MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING OF THE GRANTSVILLE CITY COUNCIL, HELD ON APRIL 15TH, 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
Jake Thomas
Jeff Williams

Council Members Excused: none.

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
Barry Bundersen, City Engineer
Aspen Clegg, Finance Director
Police Chief Robert Sager
Ben Henderson, Roads Supervisor
Fire Chief Jason Remick
Markus Seat, Deputy Public Works Director

Citizens and Guests Present or on Zoom: Brian White, Les Peterson, Chad Hambree, Ryan Noble, Daniel Meza, Angelyn Kemp, Spencer Reynolds, Don Rivera, and others who may not have signed in or used their full name via Zoom.

Mayor Hammond called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked Les Peterson to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA:

1. **Public Comment**

   Mayor Hammond opened the floor for public comment at 7:01 p.m. There were none. The floor was closed.

2. **Summary Action Items:**

   a. **Approval of Minutes from the April 1st, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting**

   The minutes from the April 1, 2026 City Council meeting were not ready to be presented.

   b. **Approval of bills**

   Councilmember Thomas asked for clarification regarding a cemetery expense listed for underlayment. Staff explained that the material was a thick rubber weed barrier that would be installed beneath the fence liner. No additional questions or concerns were raised regarding the bills.

   Motion: Councilmember Thomas moved to approve the invoices.

Second: Councilmember Butler seconded the motion.

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

3. Consideration of Resolution 2026-24 approving the appointment of Candy Swallom to the Grantsville City Library Board

Councilmember Butler stated that both individuals being considered for appointment to the Library Board had been attending Library Board meetings as citizens in order to learn the process prior to council approval. He noted that they had made an extra effort to support the Library Board. Mayor Hammond thanked Councilmember Butler, who served as the council representative on the Library Board, for the update.

Motion: Councilmember Butler moved to approve Resolution 2026-25 approving the appointment of Candy Swallom to the Grantsville City Library Board.

Second: Councilmember Williams seconded the motion.

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

4. Consideration of Resolution 2026-25 approving the appointment of Camille Coons to the Grantsville City Library Board

Motion: Councilmember Williams moved to approve Resolution 2026-25 approving the appointment of Camille Coons to the Grantsville City Library Board.

Second: Councilmember Dalton seconded the motion.

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

5. Consideration of Resolution 2026-26 approving the Memorandum of Understanding with the Inland Port Authority

Stephanie Pack with the Utah Inland Port Authority presented the proposed Memorandum of Understanding regarding sales tax revenue within inland port project areas located in Grantsville City. Ms. Pack explained that the agreement would allow any sales tax collected by the Inland Port Authority within the project areas to be remitted back to Grantsville City. She stated that the project areas were anticipated to be primarily industrial, though future retail development could generate sales tax revenue subject to the agreement.

Councilmember Thomas confirmed that the agreement would apply to all Inland Port project area locations within the city boundaries. Mayor Hammond identified the areas as including the Broken Arrow site, the Romney property, and Robert Green's property. Councilmember Butler noted that the council had previously discussed the matter in detail during a February meeting.

Councilmember Dalton asked why the agreement did not specify a percentage for sales tax revenue sharing. Ms. Pack explained that sales tax distributions differed from property tax increment distributions and stated that the Inland Port Authority intended to remit its full sales tax portion back to the city. City Manager Michael Resare clarified that property tax arrangements would vary depending on each individual development and would be addressed separately through future agreements, while the current MOU focused solely on ensuring sales tax pass-throughs for all project areas.

Councilmember Thomas asked about the monthly reporting process and auditing procedures. Ms. Pack explained that sales tax collections occurred monthly and that the city would receive monthly reports and remittances. She stated that the Inland Port Authority was working with the Utah State Tax Commission to potentially automate the process while still complying with statutory auditing requirements.

Councilmember Butler asked whether the MOU could include language acknowledging that future property tax negotiations could occur through interlocal agreements. Ms. Pack stated that the request was appropriate and explained that property tax arrangements in other communities had been addressed through separate interlocal agreements. City Attorney Tysen Barker summarized the proposed language, stating that the MOU could clarify that future property tax negotiations would occur through interlocal agreements if needed. Mayor Hammond stated that including the language would help future councils and staff understand the process. Ms. Pack agreed that such language would be appropriate. Mr. Barker stated that he could draft the additional language and coordinate with staff without requiring the matter to return to the council.

Councilmember Dalton asked about provisions regarding jurisdiction and limitations of liability contained within the agreement. Mr. Barker explained that Salt Lake County jurisdiction was acceptable because matters within the Third District Court system could still be handled there even if filed in Tooele County. He also explained that the limitation of liability provision waived indirect or consequential damages but did not waive the city's ability to recover direct damages.

Councilmember Williams asked for additional information regarding the Inland Port Authority's involvement in residential development projects. Ms. Pack explained that residential components had been included in some rural project areas at the request of local communities in order to support workforce housing needs associated with industrial development. She stated that the Inland Port Authority followed the direction of participating communities and remained sensitive to impacts on taxing entities, including cities, counties, and school districts.

Councilmember Dalton asked what would occur if the agreement were terminated in the future. Ms. Pack explained that sales tax revenues would continue to flow monthly to the city under the agreement, but if the agreement were dissolved, the Inland Port Authority would retain and use the revenue for statutorily authorized infrastructure-related purposes within the project area. She further explained that project areas had a statutory life of 25 years unless dissolved earlier.

Motion: Councilmember Butler moved to approve Resolution 2026-26 approving the Memorandum of Understanding with the Inland Port Authority with the addition of a clause after #3 with a heading of Property Tax, and having the City Attorney draft the paragraph and approve with staff prior to execution of the contract.

Second: Councilmember Williams seconded the motion.

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

6. Public Hearing Item: Discussion and consideration of adopting Resolution 2026-22 approving the expenditure of Class C Road Funds for road department equipment

Road Department Supervisor Ben Henderson presented a proposal for the purchase of road maintenance equipment using Class C Road Funds. Mr. Henderson provided an overview of his professional background in asphalt maintenance, preservation, and public works operations. He explained that the proposed equipment purchases were intended to improve the city's ability to maintain roads in-house, extend roadway life, and reduce long-term repair costs. He stated that the city was currently behind on preventative maintenance efforts but could improve roadway conditions through crack sealing, mastic repairs, chip sealing, reclamation work, and related preservation methods.

Mr. Henderson reviewed several proposed equipment purchases, including a crack seal machine, mastic machine, chip seal truck, pneumatic roller, street sweeper, asphalt zipper, water truck, skid steer with grading capabilities, replacement dump truck, pickup trucks, trailer, and sign installation equipment. He discussed estimated return-on-investment calculations for each item and explained that performing work in-house would significantly reduce costs compared to contracting the work out. He also described various road preservation techniques and provided examples of similar projects completed during his prior employment with other municipalities and counties.

Councilmembers asked questions regarding staffing, long-term maintenance planning, road repair methods, succession planning within the department, contractor costs, and equipment storage. Mr. Henderson stated that he intended to train staff for long-term continuity and explained that most projects could be completed with existing staffing levels through proper planning and scheduling. Mr. Resare added that seasonal employees could potentially assist with some road maintenance operations during peak periods.

At 7:54 p.m., Mayor Hammond opened the floor for public comments regarding the proposed expenditure of Class C Road Funds. No public comments were made, and the public hearing was closed.

Finance Director Aspen Clegg explained that the city currently had approximately $4.8 million in restricted Class C Road Funds available as of March 31, 2026. She stated that the funds were distributed by the state based on fuel tax revenues, population, and road mileage, and that state law restricted the use of those funds solely for road-related purposes, including qualifying road maintenance equipment purchases. Ms. Clegg clarified that the funds could not be transferred to unrelated city projects or borrowed for other purposes and noted that the city's annual audit process required proof that the funds remained restricted or were spent on qualifying road-related expenditures.

Councilmember Skinner asked whether sufficient funds would remain available after the proposed purchases. Ms. Clegg stated that approximately $1.7 million would remain in the account after the proposed expenditures and noted that the city also continued receiving annual Class C allocations. Mayor Hammond and staff emphasized that performing roadway maintenance in-house would allow the city to complete substantially more road work compared to hiring outside contractors.

Councilmember Butler asked whether the city had previously underutilized the Class C Road Funds. Public Works Director Christy Montierth stated that prior staffing and equipment limitations prevented the city from performing the level of maintenance now being proposed and explained that most work had historically been contracted out. Councilmember Thomas emphasized the importance of roadway preservation and preventative maintenance and expressed support for the department's long-term maintenance strategy while encouraging fiscal responsibility regarding equipment purchases.

Councilmember Dalton asked questions regarding equipment costs, warranties, replacement planning, return-on-investment calculations, and whether all equipment needed to be purchased immediately. Mr. Henderson and Ms. Clegg explained that the estimates presented reflected worst-case pricing assumptions and that staff would continue seeking the most cost-effective options, including state contract pricing, used equipment, and demo equipment when appropriate. Mr. Henderson stated that some equipment would require extended manufacturing and delivery timelines and could be phased as needed.

Councilmember Butler requested that staff provide future reports to the council regarding equipment purchases, project progress, and estimated savings achieved through in-house road maintenance work. Mayor Hammond agreed and requested that future updates include information regarding completed projects, roadway mileage improved, and estimated cost savings compared to contractor pricing.

Councilmember Williams expressed concern regarding the quality of some previously constructed roads within the city and asked about roadway inspection standards. Staff explained that the city had improved inspection practices in recent years and noted that some roadway issues were tied to utility infrastructure failures beneath the roads rather than solely roadway construction quality.

Mayor Hammond thanked Mr. Henderson, Ms. Clegg, Mr. Resare, and staff for the presentation and information provided regarding the proposed equipment purchases and roadway maintenance program.

Motion: Councilmember Butler moved to approve Resolution 2026-22 approving the expenditure of Class C Road Funds for road department equipment.

Second: Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Nay"; Councilmember Skinner, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". The motion carried 4-1.

7. **Public Hearing Item: Discussion and consideration of Ordinance 2026-16 approving and adopting an updated Annexation Policy Plan; repealing and replacing the prior Annexation Policy Plans; and providing for an effective date**

Bill Cobabe presented the proposed updated Annexation Policy Plan and explained that the item had previously been reviewed by the council but was being brought back to satisfy updated noticing requirements under state law. Mr. Cobabe explained that the annexation policy plan served as a guiding document for future annexation considerations involving unincorporated areas surrounding Grantsville City. He stated that the plan identified areas designated for possible future annexation consideration and clarified that the plan did not obligate the city to annex property or construct infrastructure improvements. He explained that future annexations would require developers or property owners to connect to existing city systems and provide necessary water shares and infrastructure improvements as part of the annexation process.

Mr. Cobabe further stated that the annexation policy plan helped establish the city's future planning boundaries and provided Grantsville City with priority consideration regarding annexation discussions involving adjacent municipalities. He noted that the Planning Commission had recommended approval of the updated annexation policy plan.

At 8:38 p.m., Mayor Hammond opened the public hearing for comments regarding the proposed annexation policy plan. No public comments were received, including from those participating online, and the public hearing was closed.

Councilmember Skinner confirmed that the document being considered was the same version previously reviewed by the council and that the item had only been delayed to complete the required public noticing process. City Attorney Tysen Barker stated that adopting the annexation policy plan was required by state code and explained that the plan benefited the city by preserving future annexation opportunities without creating binding obligations. Mr. Barker clarified that property owners within the identified annexation areas would still be required to complete the normal annexation review process, including Planning Commission and City Council review, and could also be required to enter into annexation agreements with the city prior to approval.

Motion: Councilmember Dalton moved to approve Ordinance 2026-16 approving and adopting an updated Annexation Policy Plan; repealing and replacing the prior Annexation Policy Plans; and providing for an effective date.

Second: Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion.

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

8. **Consideration of Resolution 2026-23 approving the purchase of a sewer Vactor truck and authorizing partial funding and financing**

Public Works Director Christy Montierth and Deputy Public Works Director Markus Seat presented a proposal to purchase a sewer vacuum truck with partial funding from the current sewer budget and financing for the remaining balance. Mr. Seat explained that the city currently budgeted approximately $90,000 annually for contracted sewer cleaning services, which only covered a portion of the city's approximately 90 miles of sewer system. He noted that the city currently owned an older jet rodding unit from the early 1990s that lacked vacuum capabilities, making it less effective because debris could not be removed from the sewer system during cleaning operations.

Mr. Seat explained that the proposed vacuum truck would allow the city to clean sewer lines internally by removing grease, sludge, gravel, and other debris from the system. He stated that the truck would also be capable of cleaning storm drains and performing hydro excavation work for utility projects. Mr. Seat noted that the city currently maintained approximately 1,600 manholes and emphasized the importance of regular sewer cleaning in preventing costly sewer backups and emergency situations.

Councilmember Butler asked whether sewer backups had previously occurred within the city. Mr. Seat acknowledged that backups had occurred and stated that the proposed equipment would improve the city's ability to respond quickly and reduce reliance on outside contractors for emergency services. He noted that emergency contractor callouts could cost between $5,000 and $10,000 per incident and that response times were dependent on contractor availability.

Councilmember Thomas asked about the truck's capabilities, including hydro excavation and storm drain cleaning functions. Mr. Seat explained that the truck would primarily be used for sewer and storm drain maintenance and clarified that cross-contamination concerns limited its use for water system cleaning operations. He also explained that the truck would provide sufficient vacuum power to clean deeper sewer infrastructure, including lift stations.

Councilmember Butler asked whether the department had the expertise necessary to operate the equipment. Mr. Seat confirmed that personnel had experience working with similar equipment and stated that additional training would continue after purchase. Ms. Montierth added that no immediate additional staffing would be required for operation of the truck, though an additional employee would eventually be needed once the new wastewater treatment plant became operational.

Ms. Montierth and Mr. Seat stated that they had researched multiple vacuum truck manufacturers and visited several municipalities, including Riverton, Eagle Mountain, Salt Lake City, Spanish Fork, Harrisville, and Tooele, to evaluate equipment and gather recommendations from operators. Mr. Seat explained that the proposed truck had been selected based on operational needs, durability, and overall performance. Ms. Clegg further noted that the selected manufacturer was available through a state contract purchasing program and that the truck would include a five-year warranty on the vacuum equipment.

Councilmember Skinner clarified the proposed financing structure. Ms. Montierth explained that approximately $100,000 from the existing sewer budget would be used as a down payment, while the remaining balance would be financed over approximately five to seven years. She further explained that the annual sewer cleaning budget currently paid to outside contractors would instead be redirected toward loan payments for the new truck.

Councilmember Butler asked about potential liability and insurance concerns associated with city staff operating the equipment rather than outside contractors. Finance Director Aspen Clegg explained that the city's existing insurance policies, including vehicle and general liability coverage through the Utah Local Government Trust, would apply to the equipment and operations. Councilmember Butler commented that proactively removing sewer debris would likely reduce overall liability risks.

Councilmember Dalton asked whether additional suppliers and pricing options had been reviewed. Mr. Seat confirmed that several manufacturers had been evaluated and explained that although one lower-priced option had been identified, it was a smaller-capacity truck that would not meet the city's operational needs as effectively. He further explained that the selected truck provided a larger debris capacity and operational efficiencies that justified the additional cost.

Motion: Councilmember Thomas moved to approve Resolution 2026-23 approving the purchase of a sewer Vactor truck and authorizing partial funding and financing.

Second: Councilmember Butler seconded the motion.

Vote: The vote was as follows: Councilmember Butler, "Aye"; Councilmember Dalton, "Nay"; Councilmember Skinner, "Aye"; Councilmember Thomas "Aye"; Councilmember Williams, "Aye". The motion carried 4-1.

9. Consideration of Resolution 2026-21 approving the surplus of a decommissioned police department vehicle

Chief Sager presented a request to declare a decommissioned Police Department vehicle as surplus. He explained that the vehicle had been in the city's fleet since 2018 and had just under 100,000 miles. Chief Sager stated that the vehicle had developed mechanical issues that staff determined were not cost effective to repair. He noted that two vehicles had been evaluated for replacement, but one had been reassigned to Code Enforcement for part-time use, while the second vehicle was recommended for surplus.

Councilmember Thomas asked about the police vehicle decommissioning process. Chief Sager explained that the department evaluated patrol vehicles annually during the budget process and monitored wear, mileage, and maintenance needs. He stated that patrol vehicles generally experienced more wear due to emergency response use and were typically replaced within five to six years, while investigative or administrative vehicles could remain in service longer due to lighter use. Chief Sager further explained that once replacement vehicles became operational, usable equipment from the older vehicles was removed and transferred to new vehicles when possible.

Mr. Resare stated that once approved as surplus, the vehicle would be sold through a public auction website. Chief Sager noted that staff anticipated the vehicle would sell for approximately $10,000 to $15,000 depending on market conditions. Councilmember Skinner commented that the proceeds could help offset equipment costs associated with the sewer vacuum truck purchase. Chief Sager stated that the proceeds would return to the general fund unless otherwise allocated.

Motion: Councilmember Thomas moved to approve Resolution 2026-21 approving the surplus of a decommissioned police department vehicle.

Second: Councilmember Skinner seconded the motion.

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

10. Presentation of a concept plan for the Sun Sage Terrace Subdivision Phases 4 - 6

A concept plan was presented for Sun Sage Terrace Subdivision Phases 4 through 6. Mayor Hammond reminded those present that the item was for presentation and discussion purposes only and that no action would be taken by the council.

The applicant explained that staff had worked with the developer for several months to revise the concept plan in response to roadway and connectivity requirements. The applicant stated that the city required construction of the full width of a 90-foot collector road along the western portion of the property rather than requiring only a half-width road section adjacent to neighboring properties. The applicant explained that the wider roadway and additional connectivity requirements to the north reduced the total number of developable lots.

The applicant requested flexibility regarding several lots that would be slightly smaller than the required half-acre minimum lot size. He stated that the lots in question would still be approximately 20,000 square feet in size and that the overall development density would remain consistent with half-acre zoning standards. The applicant explained that the request was intended to preserve a minimum total of 128 lots after accounting for the roadway and infrastructure requirements.

The applicant also identified approximately 7.8 acres of proposed open space to be maintained by a homeowners association, including drainage areas and a planned walking trail near Apple Mill Road.

Mayor Hammond asked whether the requested lot count represented an increase in density. The applicant stated that the proposal did not increase overall density and was intended only to offset lots lost due to roadway requirements and connectivity improvements.

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe discussed the proposed roadway network and future connectivity with surrounding developments, including the future Nygren Loop arterial roadway and connections to the Mack Canyon subdivision area. Mr. Cobabe explained that existing residential properties along the northern boundary influenced the roadway alignment and stated that requiring the developer to construct the full road width avoided placing roadway impacts onto existing neighboring properties.

Mr. Cobabe stated that the developer had been cooperative throughout the review process and responsive to staff concerns and requested modifications. He explained that staff’s primary concern involved the requested reduction in minimum lot sizes and stated that the matter would likely require a master development agreement to formally establish the approved layout and lot configuration while preserving the city’s interests and the developer’s entitlements.

Councilmember Dalton asked whether additional lot adjustments could reduce the roadway jog near Main Street. The applicant indicated a willingness to explore additional modifications provided the changes did not delay previously approved phases of the subdivision. Mr. Cobabe explained that while some aesthetic improvements could potentially be made to the roadway alignment, the current configuration did not create significant operational concerns.

Councilmember Butler reminded the council that the developer had previously presented a higher-density proposal for the property and stated that the current concept reflected prior direction from the City Council, Planning Commission, and neighboring residents to pursue larger half-acre style lots with additional open space. Councilmember Skinner noted that the proposed lots being discussed were still approximately 20,000 square feet and only slightly smaller than the standard half-acre requirement.

The applicant stated that he was seeking preliminary feedback from the council before investing additional resources into engineering and final design work. Mr. Resare noted that the developer would be responsible for construction of the full width of Nygren Loop, which significantly impacted the project layout and lot count. The applicant also explained that no lots would front directly onto Main Street or Nygren Loop, which further reduced developable lot opportunities.

Mayor Hammond and councilmembers asked additional questions regarding roadway widths, future build-out of Main Street, access points, and surrounding subdivision connections. The applicant explained that only half of the Main Street roadway width would be constructed by the development, while the full width of Nygren Loop would be required.

Councilmember Thomas expressed interest in additional details regarding the proposed open space and trail system connectivity. The applicant and staff explained that a trail network had previously been incorporated into earlier concept revisions and that the current intent was to route trails through the drainage corridor and open space areas rather than between residential lots. Staff stated that the trail system would ultimately connect through the open space areas and provide future connectivity toward the Mack Canyon subdivision area.

Councilmember Butler noted that the distance between the development and the Mack Canyon subdivision was greater than initially perceived and emphasized that the proposal avoided taking property impacts from existing neighboring residents. Councilmember Dalton stated that although the process had been lengthy and occasionally frustrating, he believed the proposal represented an appropriate compromise that allowed the city to obtain needed roadway improvements while limiting the requested lot size reduction to approximately five percent. Councilmember Butler further noted that the overall density of the project was not increasing despite the requested lot size adjustments.

The applicant stated that if the council was generally supportive of the concept, he would proceed with preparation of a master development agreement and future formal applications for review.

11. Discussion and Council direction of the Townhomes on Willow sidewalks

Community Development Director Bill Cobabe introduced a discussion regarding sidewalk, curb, gutter, and roadway improvements associated with the Townhomes on Willow development. Mr. Cobabe thanked the developer, Shawn Holste, for his patience and willingness to work with staff and neighboring property owners while the city evaluated possible roadway and sidewalk modifications.

City Engineer Barry Bunderson reviewed the existing and proposed conditions along Willow Street between Durfee Street and Main Street. Mr. Bunderson explained that Willow Street was identified as a collector road within the city's transportation planning documents and that the approved

Townhomes on Willow development included conditions requiring the sidewalk to be constructed along the west right-of-way boundary. He stated that because the sidewalk alignment and roadway improvements were specifically included within the approved development plans and resolution, staff did not believe they could make substantial modifications without additional council direction.

Mr. Bunderson reviewed roadway cross-sections, drainage considerations, curb and gutter options, sidewalk placement, and future transportation planning for the corridor. He explained that staff had analyzed the possibility of using a modified mountable curb rather than the city's standard high-back curb but determined that the modified curb reduced stormwater conveyance capacity and provided only minimal elevation differences for driveway transitions. He further explained that the park strip area was necessary to provide elevation transition between the roadway and sidewalk while maintaining drainage within the public right-of-way.

Mr. Bunderson stated that the current transportation plan anticipated Willow Street eventually functioning as a three-lane collector roadway with one lane in each direction and a center turn lane. He explained that the proposed roadway design fit within the existing 60-foot right-of-way and that the Townhomes on Willow frontage included an additional three feet of width to accommodate the city's current roadway standards. He clarified that the additional width primarily affected the park strip rather than the roadway travel lanes themselves.

Councilmembers discussed concerns regarding roadway width, traffic speeds, pedestrian safety near the elementary school, driveway elevations, drainage impacts, and the potential future widening of Willow Street. Councilmember Dalton expressed concern regarding widening the roadway beyond its current configuration and stated that narrower roads often reduced vehicle speeds and better reflected the existing character of Willow Street. Councilmember Thomas stated that maintaining adequate roadway width for future traffic flow and turning movements remained important, particularly given anticipated growth and additional townhome traffic.

Residents and the developer discussed concerns regarding impacts to existing lawns, sprinklers, driveways, and front yard areas within the existing right-of-way. Residents expressed concern regarding steep driveway transitions and the visual impact of future roadway improvements. Mr. Bunderson explained that the approved plans already included driveway reconstruction and grading adjustments where necessary to provide proper transitions from the roadway to existing properties. He further stated that affected driveway repairs would be completed as part of the development improvements.

The developer stated that he wanted to ensure the project was completed correctly and expressed concern that future roadway widening could negatively impact neighboring residents. He stated that he believed maintaining a narrower roadway configuration would better match the existing character of Willow Street while still allowing installation of sidewalks, curb, gutter, and other safety improvements.

Councilmembers discussed whether additional field review would be helpful prior to making a final decision. Staff offered to stake and mark the existing right-of-way boundaries, future curb locations, roadway centerlines, and other reference points along Willow Street so councilmembers could better visualize the proposed improvements and their impacts on adjacent properties. Mayor Hammond and councilmembers agreed additional on-site review would be beneficial before providing final direction.

Mr. Bunderson stated that staff would coordinate additional field markings and site review opportunities for councilmembers prior to bringing the matter back for further discussion and direction at a future meeting.

12. Discussion of a utility assistance program

Mayor Hammond introduced discussion regarding a proposed utility assistance program and stated that Councilmember Dalton recommended postponing the item to a future meeting due to the late hour and concerns regarding the council's ability to give the matter proper attention. Councilmembers generally agreed that the discussion would be more productive at a future meeting.

Motion: Councilmember Dalton moved to continue the discussion of a utility assistance program to the May 6, 2026 meeting.

Second: Councilmember Butler seconded the motion.

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

13. Adjourn

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

Motion: Councilmember Williams moved to adjourn the meeting. There were none opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.