging area?*  
This question would best be answered by the Police Chief.
- 6) *If the crosswalk is moved between the MVA entrance and exit, would holding back pedestrian students until the carpools cleared be advisable?*  
A downside would be the delay for students walking to the Red Pine staging area for pick-up. Also, if left turns are restricted, there would be no gaps created by cars stopping for students to cross to allow the school traffic to turn right. On the positive side, removing pedestrians from heavy vehicle traffic times is safer. Activation of the school zone flashing signs would need to be timed so proper speed limitations are in place.
- 7) *If we had a worst-case scenario and MVA decided they did not want to work with us on cones, a pedestrian refuge, or a new sidewalk, would we want a solid median?*  
This scenario would require more exploration, and the location of the crosswalk would be in question. We cannot have left turns going through the crosswalk, so collaboration is necessary in solving the problem.
- 8) *What about requiring buses for MVA students?*  
This option has been discussed with staff and would involve a much bigger investment and require deeper collaboration with the school. It is not a near-term solution.

Mr. Adamson explained that the report mentioned a Danish offset crossing, but this is only possible with a permanent median in place. A standard zebra striped crossing would be recommended here.

Shane Sorensen mentioned that the suggested red curb painting would only apply to school crosswalk locations, as the intersections already have red curbing of 30 feet in each direction.

It was also suggested that curbs at driveways on Main Street be painted red to help prevent them from being blocked by cars waiting in the queue.

9) *What about allowing staging on 120 South, west of Main Street?*

The study is primarily about Main Street. Staging on 100 South and 120 South would be more about the neighborhood effects than operations, and this decision would be up to staff and council discretion. From a safety and operations standpoint, Main Street north of 100 South should be a no staging area.

10) *Can we create efficiency with a second MVA egress, while still allowing left turns and sending the southbound cars out of town instead of through the neighborhoods?*

The chief focus of the study was on how to improve conditions on Main Street and disperse the traffic without major adverse impacts on other areas. If a second egress were created, some drivers would opt to go right and travel the alternate routes. If the majority of the vehicles continued to turn left on Main Street, we would not consider that movement to be protected. There may be cars waiting at the crossing and blocking access. There is a lot of north and southbound traffic as well as frequent crossings by students. The crossing guards try to move blocks of students at a time, rather than continually blocking traffic with a trickle of students, so there would be stretches when left turns would not be possible. If you bundled the left turns with the crosswalk, it would require a much more trained individual than a crossing guard to regulate that. We would likely need a dedicated police officer during peak times so that the students would not be in danger. More research would be needed before we could recommend this approach.

Jessica Smuin said she visited the site today and counted a ratio of 5:1, with five cars going left and one car turning right out of the school. She mentioned Andrew Young's suggestion that we send the cars back out the way they came and wondered if we could use two crossing guards at the school site and model another option.

Mr. Adamson said that based on the traffic data collected by Fehr & Peers and the previous consultants the ratio is more like 2:1, with two left turns for every right turn. He has seen the left turn model implemented at other schools, but it was not on the city's main street. With our high traffic volume, further exploration of the impacts would be needed before it could be considered a viable option.

11) *Should we pilot moving the crosswalk to the south and do a second test with a north crosswalk location?*

A crosswalk pilot would be more expensive/permanent because the lines would have to be painted on the street. Other solutions such as using cones or temporary curbs would give more flexibility as we observe operational conditions. The proposal suggests painting zebra stripes at the new south crosswalk, but that the 100 South crosswalk be left as a traditional crossing. We do not want to encourage students to cross there.

12) *How do these decisions affect the need for a roundabout at Canyon Crest and Ridge Drive?*

The study did not analyze what the traffic increase that might occur if MVA creates a north egress, but we are close to needing that roundabout even without the rerouting of right hand turns from MVA.

Mayor Carla Merrill invited Police Sergeant Charlie Thurston to the mic. Because he has seen the situation and the behavior of the students, parents, and other drivers, she asked for his opinion on the recommendations and what would help safety and traffic flow.

Sgt. Charlie Thurston said that moving the crosswalk south would be advantageous because it shifts the pedestrians away from 100 South and 120 South. It would also allow students who are waiting to cross to gather on school property, instead of blocking the sidewalk or the bank entrance. From his experience watching officers try to direct traffic at an accident site, even if there is a police car with red and blue flashing lights, vehicles still try to skirt around and go through the intersection. He thinks the biggest downside to having the crosswalk to the north of the current egress is that it will become blocked.

13) *What is the problem with cars queuing on Main Street?*

Sgt. Thurston said that the queued cars can be an annoyance for people who live or have business on Main and whose driveways are blocked. Main Street becomes wider as you go toward the roundabout. If parents would queue on the west side of the street, it would be safer than waiting at Legacy Park and doing a U-turn. Also, parents driving around the block to travel south is preferable to darting into traffic with a left turn.

Brent Rummler commented that people will always find the shortest route. If we restrict pickup north of 100 South, they will find other places, like Main Street Court. We are never going to get all the traffic off Main Street but dispersing it so it does not burden one area would help. Enforcement of the restrictions, especially at the beginning of the school year, will be vital.

Mayor Carla Merrill asked Police Chief Brian Gwilliam if they were ticketing cars that park on red curbs during pickup times.

Police Chief Brian Gwilliam said that it depends on the day and the availability of officers. Sometimes they issue warnings and sometimes it is a citation. With the traffic volume, it is difficult to conduct enforcement in a full-sized vehicle. It is much better for officers to be on foot or on a motorcycle. The Chief is grateful that we have the study data and is hopeful we can find the right solutions. He appreciates the good relationship with MVA.

14) *What are the considerations with crossing guards?*

The police department trains them and the city budget pays for their time. If there is a reduced-speed school zone by an elementary school, a crossing guard is required by law. Junior high and high schools are not required to have crossing guards, but some opt to hire them. Crossing guards turn the school zone lights on and off with their shifts. The police department decides where the crossing guards will be placed, and it is a joint effort between the police and the city to provide safe routes to school.

15) *Does Mountainville Academy have a cap on student enrollment?*

Dan Jimenez responded that their charter is capped by the state at 750. Enrollment has varied between 675 and 725. Changing the enrollment cap would be based on population growth, and Dan did not think we have the growth in our area to warrant an expansion. He was not sure if the process involved both the State Charter School Board and the State Legislature but said he could bring more information to a future meeting. If there were a need to increase enrollment in the future, Dan said Alpine residents could receive preferential enrollment.

The council discussed issues regarding testing the recommendations:

- If left turns are restricted, a second egress from MVA would be necessary.
- A pilot program would allow evaluation of the solutions and give parents an idea of the impact before the hectic start of a new school year.
- A pilot would provide lots of information without being permanent. Selling the city property on 100 South would be a permanent decision.
- The next City Council meeting is on March 24, and the MVA Board will meet on March 26.

Mayor Carla Merrill asked the council members for their opinions so staff can prepare information for a vote at a future meeting.

Brent Rummler commented that the new MVA School Board is receptive to seeking solutions, and he appreciates Dan Jimenez and the board working with the city. However, boards can change quickly, and a future group may be less receptive to collaboration. It would be good to find solutions while we have the opportunity, and to put measures in place before the new school year. Brent likes the idea of staging on 120 South so some cars can go west. He would like to see staging restricted north of 100 South, with signs and enforcement. We cannot take all the traffic off Main Street, but this plan disperses it appropriately and addresses how changes will impact other neighbors, including our elderly residents on Red Pine Drive. With all the activity on Main Street we may not want to create bike lanes there.

Sarah Blackwell said that based on these conversations and the results of the studies, she recommends moving the crosswalk south. Her preference would be to allow cars to turn left and go out of town, but the studies recommend only right turns. If we test these recommendations, it will also give us a better idea of traffic needs at the proposed roundabout on Ridge Drive and Canyon Crest Road.

Chrissy Hannemann said she wants to move forward with what the study suggested and agrees with running pilots before implementing permanent solutions. The traffic task force could create a proposal to bring to the City Council. We also want to get feedback from MVA parents and Alpine residents. If we move quickly, we could run the first pilot in April, and a second pilot, if needed, in May before school is dismissed for the summer.

Andrew Young said he supports either location for the crosswalk, with repainting of the existing crosswalks, dropping the speed limit on Main Street, and additional red painted curbs. With 60+ percent of cars coming in from the south, the proposals will not fix the problem but will simply disperse traffic elsewhere. Andrew feels that the only real solution is to have buses. He appreciates working with MVA to find solutions and wants to see them implemented this summer. If we still have the same problems in a year, he will recommend buses again.

Shane Sorensen explained that the purpose of tonight's agenda item was to review the report and have a discussion. Staff will need a motion and a majority vote in order to coordinate efforts, identify funding, and implement pilot solutions.

Mayor Carla Merrill thanked Michael Adamson for presenting the study findings and answering questions from the council.

## **B. Financial Report – February 2026**

Shane Sorensen said our sales tax revenue is up 6.43 percent over last year and we hope this trend continues. We are 75 percent through the fiscal year, and the accounts are in order and projects are complete or moving forward. We will have a public hearing and a mid-year adjustment to clean up budget details at our next meeting.

Council members and staff discussed:

- The question on the Financial Report with revenues of \$730,000 for waste collection and \$758,550 in garbage expenses will be resolved with the mid-year budget adjustment.
- The Class C Road Fund is 100 percent expended now. This is because street projects are typically completed in the late summer and fall, so a mid-year adjustment is always needed. This will happen at our next meeting.
- Impact fees are not growing because we do not have as many new homes.
- The 300 North Well modifications will be paid from the PI fund.
- Fire station expenses will be paid in this fiscal year from the General Fund and the Capital Improvement Fund.

Chrissy Hannemann said that the Finance Committee will meet on March 26 at 8:00 am, and the auditor will be there to answer council questions. Shane is the best resource for learning to understand the Financial Report and the budget.

Brent Rummier commented that we should encourage our friends and neighbors to purchase items online to support our sales tax revenue.

## **V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **A. Consideration of Approval of a Five-Sided Lot at 1145 E. East Mountain Drive**

*(Plat B incorrectly listed the address as 1147 E. East Mountain Drive. This has been corrected.)*

Ryan Robinson (attending by Zoom) said that an application has been received to combine Lot 1 of the Thelin Estates Plat A subdivision (parcel 53:281:0001) with parcel 11:054:0464. There is an existing

home on Lot 1, while the odd shaped parcel to the west is a legal parcel. A plat amendment has been provided to combine the two properties. Each lot in a zone must have the minimum square footage.

Alpine Development Code definitions, Section 3.01.110, a Lot is defined as follows:

***LOT.** A tract of land regardless of any label, that is created by and shown on a subdivision plat that has been recorded in the Office of the County Recorder. Lots shall be generally rectangular in nature and shall have no more than five sides without an exception being recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council; the front of a property, located at the front right of way, does not count against this requirement.*

As situated today, Lot 1 has four sides, but when combined with the odd shaped parcel to the west, it would have more than five sides. Staff have reviewed the plat amendment and given conditional approval, subject to recommendation by the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council of the lot having more than five sides.

The request was considered by the Planning Commission at their March 3, 2026, meeting. Following is the motion recommending approval of the request to the City Council:

*MOTION: Planning Commission member Troy Slade moved to recommend approval of the more than five-sided lot associated with the proposed Thelin Estates Plat A amendment. John Mackay seconded the motion. There were 6 Ayes and 0 Nays. The motion passed.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

While the approval of the plat amendment combining the lot and parcel is an administrative decision, approval for a lot with more than five sides requires legislative action. Staff recommend that the City Council consider approval of the more than five-sided lot.

Steve Doxey explained that a parcel is a piece of land which is not part of a recorded subdivision, while a lot is part of a recorded subdivision. In this case, if the parcel is not combined with the lot, neither a home nor an accessory building may be built on the west parcel because it does not have sufficient frontage.

Staff and council discussed the following details:

- The homeowner wishes to construct a barn on the west side, which would have to meet established setback requirements.
- The provision to request an exception to the five side rules exists because not all situations are the same.
- The council is exploring additional restrictions on setbacks to protect views. If this amendment is approved tonight, those future restrictions would not apply here.
- Alpine City code says that a barn or other accessory structure may not be constructed on a separate parcel. It must be on the same lot as the residential dwelling.

Andrew Young commented that when he ran for City Council the number one issue expressed by residents was traffic. The second issue was extreme construction. The council's job is to preserve the look and feel of the city. He has seen similar situations where owners construct a complex of buildings (an albatross) and it creates problems for the neighbors and the owners themselves with lengthy construction periods, the blocking of views, and the resulting layout makes it difficult to sell. Approving this lot amendment will set a precedent for more actions like this, and Andrew thinks this amendment breaks our own ordinances. He would also like to see code changes to limit the grading allowed during construction and its effect on setbacks.

Chrissy Hannemann said the council is attempting to put buffers in place through massing standards, semi-impervious surface restrictions, and ADU regulations. In this situation, however, we are combining a currently unusable parcel with a larger piece that already has a home on it. The extra property provides a buffer between neighboring homes and gives the area a more rural feel.

Mayor Carla Merrill commented that she has been discussing this with various legislators and views are not protected in the Utah State Constitution. Any code changes to protect views in Alpine must be legally defensible.

Steve Doxey clarified that view protection, grading, and other concerns expressed by council may be brought up for a text or code amendment in the future. Currently a building permit has not been submitted for this lot. This is just an application for a subdivision amendment to allow the lot and the parcel to be combined.

**Motion:** Chrissy Hannemann moved to approve the more than five-sided lot at 1145 E. East Mountain Drive with the condition that staff identify which setbacks applies to each lot line prior to recording the change at the County level. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. There were 3 yes votes and 2 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Sarah Blackwell	Jessica Smuin	
Chrissy Hannemann	Andrew Young	
Brent Rummler		

**B. Resolution R2026-10: A Resolution Expressing Alpine City’s Intent to Adjust Its Common Municipal Boundary with Draper City Affecting Parcels 11:008:0012, 66:579:0003 and 66:579:0004, Authorizing and Scheduling a Public Hearing, and Providing for Notice Thereof**

Shane Sorensen explained we are trying to correct a discrepancy between the city boundary and the deeded lot line. Draper City has already completed the first steps of the process on their side. The process requires each city to approve a resolution saying they are willing to look at the issue, and State law requires a public hearing be held no sooner than 60 days after the action is approved. We would hold the public hearing, and then the council can vote. It will take a positive vote from each City Council for this adjustment to happen. The subdivision was originally proposed as what you see tonight, but the County Recorder at the time required adjustments.

This application was submitted by David Mortensen, a surveyor with Civil Science, on behalf of three property owners. Section 10-2-903 of the Utah State Code provides for and outlines the process for a municipal boundary adjustment. Following is a summary of the request taken from an email sent by Mr. Mortensen:

- **Project Overview (1 page)**
  - *Project name - Alpine and Draper Municipal Boundary Adjustment*
  - *Property location - (address and/or parcel numbers) parcels 11:008:0003, 66:579:0003, 66:579:0004, and 11:008:0012*
  - *Brief description of the property - Parcels are vacant*
  - *High-level description of the boundary issue - There is an ambiguity between the deeded parcels and the city line. The city line overlaps parcels 11:008:0003, 66:579:0003, and 66:579:0004 as monumented on the ground.*
  - *Clear statement of what is being requested - (resolution of intent to modify the boundary) We are working to make the city line match the deeded boundary lines.*
- **Vicinity / Boundary Map**
  - *Aerial or GIS-style map Attached pdf of Utah County Parcel Viewer*
  - *Property boundary clearly outlined - Attached proposed Municipal Boundary Line Adjustment*
  - *Existing municipal boundaries labeled - Shown and labeled on proposed Municipal Boundary Line Adjustment*
  - *Area proposed for boundary modification clearly highlighted - Shown and highlighted on proposed Municipal Boundary Line Adjustment.*
- **Rationale for Boundary Modification (1 page max)**
  - *Alignment of municipal services We are proposing a Municipal Boundary Adjustment per Utah Code Title 10, Chapter 2, Part 9 Municipal Boundary Adjustments ([Utah Code Part 10-2-9](#)) I have attached a pdf copy of the code.*

- *Access and connectivity considerations* No access is planned to be needed between the parcel in Draper and the parcels in Alpine.
- *Infrastructure efficiency* - This is not applicable as we are not affecting any roadways. The lots in Alpine are utilizing the built roadway for access to the two parcels.
- *Consistency with long-term planning goals* - This proposal should not affect any long-term planning.
- **Statement of Intent (short paragraph)**
  - *Clarifies the request is exploratory*
    - *Two of the Alpine parcels were part of a plat recorded in 2017 and were monumented on the ground to a deeded parcel. However, the recorded parcel overlapped the city boundary. At the time of recording, the County indicated this configuration was not allowable and, at the last minute, shifted the west boundary to align with the ambiguous city boundary line dating back to 1855.*

*Since that time, I have met with Draper City regarding this issue. The owner of the affected Alpine parcel would like the resulting gap area returned to their parcel, which would require a Municipal Boundary Adjustment pursuant to the attached state statute.*

*As referenced in a prior email dated January 29, 2026, from Kellie Challburg, Assistant City Manager, she stated:*

*We have the item on the agenda for the next meeting on February 3. It is listed as an action item. I don't expect any questions from the council, as I believe they were addressed at the last meeting, but you are welcome to attend. It will be part of the regular business meeting at 7:00 p.m.*

*This resolution is to move forward with the intent and noticing for the public hearing, which is tentatively scheduled for April 7.*

*I have also been in contact with Dale Robinson of Sunrise Engineering, who has been working with Karen Burnet on preparing a Draper City legal description. Both Dale and I, in our professional capacity as surveyors, believe that the east line of Draper parcel 11:008:0012 represents the location where the city boundary was originally intended to be established by the adjoining property owners.*

*Please let me know if you have any questions or if additional information would be helpful as this moves forward.*

- *Confirms no formal application or approval is being requested at this stage - Per our conversation, we are submitting for Alpine City approval for this process. A formal request was sent to Ryan Robinson back on 10-30-25 (application is attached)*
- *Stated purpose is staff coordination and council discussion only - According to our conversation a few weeks ago we are proposing for both staff coordination and council approval through a public hearing in both Draper City and Alpine City.*
- **Primary Contact Information**
  - *Applicant / Owner name: Applicant - David Mortensen, Civil Science, [dmortensen@civilsience.com](mailto:dmortensen@civilsience.com)*
  - *Authorized representative - (Jake / Blue Bison Development) My client is Jake with Blue Bison. He is working with the owner of parcels in Alpine specifically David and Keri Witbeck.*
  - *Email and phone number: David Mortensen email [dmortensen@civilsience.com](mailto:dmortensen@civilsience.com). Phone number is 801-768-7200 ext. 173.*

Draper City approved a resolution at their February 3, 2026, City Council meeting acknowledging their intent to adjust the municipal boundary with Alpine City. This process requires that both cities hold a public hearing no sooner than 60 days following the approval of the resolution of intent being passed by each respective city. Draper City intends to hold their public hearing on April 7, 2026. If the Alpine City Council approves the resolution as proposed, the soonest regularly scheduled City Council meeting where a public hearing could be held would be May 12, 2026. There are specific advertising requirements that need to be met by both cities prior to the public hearings.

If the boundary adjustment is eventually approved, a plat amendment may be required to adjust the strips of property into the lots in the Summit Pointe Plat A subdivision.

The following documents were included in the packet:

- The completed Municipal Boundary Line Adjustment Form
- Alpine and Draper Municipal Boundary Line Plat (this plat would be recorded as the final step in the boundary adjustment process)
- Parcel map with aerial photo
- Email from David Witbeck (Alpine property owner)
- Resolution R2026-10: Resolution Expressing Alpine City's Intent to Adjust Its Common Municipal Boundary with Draper City Affecting Parcels 11:008:0012, 66:579:0003 and 66:579:0004, Authorizing and Scheduling a Public Hearing and Providing for Notice Thereof

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Review the municipal boundary adjustment that has been proposed by the applicant and for which Draper City has passed a resolution of intent to move forward with the process of adjusting the municipal boundary with Alpine City. If the City Council is in favor of the municipal boundary adjustment, Resolution R2026-10 should be approved and a date for a public hearing should be set.

David Mortensen with Civil Science was invited to the mic.

David Motensen said this is a crazy situation that started in 1855 when the whole country was divided into two-mile by two-mile sections. When Alpine attempted to annex this area in 2017, the intent of the subdivision was to split the land into four lots. The plat had all the required signatures from the city, but the County Recorder made them erase the line and put in numbers to make it smaller so it would conform to the established section line. This created the gap piece. A surveyor staked the lots and put pins in the ground. We are trying to put the line back where it was originally intended to be and clear up the ambiguity. David highlighted the narrow parcel that is in question, which is roughly 20 feet wide but does not have parallel lot lines.

David reported that Draper is in support of this proposal and is working through their process. The County Surveyor, who would have to sign the boundary annexation plat, is also in favor of this proposal.

Staff and council discussed various issues with David:

- There currently is not a recorded owner of this narrow strip of land per the County Assessors. David said the intent of the subdivision and the physical markers show this piece to be part of Lots 3 and 4.
- If we do not approve this change, the owners of Lots 3 and 4 cannot install a fence there or make other improvements.
- There was a suggestion that the city could use a narrow easement for access to public open space, but the city does not own the land. Alpine owns the open space below the narrow strip, but the owners to the west and north are private entities. If the city wanted to acquire this strip of land, we would have to follow our process.
- The owners of Lots 3 and 4 are allowed to begin construction on their homes.

David Witbeck, the owner of Lot 4, was invited to the mic.

David Witbeck said that based on information from the County they can begin construction on their land, but setbacks are measured from the property lines. They want to have the property line issue resolved before they pay for engineering.

**Motion:** Jessica Smuin moved to extend the meeting to 9:40 pm at the latest. Andrew Young seconded the motion. There were 4 yes votes and 1 no vote (Andrew Young). The motion passed.

David Witbeck said that he agreed with the original developer that he would allow the city to have a 10-foot easement on the west, but he does not want to give up 10 feet in addition to the 20 feet they have already lost.

Mayor Carla Merrill explained that with the original developer of the subdivision there were many conditions to be met for approval of the fifth lot. One of the conditions was that the developer would build a trail connecting to the Draper City trail system.

Ryan Robinson commented that the proposed trail did not meet the city standards for trails in Alpine, and the option expired a year ago in September.

David Witbeck commented that they would just like to have the property they thought they were buying.

**Motion:** Brent Rummmler moved to approve Resolution 2026-10 A Resolution Expressing Alpine City’s Intent to Adjust Its Common Municipal Boundary with Draper City Affecting Parcels 11:008:0012, 66:579:0003 and 66:579:0004, Authorizing and Scheduling a Public Hearing for May 12, and Providing for Notice Thereof. Chrissy Hanemann seconded the motion. There were 4 yes votes and 1 no vote, as recorded below. The motion passed.

<u><b>Yes</b></u>	<u><b>No</b></u>	<u><b>Excused</b></u>
Chrissy Hannemann	Sarah Blackwell	
Brent Rummmler		
Jessica Smuin		
Andrew Young		

**C. Resolution R2026-13: Appointments to the Alpine Water Citizen Advisory Committee**

Shane explained that Resolution R2026-11 creating the Alpine Water Citizen Advisory Committee was approved at the February 24, 2026, City Council meeting. The mayor has appointed residents who filled out an application to serve.

This committee is created like the Trail Committee with respect to terms. The normal term for a member is three years, with the terms being staggered so there is continuity on the committee.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve Resolution R2026-12 appointing members to the Alpine Water Citizen Advisory Committee.

Staff and council members discussed the following:

- Water use and drought will be an issue for years to come, so this is an important assignment.
- We need a plan for education and uniform enforcement.
- The committee must have a minimum of five members. They can help the city in updating our Water Master Plan.
- The council appreciates the members for being willing to serve the community.

**Motion:** Brent Rummmler moved to approve Resolution R2026-13 appointing Jeff Davis, Bryan Irving, Clyde Stauffer, Steven Burrows, Will Jones, and adding Sullivan Love (with an initial term ending on Dec 31, 2026), as members of the Alpine Water Citizen Advisory Committee. Andrew Young seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

<u><b>Yes</b></u>	<u><b>No</b></u>	<u><b>Excused</b></u>
Sarah Blackwell		
Chrissy Hannemann		
Brent Rummmler		
Jessica Smuin		
Andrew Young		

**D. Resolution R2026-14: Amendments to Historic Preservation Commission**

Shane Sorensen said that On May 24, 2022, the City Council approved Ordinance 2022-16 establishing the Historic Preservation Commission. Councilmembers Jessica Smuin and Sarah Blackwell have requested an amendment to the commission to include arts and culture elements. Since the original commission was established, city ordinances have changed. Citizen advisory committees are now established by resolution, with a minimum of five members, and no more than nine. Committees are recommending bodies, and projects and expenditures would be voted on by the City Council.

Included in the packet was Resolution R2026-14, establishing the Historical Preservation, Arts and Culture Citizen Advisory Committee. One purpose of the original commission was to meet a specific requirement to be eligible for certain grants. The wording from the original commission modeled by the state was left essentially unchanged with language added to include arts and culture. Attorney Steve Doxey reviewed the new resolution. We will have another resolution to appoint the committee members in the future. The packet included redline and clean versions of the resolution.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Review and approve Resolution R2026-14 establishing the Historical Preservation, Arts and Culture Citizen Advisory Committee.

Council members mentioned the following:

- The committee could help identify and propose properties to be on the historical register.
- Residents have amazing stories and photos that should be preserved.
- A resident suggested that the old monument in the cemetery be restored and have appropriate names added.
- The Daughters of the Utah Pioneers (DUP) are a great resource.

**Motion:** Jessica Smuin moved to approve Resolution R2026-14 establishing the Historical Preservation, Arts and Culture Citizen Advisory Committee. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. There were 5 yes votes and 0 no votes, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Excused</u>
Sarah Blackwell		
Chrissy Hannemann		
Brent Rummler		
Jessica Smuin		
Andrew Young		

**VI. STAFF REPORTS**

Shane Sorensen reported that Cody Smith and the rodeo committee are arranging for a PI retention basin to be moved out of the parking area. They are also working with volunteers to increase the size and accessibility of the announcer stand.

Trees at Creekside and Burgess Parks have been trimmed for the spring season.

Fire station – With the design and other elements decided, the overall cost for the fire station is higher than SIRQ’s early estimate. They are working on additional value engineering and staff will bring a list of options to the council in a few weeks. We want to keep the project moving forward to stay on schedule.

There will be an LPPSD meeting tomorrow morning (Wednesday) at 7:30 am. The water information meeting for residents will be at City Hall tomorrow evening.

Staff held a kickoff meeting for the Parks Master Plan last Thursday, where they discussed the public involvement process. More information will be brought to the council.

We have received several new subdivisions recently: Smooth Canyon Plat B, the Page property, and the area below the Healey Well which was previously owned by the Church.

## VII. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

Brent Rummler reported that LPPSD is working on their budget for 2027. It has been 12 years since the police department requested additional officers, and they are proposing a sergeant position and a patrol officer. The fire department may need 10 firefighters instead of the nine previously requested so they can have four at each station. The Board requested historical data from the police and fire departments so they could analyze the number of incidents and the increased workload.

**Motion:** Jessica Smuin moved to extend the meeting to 9:45 pm. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. There were 4 yes votes and one no vote (Andrew Young). The motion passed.

Mayor Carla Merrill reminded the council of the water information meeting tomorrow evening at City Hall beginning at 7:00 pm. Members of the Water Committee and staff will be there to answer questions and help residents sign up for the Eye on Water app.

Alta Bank has pledged a donation as part of the fire station remodel for the Alta Bank Community Room.

Mayor Merrill is working with Shane Sorensen on an application through Congressman Mike Kennedy's office for the upsizing of our culinary water tank to 1.5 million gallons. The application is due tomorrow, and the maximum grant is \$3M. The project is expected to cost \$6.9M. Shane is also working on a federal grant for the Heritage Hills Well connected to drought mitigation.

Sarah Blackwell referenced Jen Wadsworth's proposal during public comment at the last City Council meeting. Jen requested a community neighborhood ambassador team to improve communication between the city and the residents. The idea is to divide the city into ten zones and have each council member be responsible for two zones. This would facilitate sharing information about agenda items that are relevant to certain areas and help council members understand residents' concerns. Sarah asked the council to think about the proposal, and she will reach out for feedback.

Chrissy Hannemann said the Sculpture Garden Committee is moving forward and has made a short video that council members may view. Mayor Merrill asked Chrissy to help with the Alpine City Legacy Foundation, which is a non-profit organization. She has been looking into the donation history and thinks we could ramp this up with more exposure. Some residents are passionate about history and cultural arts, and they also appreciate tax write-offs. After donations are made to the foundation they are forwarded to the city for projects. She will provide more details at a future meeting.

Chrissy said it is helpful to have council members attend the Mountainville Academy Board meetings in person. She reminded everyone of the March 26<sup>th</sup> MVA Board meeting and will send out the details.

She also reminded the council of the Utah League of Cities and Towns Conference on April 22-24.

Chrissy reported that community library now has a permanent home as the building and the land have been donated to them. They want to grow from a children's library to a full library and expand their services.

**Motion:** Sarah Blackwell moved to extend the meeting to 9:50 pm. Jessica Smuin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Andrew Young reported that Smooth Canyon Park is being used as a dog park, and there has been a dog bite incident. Neighbors would like signs requiring dogs to be on a leash.

Andrew said he is trying to find out who owns the land discussed at the last meeting as the Alpine Highway Easement. He asked about the process when the city researched ownership on a trail recently.

Shane Sorensen said there was a council motion regarding that.

Andrew said he thinks Alpine City owns it because the city park is at the end of the lane. Ownership of the lane is not clear now, but at the request of the resident next to the lane Andrew would like to install a sign that prohibits through traffic. The sign would be on private property.

Shane Sorensen said on the question of city ownership, the city-owned extension of Allegheny Way has been there for about 15 years, and the narrow gap existed long before that.

Andrew reported that the Trails Committee would like an ordinance that allows them to install signs prohibiting motorized vehicles. He will save his other reports for a future meeting.

**Motion:** Jessica Smuin moved to adjourn the meeting. Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting ended at 9:49 pm.