MINUTES OF THE COMBINED WORK MEETING OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY COUNCIL AND GRANTSVILLE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON APRIL 14, 2026 AT THE GRANTSVILLE CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 429 EAST MAIN STREET, GRANTSVILLE, UTAH AND ELECTRONICALLY VIA ZOOM. THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.

Mayor and Council Members Present:
Mayor Hammond
Rhett Butler
Derek Dalton
Brittany Skinner
Jeff Williams *joined at 7:15 pm*

Council Members Excused: Jake Thomas

Planning Commissioners Present:
Chair Sarah Moore
Gary Merrill
Cameron Moulton
Jason Hill
John Montgomery

Planning Commissioners Excused: Christopher Horrocks.

Appointed Officers and Employees Present:
Michael Resare, City Manager
Alicia Fairbourne, City Recorder
Tysen Barker, City Attorney
Christy Montierth, Public Works Director
Bill Cobabe, Comm. Development Director
Aspen Clegg, Finance Director
Shelby Moore, Planning and Zoning
Ben Henderson, Roads Supervisor
Barry Bunderson, City Engineer

Citizens and Guests Present or on Zoom: Robert Rousselle (Ensign Engineering), Micklane Farmer (Jones & DeMille Engineering), Mario Meno, and others who may not have signed in or used their full name via Zoom.

Mayor Hammond called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA:

1. **Presentation and Discussion: Discussion regarding the Grantsville City Master Transportation Plan, including current conditions, future transportation needs, and potential improvements.** ***No formal action will be taken.***

   The Council and Planning Commission received a presentation from Micklane Farmer of Jones & DeMille Engineering regarding the Grantsville City Master Transportation Plan. The presentation included an overview of current roadway conditions, projected traffic volumes, and future transportation needs based on anticipated growth. Mr. Farmer explained that traffic modeling indicated most roadways could function with three lanes or less, though several corridors were currently planned as five-lane arterials with wider right-of-way widths.

   Discussion focused on whether to maintain these wider right-of-way corridors or reduce them to better align with projected demand. Staff advised that preserving additional right-of-way would allow for future expansion without requiring property acquisition or eminent domain. However, it was also noted that requiring more right-of-way than justified could create legal risk and potential obligations to compensate property owners.

Councilmember and Planning Commission discussion included the long-term implications of roadway width decisions, including maintenance costs, setbacks tied to right-of-way, and the importance of planning for future growth. Community Development Director Bill Cobabe recommended maintaining wider corridors where possible to preserve flexibility for future expansion, noting that previous planning decisions had allowed Main Street to accommodate current traffic demands. Other members expressed concern about maintaining unused right-of-way areas and the associated upkeep.

Specific roadway segments were reviewed, including Main Street, Depot Road, and developing areas on the west bench. The group discussed the importance of ensuring adequate north-south connectivity and planning for future development areas that are not yet built out. Mayor Hammond asked clarifying questions regarding existing and future development locations to better understand how the proposed road network would serve those areas.

Significant discussion occurred regarding the proposed alignment of 33rd Parkway and its connection to State Route 112. Mr. Farmer and staff outlined multiple alignment options, including connections through or around the Lakeview Business Park and potential ties to Durfee Street or Nygreen Street. Staff explained that existing development agreements anticipated the roadway along the north side of the business park, while current right-of-way ownership and rail infrastructure created design constraints.

Councilmembers and Planning Commission members discussed the challenges of aligning intersections, particularly at Durfee Street and State Route 112, and the need to meet UDOT requirements for safe intersection design. The consultant indicated that connecting the roadway to Nygreen Street would provide better overall traffic flow and connectivity through the City, while also reducing impacts to existing residential areas. Additional discussion included the presence of rail crossings, long-term plans for grade separation, and the importance of maintaining an effective east-west corridor to alleviate congestion on State Route 138 and Main Street.

Mayor Hammond and other members noted that without an additional east-west connection, traffic congestion would continue to increase on existing routes. Discussion also addressed the balance between engineering recommendations, property constraints, and political considerations associated with roadway alignment decisions.

2. **Presentation and Discussion: Discussion of proposed amendments to the Parks and Transportation Capital Facilities Plans (CFPs), Impact Fee Facilities Plans (IFFPs), and Impact Fee Analyses (IFAs) for Grantsville City.** ***No formal action will be taken.***

Following the transportation discussion, the Council and Planning Commission received a presentation from Robert Rousselle of Ensign Engineering regarding proposed amendments to the Capital Facilities Plans (CFPs), Impact Fee Facilities Plans (IFFPs), and Impact Fee Analyses (IFAs) for water, wastewater, parks, public safety, and other infrastructure systems.

Mr. Rousselle explained that the plans are updated annually and are based on projected growth, level of service standards, and anticipated infrastructure needs over a ten-year planning period. He reviewed updated demographic projections, noting that growth rates had been slightly reduced from prior estimates, and explained how those projections were used to determine required capital improvements.

The presentation included a review of planned infrastructure projects across multiple service areas, including water system expansions, wastewater treatment and collection improvements, park development projects, and public safety facilities. Mr. Rousselle explained how impact fee eligible costs are calculated and clarified that developer-funded projects are not included in impact fee calculations.

Discussion included changes to impact fee calculations based on updated data. For public safety, Mr. Rousselle explained that fees were recalculated using police call data, which resulted in lower impact fees for single-family residential units and higher fees for multi-family and non-residential uses. For parks, project timelines were adjusted to maintain positive fund balances. For wastewater, impact fees increased slightly due to planned system improvements, including interceptor upgrades and treatment facility capacity needs.

Councilmember and Planning Commission members asked questions regarding how impact fees are set and whether the City should consider higher fees to create additional financial buffers. Mr. Rousselle explained that impact fees must be based on documented need and proportionate to growth, and that setting fees too high could result in legal challenges. Mr. Cobabe added that impact fees are heavily regulated and must be supported by defensible data, noting that excessive fees could be challenged by developers.

Additional discussion addressed how impact fees compare to other municipalities, how they are applied to different types of development, and the role of fee waivers or incentives in economic development. Members also discussed the flexibility of the plans, noting that impact fees and capital improvement plans are updated regularly to reflect changing conditions.

At 8:24 p.m., there was a brief recess.

The meeting reconvened at 8:30 p.m.

The presentation resumed and additional questions were addressed by staff and the consultant.

The meeting concluded following discussion, with no formal action taken.

3. Adjourn

There being no further discussion, Mayor Hammond asked for a motion to adjourn.

Motion: Councilmember Dalton moved to adjourn.

Second: Councilmember Williams seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, “Aye”; Councilmember Dalton, “Aye”; Councilmember Skinner, “Aye”; Councilmember Thomas, Absent; Councilmember Williams, “Aye”. There were none opposed. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.