



EMIGRATION
CANYON

EMIGRATION CANYON CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP MEETING

APRIL 21, 2026, 7:00 PM

UNIFIED FIRE AUTHORITY STATION 119

5025 E. EMIGRATION CANYON ROAD, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84108

EMIGRATION CANYON CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES April 21, 2026

Council Members Present:

David Brems, Mayor
Nicholas Griffith, Council Member
Catherine Harris, Council Member
Jennifer Hawkes, Council Member
Robert Pinon, Council Member

Council Members Absent:

Staff Present:

Diana Baun, City Recorder
Sarah Leavitt, Deputy Recorder (via Zoom)
Tamaran Woodland, Assistant City Engineer
Cameron Platt, Legal Counsel

Others Present: Evan Tyrrell (WFWRD)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor David Brems, presiding, called the meeting to order at 6:10 PM and determined a quorum was present. He noted that Council Member Griffith was on his way and would be joining the meeting soon.

2. COUNCIL DISCUSSION TOPICS

A. Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling District Presentation

Evan Tyrrell from WFWRD reviewed his prepared presentation (included in the published meeting packet documents), an overview of waste and recycling services provided to Emigration Canyon residents. He explained that the district's service fees funded not only weekly trash and recycling collection but also additional programs including bulky waste disposal, landfill vouchers, container repair and replacement, seasonal Christmas tree and leaf collection programs, customer service operations, educational outreach, and billing management. He stated that Emigration Canyon residents also had access to subscription-based green waste and curbside glass recycling programs. Mr. Tyrrell reported that the district serviced 607 homes in Emigration Canyon and more than 86,000 households countywide. He explained that trash from the canyon was generally hauled to the Salt Lake Valley Transfer

EMIGRATION CANYON CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

MAYOR DAVID BREMS, COUNCIL MEMBER NICK GRIFFITH, COUNCIL MEMBER JENNIFER HAWKES,
COUNCIL MEMBER CATHERINE HARRIS, COUNCIL MEMBER ROBERT PINON

Station, recyclable materials were sent to Rocky Mountain Recycling, and green waste was transported for composting and redistribution.

Evan Tyrell reviewed operational data for 2025, including the number of service containers in Emigration Canyon and the total tonnage collected. He stated that the district serviced 592 recycling containers, 92 green waste subscriptions, and 60 curbside glass subscriptions within the community. He explained that approximately 890 tons of material were collected from Emigration Canyon during calendar year 2025. Mr. Tyrell also reviewed disposition costs, stating that disposal and recycling costs for Emigration Canyon totaled approximately \$33,000 in 2025. He explained that Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling operated entirely as an enterprise fund without relying on property taxes or sales tax revenue. He discussed districtwide cost comparisons and explained that the district continued to provide weekly recycling service while many other municipalities had moved to biweekly recycling collection.

Evan Tyrell discussed landfill vouchers available to residents and explained that residents could request one voucher per year through the district's website. Mayor David Brems asked how residents obtained the vouchers, and Mr. Tyrell explained the online request process and stated that vouchers included QR codes usable at disposal facilities. Mayor David Brems asked about acceptable materials and clarified that vouchers generally covered residential truckloads but excluded items such as tires, mattresses, refrigerators, and certain hazardous materials. Mr. Tyrell explained that refrigerators required special handling because of regulated refrigerants and stated that the district was developing new collection programs to better address appliance disposal. Mayor David Brems also asked about electronic waste disposal, and Mr. Tyrell explained that although Utah did not prohibit landfilling electronics, several county facilities accepted electronic waste free of charge.

An audience member asked what should be done with an old refrigerator. Evan Tyrell responded that a new appliance collection program was being developed and would soon provide additional options for residents. Mr. Tyrell then discussed recycling education materials and stated that new flyers and downloadable guides were being created to clarify proper recycling and green waste disposal practices. Council Member Nicholas Griffith requested that the materials be shared with the city, and Diana Baun confirmed that digital versions were already available and would be distributed.

Evan Tyrell reviewed district financial performance and stated that operational cost-saving initiatives had reduced projected expenditures substantially during the previous year. He explained that the district identified approximately \$1.82 million in savings during 2025 and had already identified an additional \$500,000 in savings for 2026. Mr. Tyrell stated that these efforts were intended to stabilize service rates while maintaining district operations and services.

Evan Tyrell then discussed changes to the district's bulky waste and trailer reservation program. He explained that the district had discontinued its fee-based trailer and container

rental program and shifted resources toward a seasonal bulky waste program focused primarily on densely populated valley communities. He stated that Emigration Canyon residents had received postcards regarding trailer reservations for May 2026 and explained that the district planned to provide up to three trailer reservations per day during the month of May, totaling approximately 57 reservations. Mr. Tyrell noted that this represented nearly 10% of households in Emigration Canyon. He explained that trailers would now be removed the following business day rather than remaining onsite for extended periods as in prior years.

Council Member Robert Pinon explained that Emigration Canyon also operated annual chipper days in partnership with Unified Fire Authority as part of the community's Firewise wildfire mitigation efforts. Council Member Catherine Harris elaborated that residents cleared brush and dead vegetation to improve defensible space and that Unified Fire Authority crews later chipped the materials. She explained that many residents previously used the district's trailers to remove chipped wood following the chipping operations. Harris expressed concern that limiting trailer availability to May would interfere with those wildfire mitigation efforts because chipping operations occurred later in the summer.

Mayor David Brems expressed concern that the revised trailer program would not adequately meet Emigration Canyon's wildfire mitigation needs and stated that additional trailers and improved access were necessary. Council Member Jennifer Hawkes stated that her household had attempted to reserve a trailer online but was informed that reservations were closed. Evan Tyrell explained that the reservation system had inadvertently closed automatically after several days, despite available reservations remaining. He stated that the system would reopen the following morning and confirmed that several reservation slots were still available.

Council Member Catherine Harris stated that trailer participation in Emigration Canyon had historically been very high and suggested that per-household participation may exceed that of many valley communities. Mayor David Brems reiterated that the current allocation would not adequately address wildfire fuel reduction needs in the canyon. Evan Tyrell acknowledged those concerns and stated that the district would revisit the issue with the board and city representatives to determine whether additional trailer opportunities could be provided later in the year. He noted that trailer resources were constrained by staffing and operational scheduling, but stated that the district remained open to adjustments and future improvements.

Council Member Nicholas Griffith stated that Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling provided significant cost savings and valuable services to the city compared to private operations. He thanked Evan Tyrell for revisiting the trailer issue and stated that the council would continue working collaboratively with the district to improve coordination with wildfire mitigation programs and chipper days.

Before concluding, Evan Tyrell briefly described a new year-round appliance and mattress collection program scheduled to begin in May. He explained that residents would be able to

request pickup services online for refrigerators, freezers, mattresses, and other large appliances. Mayor David Brems asked whether mattresses would incur additional fees, and Mr. Tyrell explained that the service would operate on a cost-recovery basis with both base pickup fees and per-item charges. An audience member asked about refrigerator disposal costs, and Mr. Tyrell confirmed that the estimated charge would be approximately \$55, consisting of a household pickup fee and a refrigerator disposal fee.

Council Member Nicholas Griffith joined the meeting during the presentation.

B. Road/Bike Signage

City Attorney Cameron Platt reviewed his document shared prior to the meeting (**Attachment A**) and the council discussed their opinions and options regarding signage throughout the canyon. Mr. Platt reviewed the legal and regulatory requirements for bicycle lane and no-parking signage within Emigration Canyon. He explained that he had previously distributed a summary memorandum to the council outlining the applicable standards for bicycle signage placement and spacing requirements. He stated that signage was required at the beginning and end of bike lane areas and no-parking zones, as well as at intervals generally ranging from every 200 to 300 feet depending on engineering analysis and roadway conditions. He explained that additional signage was typically required where there were interruptions, crossings, or transitions in the roadway.

Council Member Jennifer Hawkes asked whether crosswalks would qualify as roadway interruptions requiring additional signage, and Cameron Platt confirmed that they would. Council Member Catherine Harris stated that there were no specific state legislative mandates governing exact sign placement frequency, but noted that the city had adopted recommendations contained within the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Cameron Platt confirmed that the city followed those adopted standards and stated that the guidance materials he had distributed included examples of the applicable signage requirements. Diana Baun noted that copies of the materials were available for review during the meeting if desired.

Cameron Platt stated that after informally driving through the canyon, he believed the city generally performed well with bicycle lane signage but could potentially improve the amount of vertical signage in some areas. Mayor David Brems asked who held responsibility for determining sign placement, installing signs, and maintaining them. Cameron Platt responded that the engineering department was responsible for those determinations and deferred to Engineering Manager Tamaran Woodland regarding implementation and inspection. Tamaran Woodland stated that the city could add additional signage if requested by the council.

Council Member Catherine Harris commented that uphill bike lane signage appeared generally adequate, but downhill sections varied significantly because some areas lacked usable bike

lanes while other sections widened into proper bike lanes. She stated that improved signage would help clarify those changing conditions. Council Member Jennifer Hawkes added that some roadway areas lacked painted bicycle symbols entirely. Harris further explained that in several locations the shoulder narrowed substantially and did not function as a true bike lane before widening again shortly afterward.

Council Member Catherine Harris then asked about the city's roadway sweeping schedule and recalled prior discussions about more frequent sweeping during the previous summer. Mayor David Brems responded that the matter had been discussed through the Municipal Services District and stated that he was attempting to have the canyon roads swept every two weeks. He noted that conditions had recently been difficult while riding through the canyon. Council Member Catherine Harris responded that sweeping every two weeks might not be sufficient and stated that she had believed the roads previously had been swept weekly.

3. ADJOURN

The April 21, 2026 Emigration Canyon Council Workshop Meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM.

The April 21, 2026 City Council Workshop Meeting Minutes were Approved by the City Council on the 19th day of May 2026:

ATTEST:



Diana Baun, City Recorder


David Brems, Mayor

UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) applies the **Utah MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices)**, which aligns with the national **MUTCD 11th Edition** (and prior editions with updates) for bicycle signage on state highways and facilities. Utah Code treats bicycles as vehicles (§ 41-6a-1102) that must obey all traffic-control devices, and defines a bicycle lane as a designated portion of the roadway marked by striping, signage, pavement markings, or barriers for preferential or exclusive bicycle use (§ 41-6a-102). A traffic-control device may direct bicyclists to use an adjacent path instead of the roadway when available (§ 41-6a-1105). Signage follows uniform MUTCD standards; engineering judgment determines exact placement, spacing, and need based on safety studies, roadway design, and active transportation policies.

Common Practical Spacing Guidelines

The MUTCD does not specify a fixed distance for no-parking signs (R7 series, including R7-9/R7-9a for bike lanes). Spacing is determined by engineering judgment to ensure signs are visible and legible to drivers in time to comply, considering roadway speed, sight distance, traffic volume, and transitions between permitted and prohibited zones.

In practice, agencies commonly follow these guidelines:

- Install signs at the **beginning and end** of the prohibited section, with directional arrows or “BETWEEN SIGNS” plaques as needed to define boundaries.
- Repeat signs at **maximum intervals of 200–300 feet** (often ≤ 270 feet) in urban areas for standard R7 signs, based on typical letter height and legibility (roughly 1 inch of letter height per 30 feet of viewing distance).
- On higher-speed or rural sections, greater spacing may be appropriate, but the restriction must remain clear throughout.
- For **no-parking bike lane signs**, placement typically aligns with bike lane regulatory signs (R3-17 series), repeating after major intersections or at intervals sufficient to reinforce the restriction.

Signs are usually angled 30–45 degrees toward approaching traffic and supplemented with pavement markings where possible. Exact spacing is set during design or traffic studies to ensure enforceability.

General Signage Requirements (MUTCD Part 9, Chapter 9A)

All bicycle signs must follow standard MUTCD shapes, legends, colors, and designs. **Nonstandard or branding modifications** that alter designs to draw extra attention are prohibited if they reduce uniformity.

- **Retro-reflectivity:** All signs on bikeways (bicycle lanes, separated bikeways, shared-use paths) must be retroreflective.
- **Sizes:** Signs affecting both bicyclists and motorists use conventional road sizes (e.g., from Tables 2B-1, 2C-1). For bicycle-only or shared-use path applications, smaller minimum sizes apply (detailed in Table 9A-1); larger sizes are allowed (and often preferred) for visibility. Diamond warning signs for path use may be as small as 18" x 18".
- **Placement and Mounting:**
 - Roadway signs follow standard vertical mounting heights and lateral clearances.
 - On shared-use paths: Minimum 4 ft mounting height (bottom of sign to path surface); at least 2 ft lateral clearance from the path edge; at least 8 ft vertical clearance over the full path width. No part of the sign or support may encroach closer. Overhead signs on paths may need higher clearance for equestrians or maintenance vehicles.
 - Signs should avoid confusing other road users and must be maintained by a designated agency to command respect.

Here is an illustration of typical sign placement on shared-use paths (based on MUTCD Figure 9A-1 / prior 9B-1):



Regulatory Signs (MUTCD Chapter 9B)

These are the most common signs UDOT uses for bicycle facilities.

Bicycle Lane Signs (R3-17 series): Rectangular white sign with black legend and bicycle symbol. The main R3-17 BIKE LANE sign shows a white bicycle symbol above the words "BIKE LANE" in black capital letters on a white background with black border.



- Used only with marked bicycle lanes (in conjunction with pavement markings like bike symbols or "BIKE LANE" words with arrows).
- Placed at the beginning of the lane, in advance of the end, and at periodic intervals (spacing by engineering judgment, considering speed, intersections, and block length). Plaques include "AHEAD" (R3-17aP) and "ENDS" (R3-17bP).

BEGIN RIGHT TURN LANE YIELD TO BIKES (R4-4): Rectangular white sign with black text reading "BEGIN RIGHT TURN LANE" above a black arrow graphic, then "YIELD TO BIKES". It alerts motorists in a right-turn lane to yield to straight-through bicyclists.



Bicycles May Use Full Lane (R4-11, sometimes re-designated in later editions): Rectangular white sign with black text "BICYCLES MAY USE FULL LANE" and a bicycle symbol. Used on narrow roadways without bike lanes to indicate bicyclists may occupy the full travel lane for safety.

Bicycle WRONG WAY (R5-1b) with RIDE WITH TRAFFIC plaque (R9-3cP): The R5-1b is a rectangular sign with "WRONG WAY" and a bicycle symbol; paired with a smaller plaque saying "RIDE WITH TRAFFIC" to correct wrong-way riding.

No Parking BIKE LANE (R7-9 series): Enforces no parking/stopping in the bike lane (white sign with black text/symbol).

Other regulatory signs include "NO MOTOR VEHICLES" (R5-3), "NO BICYCLES" (R5-6), "YIELD TO PEDESTRIANS" (R9-6), bicycle signal actuation (R10-22), and "EXCEPT BICYCLES" plaques to exempt bikes from certain rules.

Warning Signs

Bicycle Warning (W11-1): Diamond-shaped yellow (or fluorescent yellow-green) sign with a black bicycle symbol. Warns motorists of bicycles ahead or crossing areas.



- Placed in advance of hazards or crossings. Other warnings include bicycle surface condition (W8-10 for bumps/grates), turn/curve (W1 series), or intersection warnings (W2 series).

Guide and Route Signs

Bicycle Route Guide (D11-1): Rectangular green sign with white border, white bicycle symbol above, and "BIKE ROUTE" in white capital letters below. Used for wayfinding on designated routes.



- May include auxiliary plaques for arrows, distance, or direction. Numbered route markers (M1-8/M1-9) and destination/distance signs (D1 series variants) support navigation. These are often repeated at decision points and after intersections.

Additional Elements

Pavement markings (bike symbols, arrows, "sharrows," lane lines, and optional green treatments) complement signs and must follow MUTCD standards. STOP or YIELD signs on paths are used where needed.