ALPINE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

July 14, 2026

Mayor Carla Merrill called the meeting to order at 6:06 pm.

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

A. Roll Call Mayor Carla Merrill

The following were present at the anchor location, which constituted a quorum: Sarah Blackwell, Chrissy Hannemann, Andrew Young, and Jessica Smuin. Brent Rummler was excused.

Staff: Shane Sorensen, Caden Lyon, Attorney Hyrum Bosserman, Jason Judd, Chief Brian Gwilliam, and DeAnn Parry

Others: Linda Mattfeldt, Anita Healey, Spencer Maughan, Emily Maughan, Landon Wallace, Jennie Wallace, Marla Fox, Trish & Joe Harwood, Mark Harris, Julie Peterson, Karl Clegg, Bryce & Kathy Bergen, Steve Burrows, Sullivan Love, Heidi Smith, Merlynne Heaps, Stephen Snyder, Travis Austin, Jaden Gull, Swazye Gull, Jerry Bitter, Laurie Bitter, Jenny Smith, Caitlin Payne, Julianne Rowley, David Rowley, Laurie Payne, Julee Clegg, Shellie Slade, Mike Schaumann, Mary Beth Schaumann, Scott Ross, Misty Ross, Rachelle Martin, Brian Crowley, Eve Crowley, Jen Wadsworth, June Wadsworth, Cory McArthur, April Cooper, John Magnusson, Jamie Cook, Dan Cook, John James

B. Prayer Sarah Blackwell

C. Pledge Andrew Young

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of Minutes from June 9th and June 23rd City Council meetings and the June 30th work session

Motion: Andrew Young moved to approve the Consent Calendar as proposed. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

***Jerry & Laurie Bitter** – Alpine Drive, Alpine*

Jerry and Laurie are interested in reducing the 'blasted' raccoon population. Racoons live in the storm drains near their home. A city in California installed metals bars across their storm drains to discourage the animals. The Bitters had a brief discussion with Shane Sorensen this evening, and he suggested some alternative ideas for removable bars. They would like to have a pilot project on their street. Neighbors are fully in support and excited about the prospect because of the damage to their homes, property, and animals.

Mayor Carla Merrill explained that she also received public comment cards for staff salaries and the proposed commercial building. Because we are not holding public hearings on these tonight, in the interest of time, public comments on these topics will not be received. She said that residents are always welcome to email herself and the council with their comments.

IV. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

A. Monthly Financial Report

Shane Sorensen gave a brief report and said we have concluded FY2026 but will not receive the final financial report for the end of year until later, as we are still paying some invoices from June. We still have a couple of sales tax disbursements coming, with the final one around August 20th. Sales tax revenue is at +3.99 percent YOY.

Andrew Young asked why we are seeing growth in sales tax

Shane Sorensen explained that residents are spending more, which increases our revenue to sales tax, PARC tax, and the 5th/5th tax.

Chrissy Hannemann mentioned that they will do a deep dive into revenue in two weeks. In 2018 the Supreme Court made a ruling on interstate sales tax. If products are shipped from outside Utah to our homes, the tax gets attributed to our ZIP code. If it ships from somewhere else in Utah, then the state of Utah attributes it to the point of shipment. Alpine has a high proportion of sales tax from online sales, which is great for us.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

A. The Public Hearing with respect to the Issuance of Sales Tax Revenue Bonds has been postponed until the August 25, 2026, City Council meeting.

Mayor Carla Merrill explained that the State has certain notice requirements regarding bonds, so this public hearing will be held on August 25.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. Consider Approval of The FY2027 Wage Increases for City Staff

City Administrator Shane Sorensen said that included in the FY2027 tentative budget was a 5 percent placeholder for wage increases. When the final budget was presented and after considering increases by other cities and additional factors, Mayor Merrill proposed a 4.2 percent increase based on the CPI and a merit-based bonus of 0.8 percent.

As part of the motion approving the FY2027 final budget, all wage increases and a proposed staff position were removed pending a work session that would be held by June 30. The work session to discuss compensation was held on June 30, 2026. Based on the council motion approving the budget with all wages increases removed, a public hearing and budget amendment will be required to add any wage increases or other items back into the budget. Once we have the information, we will schedule the public hearing and bring it to council for approval.

Sarah Blackwell shared results from an informal survey she had conducted with city employees, providing insight into why staff chose to work for Alpine City and what they valued most. She reported that employee motivations were varied, including community, benefits, and job satisfaction, and emphasized that employees expressed a strong sense of belonging and commitment to the city. She reviewed a PowerPoint presentation including information provided by employees regarding these points and concluded the success of the city relies upon the quality of the employees that are working on the “front lines”.

Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to: 1) replace the salary and benefits for a full-time position with a $100,000 allocation for professional consulting related to planning, finance, or other consulting services including HR; 2) grant staff raises at 4 percent, split between a 2 percent COLA for every employee, and a 2 percent equity allocation at management discretion, based on salaries as of June 30, 2026 and effective July 1, 2026; and 3) give a 1 percent bonus upon completion of a performance review per the Alpine City Personnel Policy manual before the end of FY2027.

Chrissy commented that if we add the 2 percent COLA, the 2 percent equity allocation, and the 1 percent performance bonus, it is close to the original proposal with the 5 percent placeholder.

Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion.

Andrew Young expressed general support but raised an ongoing concern about aligning city staff priorities with resident-reported issues.

Mayor Merrill and others clarified that council's statutory role is limited to the legislative function and oversight of executive staff. Management of other staff falls under the City Administrator.

Chrissy Hannemann noted that the proper avenue for any changes to performance evaluation criteria would be a revision to the personnel policy.

Jessica Smuin suggested an amendment to the motion to include an additional average salary increase of 2 percent in FY2027 for a market-based salary adjustment for non-executive positions, with a specific percentage for each position based upon a minimum wage comparison of positions among Utah County Class 4 Cities, as well as Cedar Hills, together with other documented evidence of comparison equity considerations per management discretion.

Chrissy Hannemann did not accept the suggested amendment.

Jessica Smuin stated that her proposed amendment to the motion is based upon inequities in employee wages, some of which are $30,000 to $40,000.

Chrissy Hanneman stated her refusal to accept the motion amendment was based upon the cost and time required to gather the comparative data relative to the total amount, approximately $38,000, being allocated across all staff.

Shane Sorensen explained that while it is not as easy to get the comparative data as it might seem, city administration would follow the correct procedures if more detailed information was needed. He described working with the mayor to assess compensation, and comparing with positions in other cities, when possible, to reasonably adjust equity among staff positions.

Mayor Merrill asked for a roll call vote. There were 4 yes votes and 0 no votes, and 1 excused, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes	No	Excused
Sarah Blackwell		Brent Rummler
Chrissy Hannemann		
Jessica Smuin		
Andrew Young		

B. Consider Approval of FY2027 Compensation Increases for Executive Municipal Officers

Shane Sorensen explained that the Legislature passed S.B. 91 in 2024, amending Utah Code Section 10-3-818 regarding compensation increases for executive municipal officers. This section of code requires that prior to a municipal executive officer receiving a compensation increase, the city must hold a public hearing outlining any increase in compensation and publish a notice at least seven days before the date of the public hearing which includes the time, place and purpose of the public hearing. This amendment went into effect May 1, 2024. The required public hearing was held by the City Council on June 23, 2026. A motion was made and approved by the council to table the item until after a work session was held to discuss compensation. The work session was held on June 30, 2026.

Ordinance 2026-13 outlines compensation increases for the City Administrator/Public Works Director and the Assistant City Administrator/City Planner. The budgeted increases include COLA and merit components, as well as a one-time 1.3 percent bonus (paid in quarterly installments) for URS Tier II employees to offset the additional cost of URS retirement contributions for this fiscal year. The total percent increase for executive municipal officers is found in Exhibit A attached to the ordinance. For the second year in a row, the URS contribution for both Tier I and II employees decreased by 1 percent for this fiscal year, which reduces the cost to the city.

Shane said that if the council makes changes to the proposed ordinance, staff will adjust the numbers in Exhibit A.

Andrew Young said his number one concern is incorporating resident requests and their resolutions into staff wages.

Shane Sorensen said the city is purchasing software to track resident requests and code compliance responses. The subscription will be $8,000 for the first year and $6,000 for subsequent years. Staff generally just naturally take care of requests and questions. If they need to document every action, it will take away from accomplishing actual work. It may make sense to document larger projects, rather than every task, but staff will follow what the council decides. He asked Police Chief Gwilliam what percentage of time his officers spend on paperwork.

Police Chief Brian Gwilliam said he estimates his officers spend 50-60 percent of their time on reports.

Andrew Young clarified that he wants the priority to be resolving the residents' concerns.

Shane Sorensen explained that the city is basically a regulatory agency, and staff are required to enforce the ordinances passed by the City Council. When we cannot grant a request because of the ordinances on our books, residents can become unhappy with staff.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to pause the regular meeting and move into a closed meeting to be held in the Conference Room at City Hall to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual, and that at the end of the closed session the open City Council meeting will continue.

Andrew Young seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The public meeting was paused at 6:56 pm.

X. CLOSED MEETING

The regular meeting resumed at 7:18 pm

Mayor Carla Merrill reported that they held a lively discussion in the Conference Room.

Motion: Sarah Blackwell moved to approve a 2 percent COLA and a 1 percent retention bonus calculated with base salary in FY2026. The bonus is to be paid upon completion of the annual performance review. The timing and context of the review is at the discretion of the mayor, with the advice and consent of the City Council. The Assistant City Manager will match staff compensation adjustments on an annual basis. This is calculated to be a 2 percent increase in salary, and a 4 percent increase at 50 percent length of employment, effective September 1, 2026. The Assistant City Manager is eligible for a 1 percent bonus upon completion of a performance review on or before March 31, 2027.

Jessica Smuin seconded the motion.

Chrissy Hannemann explained that bonuses were not included in the original proposal. Understanding that Alpine's policy involves performance reviews, the council wants the 1 percent bonus to motivate employees to be engaged in the process. They want assurance that the reviews are happening and that they are worthwhile.

Chrissy said they are pleased to have Caden Lyon working for Alpine City and tried to calculate his compensation based on the months he has been here. The wage study was helpful and showed that Shane Sorensen is aligned with other city leaders in the area. There is great value in Shane's vast experience, and it is appreciated.

Shane Sorensen said that staff will study the motion and get back to the mayor if they have questions.

Andrew Young said, referring to a brief discussion about racoons with residents that included Shane Sorensen before the meeting, he really appreciated how Shane listened and helped them, comparing it to an early Christmas.

The mayor called for a vote. There were 4 yes votes and 0 no votes, and 1 excused, as recorded below. The motion passed unanimously.

Yes	**No**	**Excused**
Sarah Blackwell		Brent Rummler
Chrissy Hannemann		
Jessica Smuin		
Andrew Young		

C. Site Plan Approval – Long Range Shooters

City Planner Caden Lyon said that the Long Range Shooters of Utah commercial site plan is proposed for parcel number 02:011:0045 off 200 North and Main Street in Alpine. The building is to provide space for a small retail gun shop (rifles, accessories, bipods, etc.), a warehouse, space for an office, and a space in which to film content for the shop. The building will also include a one-bedroom apartment above the office area.

The City Council tabled the item at the last meeting to provide time for the applicant to modify the site plan and address concerns for parking and building design. The applicant has provided an updated site plan that meets the code requirements for §3.07 Business Commercial Zone and §3.11 Gateway/Historic Zone. The exterior materials and design of the building have been updated to conform more completely to the Gateway/Historic Design Guidelines. A combination of brick, wood, and other materials are used, and these materials meet the design guidelines.

Parking requirements for the retail shop are met with 3.5 stalls needed per 1000 sq ft, including parking for an employee and 2 spots inside the building for the apartment. In §3.07.080, exiting a site requires vehicles pulling out to be front-first, meaning that all ingress and egress from the parking lot must be done by forward motion only. The site plan has been updated to include 20 feet before the curb and 22 feet before touching the sidewalk. The site allows cars to enter through the ingress ramp on the east side of the front property line, follow the traffic flow arrows, and exit through the egress ramp on the west side using the driveway (see site plan). This permits vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward motion.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE:
- General Plan Land Use Goal #2 Policy 2.2

CITY CODE REFERENCE:
- Alpine Development Code 3.07
- Alpine Development Code 3.11
- Alpine Development Code 4.07
- Alpine Development Code 4.08
- Alpine Development Code 4.10

PUBLIC NOTICE:
This item does not require a public hearing but has been posted as an action item on the Planning Commission and City Council agendas, as applicable.

Caden Lyon said the applicant presented two revised parking configurations: (1) a 60-degree angled stall layout with one-way traffic flow, which staff recommended as the most code-compliant option; and (2) an updated 90-degree layout with one stall removed.

Responding to questions from Sarah Blackwell, Caden reported the building footprint had been reduced, allowing more space for parking. The site meets the 20 percent landscaping requirement and the code-required traffic flow for vehicles to enter and exit in a forward motion.

Bryce Bergen, speaking as the applicant, noted two options have been presented and he prefers option one; however, he emphasized his willingness to work with the community, stating they aimed to create a building that fits the historic design guidelines and community needs. He mentioned they have made extensive changes to the building's design and are committed to ensuring it aligns well aesthetically with Alpine's vision. They have worked tirelessly to ensure that adjustments were made based on feedback. He also highlighted their commitment to maintaining good relationships within the community, promising to uphold a high standard of appearance. He expressed gratitude for the support and collaboration with the city and noted that their goal remains to create a lasting positive impact both visually and economically within Alpine City.

Andrew Young mentioned that, alongside the importance of adhering to building codes, he values the community's overall feel and character. He expressed concern that Alpine seems to be moving towards a prevalent use of brick exteriors in building designs, which might not reflect the authentic heritage of Alpine or align with the town’s traditional aesthetic rooted in its natural mountain surroundings dominated by timber and stone. While tastes and preferences vary, he urged consideration of the materials to ensure they reflect Alpine's unique ambiance and historical roots.

Bryce Bergen reiterated his efforts to adjust the design of the building to be responsive to community and council feedback. He stressed that his proposal meets the city code standards and thanked the staff for their willingness to work with him on this project.

Discussion among the council focused primarily on parking stall number 1, located adjacent to the garage and oriented at 90 degrees with a one-way aisle.

Jessica Smuin raised a concern that this configuration does not align with any of the six parking diagrams approved in city code (section 3.24.020), as the only 90-degree diagram in code requires a two-way aisle. She argued that the appropriate path forward was to seek a formal parking exception per code section 3.24.030, which requires a Planning Commission recommendation before council approval.

Attorney Hyrum Bosserman weighed in, noting that under Utah law, ambiguity in land use code must be interpreted in favor of the applicant. However, he acknowledged that a reasonable reading of the code's six diagrams could support the position that a deviation exists, making an exception process appropriate.

Chrissy Hannemann expressed concern about unnecessary delay, noting that the site plan was otherwise compliant and that Planning Commission ultimately makes a recommendation, with council retaining final authority on exceptions.

Attorney Bosserman clarified that the Planning Commission should initially recommend the exception before the council makes a final decision. Although the council retains final authority on exceptions, the proper procedure is to first obtain a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to approve the proposed site plan for the new Long Range Shooters of Utah commercial site plan subject to the following condition: that the applicant receive approval to the exception for parking stall 1 after a recommendation of the Planning Commission.

Without a second, the motion failed.

Substitute Motion: Sarah Blackwell moved to approve the proposed site plan for the Long Range Shooters of Utah commercial site plan subject to the following conditions: that the applicant receives approval for parking stall 1 from the Planning Commission, and that approval is also based on a swept path analysis and site references for determining results.

Mayor Carla Merrill asked if Jason Judd would do that study or if we would contract it out.

Jason Judd, City Engineer, said that we would contract it out to Horrocks Engineers, and it would take them about 15 minutes to complete.

Shane Sorensen said it might cost $50 for the study.

Chrissy Hannemann seconded the motion.

Shane Sorensen said that because Attorney Bosserman mentioned including the word approval, part of that approval would be the Planning Commission making a recommendation on the exception, and then it would come back to the City Council.

Attorney Bosserman agreed that we are not giving the Planning Commission the authority to make the final decision.

Mayor Merrill asked that even though we do not have anything specifically in our ordinance for a 90-degree unidirectional parking stall, they would still need to obtain an exception because it is something we have not considered before?

Attorney Bosserman said you can read the code to say that we allow these six types of parking scenarios.

Jessica Smuin asked if Sarah Blackwell would be willing to remove the word 'exception' and add "swept path analysis" to ensure that 3.080.3 is met."

Sarah Blackwell accepted the amendments.

Chrissy Hannemann also accepted the amendments.

Andrew Young said we still have uncertainties. Why not just send it back so they can come with a proper design?

Mayor Merrill instructed council that we already have an amendment to the motion which has been approved. There is an option for a second amendment, or they could propose a substitute motion or table. She asked Attorney Bosserman how to vote on the substitute and original motions.

Attorney Bosserman said the council would vote on the substitute motion first and then the original.

Chrissy Hannemann commented that we have dealt with 90 percent of the criteria and we are down to the last 10 percent. She would like to limit the scope and move forward with 90 percent.

Motion: Andrew Young moved to deny the proposed site plan for the new Long Range Shooters of Utah commercial site plan based on the following findings: there are still parking design elements and Alpine City code procedure regarding exceptions that need to be followed.

With no second, the motion failed.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to table consideration of the proposed Long Range Shooters of Utah commercial site plan to allow the applicant a review of the exceptions to code 3.24.030 governing parking lots, and to require a swept path analysis of 3.07.080. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion.

Mayor Carla Merrill called for a vote. There were 2 yes votes and 2 no votes, and 1 excused, as recorded below. Mayor Merrill voted to break the tie. The motion to table failed.

Yes	No	Excused
Sarah Blackwell	Chrissy Hannemann	Brent Rummler
Andrew Young	Jessica Smuin	
	Mayor Carla Merrill	

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to table the consideration of the proposed Long Range Shooters of Utah commercial site plan allow the applicant a review of Development Code 3.24.030 governing parking lot exceptions, and to provide a swept path analysis for 3.07.080.3. Once the applicant completes the evaluation, staff will return the application to the Planning Commission for recommendation. The applicant shall then come back to City Council upon receipt of the Planning Commission supplemental motion in adherence to Alpine City Development Code.

Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. There were 3 yes votes, 1 no vote, and 1 excused, as recorded below. The motion passed.

Yes	**No**	**Excused**
Sarah Blackwell	Chrissy Hannemann	Brent Rummler
Jessica Smuin		
Andrew Young		

D. Public Hearing – Consideration for Approval: Silverleaf Plat B Amendment

Caden Lyon said that Silverleaf Plat B comprises lots 25-56 and is located off Red Pine Drive and Ridge Drive, to the north of Silverleaf Park and northeast of Peterson Park. The three roads that encompass Plat B are Silverleaf Drive, Ponderosa Drive and Wood Drive.

The applicant is requesting that the City Council approve Silverleaf Plat B Amended. This amended plat proposes to eliminate the common area that immediately abuts lots 28-44 of the plat, which was originally planned as a trail through the area for the benefit of all owners of record of Silverleaf Plat B, and revert it to the immediate adjacent property owners of lots 28-44, respectively. The highlighted blue area shows the common area described.

Under Utah Code §10-20-812, the City Council may approve the amendment of a plat if they find that:

(a) There is good cause for the vacation or amendment; and

(b) No public street or municipal utility easement has been vacated or amended.

In this case no public street has been vacated or amended. The common area on the east side of Lot 28 has a city waterline and storm drain line and is used by the city to access the Silverleaf Well. Therefore, the city would request that this area be dedicated as a municipal utility easement and a public utility easement so that the infrastructure can continue to be accessed.

Neither the Utah State Code nor the Alpine Development Code define the term "good cause" for purposes of a plat amendment. Therefore, whether good cause exists is determined on a case-by-case basis by the land use authority (City Council) based on the specific facts and circumstances of each request. The land use authority retains the discretion to evaluate each request and may consider any facts or circumstances it deems relevant in determining whether good cause has been established.

<u>Reasons there might be good cause for the amendment:</u>

- The existing common area trail is not very accessible due to overgrowth and lack of maintenance.
- This action could help resolve long-standing ownership questions.
- This action could allow more practical use of the land.

<u>Reasons there might not be good cause for the amendment:</u>

- The common area would be eliminated.
- All lots on the plat would lose a granted amenity.
- Lots 25-27, 45-56 would gain no real property.

The reasons stated above are not meant to be comprehensive as a full list of reasons either for or against finding good cause for the amendment.

If approved, the amended plat may not be submitted to the County Recorder for recording unless it is:

(a) Signed by the land use authority; and

(b) Signed and dedicated by each owner of record of Silverleaf Plat B.

STATE/CITY CODE SECTIONS:

- Utah State Code 10-20-811 Subdivision Amendments
- Utah State Code 10-20-812 Land use authority approval of vacation or amendment of plat – Recording the amended plat
- Alpine Development Code 4.04.100 Amendments to Recorded Plats; Vacation of Public Street
- Alpine Development Code 4.06.040 Subdivision Amendments

PUBLIC NOTICE:
A public hearing is required as part of this proposal for an amended subdivision plat because all the signatures have not yet been obtained.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommend that the City Council evaluate and consider the proposed subdivision amendment and determine if there is a finding of good cause for the amended plat. If the City Council approves the amended plat, staff recommend that the recorded plat includes a note for a 20ft municipal utility easement with the proposed public utility easement on the east side property line of Lot 28 for continued city access.

Andrew Young asked for clarification regarding the city's access needs within the area adjacent to lot 28 where a city water line and storm drain exist. He wanted to protect areas where the city needs access.

Shane Sorensen mentioned that when the power was installed for the Silverleaf Well, it was aligned with the trail area near lot 28 on the amended plat. This power line is not owned by the city but is essential for operating the well by providing electricity. A public utility easement on the plat would cover the power service to the well, ensuring continued access.

Mayor Carla Merrill responded that with the proposed amendment, the city would maintain access to this infrastructure through an easement that would be recorded. She reassured Andrew Young that the proposed amendment would not affect other areas of city access.

Public Hearing

Mayor Carla Merrill opened the public hearing for comments at 8:20 pm.

***Mark Harris**, Wood Drive, Alpine (Lot 30)*
Mark supported the amendment, describing the trail as heavily overgrown, unusable, and a fire hazard. He noted that motorized vehicles have been using the trail corridor at late hours, and that the homeowners abutting the trail were uniformly in support of reverting the land to adjacent owners.

***Jennifer Smith**, Silverleaf drive (Lot 44)*
Her purpose was to explain that the platted common area does not align with where the trail was historically located, and that a fence installed by a new homeowner has now physically blocked the previously used trail path. She expressed support for the amendment so that the unusable corridor could be absorbed into adjacent properties.

***Scott Ross**, Wood Drive, Alpine*
Scott provided historical context, noting that the community had worked for years to resolve the ambiguity around the corridor's ownership, and that all lot owners within Plat B had agreed to the transfer. He described the corridor as encumbered by overgrowth, encroachments, and storm drainage issues. Scott inquired about whether the city had a written easement for Lot 28. He wanted clarity on easement rights regarding water line, storm drain, and city access areas of Lot 28.

Mayor Carla Merrill said she believed the city already maintained what is known as a "prescriptive easement" for executing services and responsibilities related to essential infrastructure access, such as water lines. However, she suggested a written and recorded approach would fortify that access right and add a further legal guarantee of communication and cooperation between city partners and private owners.

Shane Sorensen confirmed that city facilities include plumbing and water resources but initially thought the trail area fell under city possession.

Attorney Bosserman affirmed the assessment. A recorded easement would reinstate mutual responsibility and certainty on both ends concerning utility service areas. For shared public-private space where utilities transverse or interact, a formal written approach is best.

Scott Ross continued his comments by explaining the process and challenges involved in addressing the common area trail. He shared that the community worked extensively to clarify ownership and resolve any inconsistencies about the common area. He noted that discussions took place among all the properties in the subdivision, and everyone was on board with the proposal to incorporate the common area into private lots. Maintaining the common area for all proved difficult, mainly due to its condition and management challenges.

Mayor Carla Merrill stated she had walked the trail last summer and agreed there were sections that were impassable.

John Manuson – 280 South, Alpine
John is a property owner whose land abuts the subdivision. He stated that his property actually extends across a portion of the corridor, and that despite verbal agreements with neighboring lot owners, two neighbors had since sent a legal letter demanding removal of improvements and threatening trespass action. He requested mediation.

With no further public comments, the mayor closed the public hearing at 8:34 p.m.

There was extensive discussion among the mayor, council, and staff surrounding the history of the trail and the property in question.

Jessica Smuin said that, per Utah law, a trail used continuously by the public for more than 10 years may establish a public right of way. She noted the trail had been on Alpine's Trail Master Plan from 2004 to 2020—a 16-year period—and argued this may give the city a legal basis to claim a right of way as the highway authority.

Chrissy Hannemann and Sarah Blackwell acknowledged the potential legal avenue but expressed concern about the practical and financial costs of clearing the overgrown path, which does not follow the plat alignment, to create a usable trail.

Mayor Merrill noted that the city had previously attempted to secure the corridor through the county and was unsuccessful.

Attorney Bosserman noted that the city had recently received a letter from an attorney representing an outside property owner regarding the common area land.

Andrew Young stated his general support for deferring to the residents most directly impacted, given their sustained exposure to the issues and their unified position in favor of the amendment.

Jessica Smuin, however, noted Alpine's identity as a trail-oriented community and expressed reluctance to vacate a corridor connecting two public spaces, particularly in light of the difficulty of reestablishing trail corridors once they are vacated.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to table the Silverleaf Amended Plat B until a future meeting for the following: 1) to look into the requirements to see if this is a public trail that the city can claim legally because it has been used for more than 10 years; 2) to allow time for more due diligence to speak with other property owners adjacent to the trial, 3) to understand if the fence encroachment cuts off the trail or if there is a way the trail could be improved; and 4) to plan for implementation costs or volunteer hours associated with trail improvement.

Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion.

Chrissy Hannemann suggested an amendment to add: 5) investigate to retain public access between Ridge Drive to the Silverleaf open space east of Lot 28.

Jessica Smuin accepted the suggestion and offered an amended motion.

Amended Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to table the Silverleaf Amended Plat B until a future meeting for the following: 1) to look into the requirements to see if this is a public trail that the city can claim legally because it has been used for more than 10 years; 2) to allow time for more due diligence to speak with other property owners adjacent to the trial; 3) to understand if the fence encroachment cuts off the trail or if there is a way the trail could be improved; 4) to plan for implementation costs or volunteer hours associated with trail improvement, and 5) to investigate a way to retain public access between Ridge Drive to the Silverleaf open space east of Lot 28.

The council voted. There were 3 yes votes, 1 no vote, and 1 excused, as recorded below. The motion to table passed.

Yes	No	Excused
Sarah Blackwell	Andrew Young	Brent Rummler
Chrissy Hannemann		
Jessica Smuin		

Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to extend the meeting no later than 10:00 pm. Andew Young seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

E. Site Plan Approval – Five.12 Building Addition

Caden Lyon said that the Five.12 commercial site plan is for the address of 168 S. Main Street and proposes a new commercial building. The building is to support their ongoing operational needs and provide more space for their non-profit ventures which are focused on feeding children.

Statement from the applicant: *"Elementary school students in the United States are going home from school on Friday and coming back to school hungry on Monday. Five.12 provides weekend backpacks full of food for those students in need."*

The applicant has met with the Planning Commission and worked to meet the Gateway/Historic Design Guidelines. After deliberation and collaboration, the Planning Commission has determined that the applicant meets these guidelines and has sent a positive recommendation to the City Council for the site plan.

The applicant has provided a site plan that meets the code requirements for §3.07 Business Commercial Zone and §3.11 Gateway/Historic Zone. The building takes on an industrial look with dark brick and black metal trims and accents to complement the main material. A water tower was proposed near the front of the site, but the Planning Commission moved to remove the tower until it can be considered more fully at a later date. There are two benches proposed near the sidewalk to meet the streetscaping requirements of the Gateway/Historic Zone, though additional benches might be needed to fully meet this requirement of one installed element every 30 ft.

There is a desire to have an office building near the front setback of the site at some point in the future, but that area will only be landscaped for now. The landscaping requirement of 20 percent coverage of the site, found in DCA §3.07.080, is currently being met and will still be met if the office building is constructed on the site at a future date.

The parking requirement for this application is found in §3.24.040 under the use category of "Industrial and wholesale establishments," which requires that the parking can meet the needs of the site for evert two employees during the largest shift. Since there are 75 employees during the largest shift, 38 stalls were deemed necessary. The parking lot exceeds that number because they are providing for the parking for the future office building at the same time.

The following is the Planning Commission motion and recommendation:

Motion: Planning Commissioner Greg Butterfield moved to recommend to the City Council the proposed site plan for the new Five.12 commercial building located at 168 S. Main Street with the following conditions:

1. Remove the water tower as part of the approval process to be presented with specificity and details at a future date.
2. If the second building is not completed within a three-year time frame, the landscape company will landscape per the design that is proposed in the space by the sidewalk in front of the entire property.

Troy Slade seconded the motion. A discussion followed.

Planning Commissioner John MacKay proposed an amendment to the second condition of the motion:

2. Strike the three-year time frame for establishing landscaping and require the entire building envelope to be landscaped as proposed with native grasses and flowers, with enough watering to establish vegetation for a one-year period.

Greg Butterfield accepted the amendment to the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCE

- General Plan Land Use Goal #2 Policy 2.2 – Business Commercial Zone should have commercial uses that serve the community. Staff feel that this use meets the requirement.

CITY CODE REFERENCE:

- Alpine Development Code 3.07
- Alpine Development Code 3.11
- Alpine Development Code 4.07
- Alpine Development Code 4.08
- Alpine Development Code 4.10

PUBLIC NOTICE:

This item does not require a public hearing but will be posted as an agenda item on the Planning Commission and City Council agendas, where applicable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend that the City Council consider approving the proposed site plan for the new Five.12 commercial building at 168 S. Main Street with the condition that the streetscaping requirement is met.

Sarah Blackwell raised a question about whether a warehouse is a permitted use in the Business Commercial Zone.

Caden Lyon clarified that the applicant acknowledged the term "warehouse" may be a misnomer—the addition is not designed with loading docks, dock doors, or high-clearance access associated with commercial warehousing, and is intended solely for the nonprofit's operational needs.

Chrissy Hannemann, who is familiar with the property and the organization, expressed support for the project but raised a concern about the long-term classification of the use. She noted that the existing building functions similarly to a nonprofit food bank, that receives and distributes commercial food products at no cost. A food bank is not a named permitted use in the BC zone. She wanted to formally designate the use as a food bank or charitable organization, so that a future change of ownership could not result in the building being used as a commercial warehouse without going through a new approval process.

Attorney Bosserman noted that the Planning Commission has authority under code section 3.07.020, Item 10, to approve uses not explicitly listed in the permitted use table that are "in harmony with the intent of the zone." He confirmed that the Planning Commission had exercised that authority here. He also noted that council could request the Planning Commission to make a more specific finding regarding the use designation but clarified that any deviation from an approved use in the future would require a new approval process regardless.

Shane Sorensen commented that he does not recall ever receiving a complaint about the activities at Five.12, so we have a history that shows things are going well.

Andrew Young read the code that said: the Business Commercial Zone is for retail and other commercial uses serving the immediate needs of Alpine residents and situated within an environment which is safe and aesthetically pleasing. The zone is also intended to serve as the commercial core of the city.

Jessica Smuin cited code section 3.07.020(8), which permits storage as an axillary use to office and retail operations.

Andrew Young raised concerns about the traffic impacts on Main Street. He mentioned the numerous parking spots at Five.12 and wondered how the traffic would be handled. He also did not think that the all-brick exterior reflects Alpine's heritage.

Mayor Carla Merrill mentioned that the Wednesday evening sessions represent most of the activity with youth groups, which do not coincide with school or daytime traffic. She suggested volunteering to help with a session. She has not received any complaints about Five.12 parking from residents, and this will improve the current informal parking situation.

Applicant representative JD Heiner of Silver Fox Construction confirmed the organization distributes backpacks primarily through volunteers using personal vehicles for delivery to schools. There are no large-scale outbound shipping operations.

A discussion ensued about what still needed to be accomplished and the need to finish the review of the Main Street Plan and hold an additional closed meeting.

Motion: Jessica Smuin moved to extend the meeting until 11:00 pm and to limit council comments to three minutes. The motion was seconded by Sarah Blckwell. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to approve the proposed site plan for the new Five.12 non-profit organization commercial building at 168 S. Main Street. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion.

Jessca Smuin asked if Chrissy would amend the motion to include the Planning Commission's recommendation that the owner plant grass and wildflowers where the future commercial building is planned and to water them for the first year.

Chrisy Hannemann accepted the amendment. Sarah Blackwell also accepted the amendment.

Andrew Young suggested an amendment to require a traffic mitigation plan as part of the approval.

Chrissy Hannemann did not accept his suggestion.

Amended Motion: Chrissy Hannemann moved to approve the proposed site plan for the new Five.12 non-profit organization commercial building at 168 S. Main Street, and that the applicant will plant grass and wildflowers where the future commercial building is planned and water them for the first year. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion.

The council voted. There were 3 yes votes, 1 no vote, and 1 excused, as recorded below. The motion passed.

Yes	No	Excused
Sarah Blackwell	Andrew Young	Brent Rummler
Chrissy Hannemann		
Jessica Smuin		

Motion Jessica Smuin moved to go into a closed meeting to be held in the Conference Room at City Hall to discuss pending or reasonably eminent litigation, the purchase, exchange, sale, or lease of real property, and that at the end of the closed meeting the open City Council meeting will continue. Andrew Young seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The public meeting was paused at 10:04 pm.

X. CLOSED MEETING

The closed meeting ended at 10:35 pm and the open meeting resumed at 10:37 pm.

VII. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Review of Main Street and Gateway Corridor Master Plan – Part IV

Caden Lyon briefly introduced the final sections of the Main Street and Gateway Corridor Small Area Plan for Council review. They were the Land Acquisition Policy, the Implementation Matrix, and the Traffic Management Plan. He noted that the Planning Commission had included a motion with its review of the traffic section for council's consideration. The city does not currently have a land acquisition policy. The proposed policy would establish a structured, prioritized approach to securing parcels within the Small Area Plan boundaries, using a weighted criteria matrix to score parcels by desirability.

Sarah Blackwell conveyed Brent Rummler's feedback that any land acquisition decision should be accompanied by a clear intended use for the parcel. No objections were raised to the policy concept.

Caden Lyon described the implementation matrix section as a priority framework, similar to the city's budget project prioritization matrix, designed to move the plan from vision to adopted ordinance. Near-term action items include adopting a land use acquisition program and updating the historic Main Street design guidelines.

Pertaining to the Traffic Management Plan, Caden summarized the plan's recommendations for each gateway corridor. Key points included:

- Main Street: A shared-use path on the east side, parking restricted to the east side, curb extensions, and a target speed reduction from 30 mph to 20–25 mph. He cautioned that reliance on rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) may signal a lack of pedestrian-scale street design and encouraged prioritizing good street design over signal-based solutions.

- Alpine Highway: Buffered bike lanes with a possible vertical barrier to separate cyclists from vehicle traffic, and speed reduction from 45 mph to 40 mph recommended.

  Jessica Smuin asked about having the UDOT-controlled Alpine Highway deeded back to the city in order to exercise greater control over speed limits and road design.

Mayor Carla Merrill noted that UDOT has been receptive to ideas in previous meetings and expressed a preference for working collaboratively with UDOT before pursuing ownership transfer.

- Canyon Crest Road: Speed reduction from 35 mph to 30 mph recommended. A roundabout at Canyon Crest and Ridge Drive is included in the city's budget. The plan also presents interim options for that intersection.

- Westfield Road: Speed reduction from 35 mph to 30 mph and buffered bike lanes are recommended.

Andrew Young expressed support for all recommended speed reductions and suggested the council consider pushing reductions further, arguing that posted speed limits often result in drivers traveling approximately 10 mph over the limit. He suggested that reducing limits to lower thresholds (e.g., 25 mph on Canyon Crest and Westfield, 20 mph on Main Street) may produce actual travel speeds closer to current posted limits. He also offered to help organize volunteers to repaint faded crosswalks as a low-cost near-term improvement.

Chrissy Hannemann proposed that the council consolidate and submit feedback to the plan's consultants, suggesting that each of the four corridor areas be assigned to a small committee of one or two council members and at least one Planning Commission member. She proposed a September 1, 2026, deadline for committees to submit consolidated feedback to Caden for forwarding to the consultants.

Andrew Young expressed interest in participating in the traffic-focused group. Sarah Blackwell and Jessica Smuin indicated support for the approach.

No formal action was taken on the Main Street and Gateway Corridor Master Plan.

VIII. STAFF REPORTS & COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

In lieu of Staff Reports and Council Communication everyone agreed to email any important information.

Motion: Chrissy moved to adjourn the meeting. Sarah Blackwell seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 pm.