NOTICE OF A REGULAR
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
August 11, 2026, at 6:00 PM

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the Vineyard City Council will hold a regularly scheduled City Council meeting on Tuesday, August 11, 2026, at 6:00 PM, in the City Council Chambers at City Hall, 125 South Main Street, Vineyard, UT. This meeting can also be viewed on our live stream page.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (BY INVITATION)

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.1. Public Hearing for an Amendment of Vineyard City Subdivision Code

3.2. Public Hearing for Proposed Amendment to the Vineyard Consolidated Fee Schedule Establishing a $150 Insignificant Land Disposal Application Fee

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS (3 MINUTES)

"Public Comments" is defined as time set aside for citizens to express their views. *Public comments can be submitted ahead of time to robinr@vineyardutah.gov.*

5. CONSENT ITEMS

5.1. Approval of the July 7, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes

5.2. Approval of the July 14th, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes

5.3. Approval of the August 4, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes

5.4. Approve Ordinance 2026-07 Amending Municipal Code for the Planning Department (Anthony Fletcher)

5.5. Approve Resolution 2026-34 Amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule to include an Insignificant Land Disposal Application Fee (Evan Smith)

6. CLOSED SESSION

The Mayor and City Council pursuant to Utah Code 52-4-205 may vote to go into a closed session for the purpose of litigation.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The next regularly scheduled meeting is on August 18, 2026.

This meeting may be held in a way that will allow a councilmember to participate electronically.

The public is invited to participate in all City Council meetings. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during this meeting should notify the City Recorder at least 24 hours prior to the meeting by calling (385) 338-5183.

I, the duly appointed City Recorder for Vineyard, Utah, hereby certify that the foregoing notice and agenda was posted at Vineyard City Hall, on the Vineyard City and Utah Public Notice websites, and delivered electronically to staff and to each member of the Governing Body.

AGENDA NOTICING COMPLETED ON: August 7, 2026

CERTIFIED (NOTICED) BY: /s/ Robin Bond
ROBIN BOND, CITY RECORDER

VINEYARD CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: August 11, 2026
Agenda Item: Public Hearing for an Amendment of Vineyard City Subdivision Code
Department: Planning
Presenter: Anthony Fletcher, Naseem Ghandour

Background/Discussion:
Background
Vineyard City Subdivision Code Sections 14.06.020(4)(j) and 14.08.030(4)(j) currently require subdivision plats to be signed by the City Planner, City Engineer, City Manager (representing the will of the Mayor and Legislative Body), and City Attorney before recording with Utah County. As the City's organizational structure evolves, referencing a specific staff position in the Municipal Code may unnecessarily limit administrative flexibility. While the City continues to designate a planner to represent the Land Use Authority during the plat approval process, future organizational changes may assign this responsibility to a different position without changing the function being performed.

Analysis
Staff reviewed subdivision plat signature requirements used by several Utah County jurisdictions, including:

- American Fork
- Eagle Mountain
- Lehi
- Lindon
- Mapleton
- Orem
- Utah County

The review found that approximately 42% of the jurisdictions require a Planning or Community Development Director signature. The most common required signatory is the City Engineer (85%), followed by the City Attorney and a representative of the approving authority.
During its June 9, 2026 work session, the City Council reviewed this issue and directed staff to prepare amendments to the Subdivision Code. Rather than identifying the signatory by a specific job title, staff recommends identifying the signatory by the role performed within the subdivision approval process.
Accordingly, staff recommends replacing references to the "City Planner" with "Planner (representing the Land Use Authority)." This amendment preserves the planner's role in the plat approval process while allowing flexibility should the City's organizational structure or position titles change in the future.
Staff also recommends amending Section 14.08.003(J)(iii) to read:
Required municipal signatories include:

- Planner (representing the Land Use Authority);

- City Engineer;
- City Manager (representing the Mayor and Legislative Body);
- City Attorney.

The City Recorder shall attest the municipal signatures.
The existing planner signature block on the printed subdivision plat would remain and continue to be used by the individual designated to represent the Land Use Authority.

Planning Commission Update

The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed subdivision code amendments at its July 15, 2026 meeting. During its discussion, the Commission identified minor grammatical edits to improve the clarity of the ordinance. The proposed amendments maintain the Planner's signature block on subdivision plats while identifying the planner as the representative of the Land Use Authority. Following the discussion, the Commission voted to recommend approval of Ordinance 2026-07 to the City Council with the identified edits incorporated.

Fiscal Impact:
The proposed amendments will have no fiscal impact.

Recommendation:
Planning Commission Recommendation

At its July 15, 2026 meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed the proposed amendments to the Vineyard City Subdivision Code. Following discussion, the Commission recommended minor grammatical edits to the ordinance for clarity. The Commission then voted to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve Ordinance 2026-07 with the proposed edits.

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments to Sections 14.06.020(4)(j), 14.08.030(4)(j), and 14.08.003(J)(iii) of the Vineyard Subdivision Code. Replacing the specific reference to the "City Planner" with "Planner (representing the Land Use Authority)" will maintain the City's review and approval process while providing greater administrative flexibility and ensuring the Municipal Code remains effective regardless of future organizational changes. The amendment also retains the planner signature block on recorded subdivision plats as the authorized representative of the Land Use Authority, preserving the existing review process while modernizing the Municipal Code.

Sample Motion:
"I move to adopt Ordinance 2026-07, amending Sections 14.06.020(4)(j), 14.08.030(4)(j)(iii), and 14.08.100 of the Vineyard Subdivision Code as presented with the recommended grammatical edits proposed by the Planning Commission."

Attachments:
1. Draft Ordinance 2026-07 July 28 Revision
2. 8.11.26 Public Hearing Planning 3

VINEYARD CITY, UTAH
ORDINANCE NO. 2026-07

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF VINEYARD CITY, UTAH, AMENDING THE VINEYARD SUBDIVISION CODE SECTIONS 14.06.020(4)(j) REQUIREMENTS FOR PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS, 14.80.030(4)(j) REQUIREMENTS FOR FINAL SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS, AND 14.08.100 FINAL SUBDIVISION REVIEW PROCEDURES.

WHEREAS, Vineyard is authorized to amend the City Subdivision Ordinance pursuant to Utah Municipal Code 10-20-801; and

WHEREAS, Vineyard staff finds it necessary to clarify and update requirements related to subdivision plat title blocks; and

WHEREAS, City Council held a work session on June 9, 2026 and identified a need to modify the list of required approving officials on recorded plats, specifically removal of the City Planner as a required signature to streamline processes while maintaining oversight; and

WHEREAS, the Planning staff upon further research and discussions propose considering maintaining removing “the City Planner” title and replacing it with Planner (representing the Land Use Authority). Planning department recommended approval of its proposal to the Vineyard City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on July 15, 2026 and after fully considering public comments and staff recommendations, recommended approval to the Vineyard City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Vineyard City Council, having reviewed the proposed text amendment, held a public hearing on July 21, 2026; and

WHEREAS, the Vineyard City Council having considered the recommendation of the Planning Commission and submitted comments from the public, having determined that it is in the best interest of the public to adopt the proposed text amendment to the subdivision ordinance

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Vineyard City, in the State of Utah, as follows:

Section 1: Amendment of Section 14.06.020(4)(j) “Requirements for Preliminary Subdivision Applications” of the Vineyard Subdivision Code is amended as follows:

j. A title block, placed on the lower right-hand corner of the Plat showing:

1. Proposed name or designation of the subdivision that is distinct from any other plat already recorded in the Office of the Utah County Recorder.
2. Name and address of the owner of record and the name, address and license number of the licensed surveyor or engineer responsible for preparing the Preliminary Plat.
3. Date of preparation of the Preliminary Plat, and all revision dates, as applicable.
4. Signature blocks for the dated signatures of the ~~City~~ Planner (representing the Land Use Authority), City Engineer, City Manager (representing the will of the Mayor and legislative body), and the City Attorney. The City Recorder shall attest to the municipal signatures.

Section 2: Amendment of Section 14.08.030(4)(j) "Requirements for Final Subdivision Applications" of the Vineyard Subdivision Code is amended as follows:

j. A title block, placed on the lower right hand corner of the Final Subdivision Plat showing:

1. The Approved name of the subdivision, as approved by the Utah County Recorder.
2. Date of preparation of the Final Subdivision Plat.
3. Signature blocks for the dated signatures of the ~~City~~ Planner, (representing the Land Use Authority), City Engineer, City Manager (representing the will of the Mayor and legislative body), and City Attorney. The City Recorder attests to Municipal signatures.

Section 3: Amendment of Section 14.08.100 "Requirements for Final Subdivision Review Procedures" of the Vineyard Subdivision Code is amended as follows:

The Development Review Committee (DRC) is identified and authorized as the Land Use Authority for Final Subdivision Applications, assuring compliance with all applicable requirements of this Ordinance. The review procedures of the City for the consideration of a Final Subdivision Application are identified in Figure 1.

1. Determination of a Complete Application. A determination of a complete Final Subdivision Application shall be made by the Planner as identified in Figure 1 and VSC 14.08.070. and VSC 14.08.080. . If incomplete as to the requirements set forth in this ordinance, the submittal will be rejected and returned to the applicant for revision and resubmittal.
2. Development Review Committee Review. Following the receipt of a staff report, the Development Review Committee shall consider a Final Subdivision

Application. The Development Review Committee (DRC) shall review and consider a Final Subdivision Application at a scheduled meeting.

a. Following the consideration of the Final Subdivision Application, and all information and materials presented, including the recommendation of City staff, the Development Review Committee may approve the Final Subdivision Application, as presented, approve the Final Subdivision Application with requirements, or deny the Final Subdivision Application with findings of compliance or non-compliance with this Ordinance, and other Land Use Ordinances and requirements, as applicable.
b. The Development Review Committee may require onsite and offsite improvements, facilities and amenities, provided one hundred percent (100%) by the Applicant for Final Subdivision Application approval, such improvements, facilities and amenities being determined consistent with the requirements herein, and found necessary by the DRC to protect the health, safety, and welfare of anticipated residents of the subdivision, or the existing residents or businesses of the City.

3. Acknowledgement and Necessary Signatures Required. ~~The owner of the Subject Property shall acknowledge the Final Plat before the Development Review Committee authorized to take the acknowledgement of conveyances of real estate and shall obtain the signature of the Mayor, acting on behalf of the Council, and authorized to take the acknowledgement of conveyances of real estate on behalf of the city, and the City Attorney.~~ The Final Plat shall be signed and acknowledged by the following required signatories; each owner of record of land described and shown on the plat, notarized acknowledgement of landowner signature, land surveyor who prepared the plat, and the municipality.

   Required municipal signatories include:

   I. Planner (representing the Land Use Authority);
   II. City Engineer;
   III. City Manager (representing the Mayor and legislative body);
   IV. City Attorney.
   V. The City Recorder shall attest to the municipal signatures.

4. Dedications and Grants of Easements. When the Applicant is proposing, or is required, to provide dedications for any public or quasi-public infrastructure, utilities, or improvements, as applicable, the owner or operator of the infrastructure, utilities, improvements, and underground and utility facilities shall approve the: (i) boundary, course, dimensions, and intended use of the right-of-way and easement grants of record; (ii) location of existing underground and utility facilities; and (iii) conditions or restrictions governing the location of the facilities within the right-of-way, and easement grants of records, and utility

facilities within the subdivision. Such approval shall be provided in writing by the owner or operator of the infrastructure, utilities, improvements, and underground and utility facilities, as applicable. When land within the subdivision is to be purchased by a public or quasi-public agency, a letter of intention to purchase shall be provided. In addition, all subdivisions shall establish and maintain a landscape easement between the subdivision fence and the sidewalk within the right-of-way.

5. Recordation of Final Subdivision Plat and all Subdivision Documents. After a Final Subdivision Application has been approved, with or without requirements, and signed by all required signatories as noted in 14.08.100(3) ~~city officials and services providers~~, the Final Subdivision Plat shall be provided to the City Recorder, for presentation by the City Recorder, or designee, to the Office of the Utah County Recorder for recordation. After the Final Subdivision Plat has been recorded, the Applicant(s) may apply for building permits consistent with the approved and recorded Final Subdivision Plat and the City requirements for such permits. The Applicant is required to pay all fees, including copies, for the recording of all Final Subdivision documents and the Final Subdivision Plat.

Section 4: Severability

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance is held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

Section 5: Effective Date

This Ordinance shall take effect upon passage and publication or posting as required by law.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Vineyard City Council this _____ day of _____ 2026.

_____
Zack Stratton
Mayor, Vineyard City

SEAL

ATTEST:

_____
Robin Raines-Bond
City Recorder, Vineyard City

	YES	**NO**	**ABSENT**	**ABSTAIN**
Jacob Holdaway	_____	_____	_____	_____
David Lauret	_____	_____	_____	_____
Parker McCumber	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ezra Nair	_____	_____	_____	_____
Jacob Wood	_____	_____	_____	_____

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

VINEYARD CITY COUNCIL

NOTICE is hereby given regarding a public hearing before the **City Council on August 11, 2026, at 6 pm** in the council chambers at 125 S. Main Street, Vineyard, Utah 84059. This is to consider an ordinance amending Sections 14.06.020(4)(j), 14.08.030(4)(j), and 14.08.100 of the Vineyard Municipal Code relating to subdivision plat signature requirements.

Amendment of Vineyard City Subdivision Code

The proposed amendment removes the City Planner as a required signatory for subdivision plats and clarifies the City's subdivision plat signature requirements. The amendment is intended to streamline the plat recording process, eliminate an administrative obstacle created by the City's current organizational structure, and align the Subdivision Code with current City practices. The proposed changes will have no fiscal impact.

Interested persons are invited to attend the public hearing and provide comments regarding the proposed ordinance.

Public comments, questions, and requests for copies of materials are encouraged to be emailed to Anthony Fletcher at anthonyf@vineyardutah.gov prior to the meeting.

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Public Hearing Notice was posted at the Vineyard City Offices, the Vineyard City website, posted on the Utah Public Notice website, and delivered to surrounding entities.

Contact Person: Anthony Fletcher, Planner
707 E Mill Road
Suite 202
Vineyard, UT 84059
(801) 226-1929
AnthonyF@vineyardutah.gov

Published and posted this 4th Day of August 2026 /s/ Anthony Fletcher, Planner

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

VINEYARD CITY COUNCIL

Notice is hereby given that the Vineyard City Council will hold a Public Hearing on **Tuesday, August 11, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.** in the **Vineyard City Council Chambers, 125 South Main Street, Vineyard, Utah**, to receive public comment regarding a proposed amendment to the Vineyard City Consolidated Fee Schedule.

Proposed Fee Schedule Amendment

The proposed amendment would establish a new Insignificant Land Disposal Application Fee of $150.00 for requests involving the disposal of certain City-owned land parcels that are:

- Valued at less than $20,000;
- Subject to an encroachment that occurred prior to January 1, 2020;
- Less than 300 square feet in size; and
- Determined by the City to have no apparent operational utility for municipal purposes.

The application fee is intended to offset administrative costs associated with reviewing and processing requests for the disposal of insignificant City-owned land.

Interested persons are invited to attend the public hearing and provide comments. Written comments may also be submitted prior to the hearing to robinr@vineyardutah.gov.

Questions regarding this proposed amendment may be directed to:

Evan Smith
Vineyard City
Email: **Evans@vineyardutah.gov**

Published and posted this 3rd day of August 2026.

Robin Bond
City Recorder, Vineyard City

MINUTES OF A REGULAR
CITY COUNCIL WORK MEETING
July 7, 2026, at 4:05 PM

Present	**Absent**
Mayor Zack Stratton	
Councilmember Parker McCumber	
Councilmember Jacob Wood	
Councilmember Jacob Holdaway	
Councilmember David Lauret	
Councilmember Ezra Nair	

Staff Present: Chief Deputy Holden Rockwell with the Utah County Sherrif's Office, Administrative Director David Kyle Herring, City Manager Brian Voeks, Parks and Recreation Director Brian Vawdrey, Public Works Director Naseem Ghandour, Assistant Engineer Patrick James, Chief Building Official Cris Thomas, Public Works Coordinator Dareli Villegas, City Planner Anthony Fletcher, City Recorder Robin Bond and Deputy City Recorder Tony Lara

Others Speaking: Ryan Bybee with Cadence Homes, Vineyard residents Chris Judd, Daria Evans, David Hyte, Shawn Herring, John Pettingil, and Keith Vincent

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Stratton called the meeting to order at 4:05pm.

2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (BY INVITATION)

Vineyard resident Chris Judd offered a prayer and led the pledge of allegiance.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Daria Evans, living in the Villas neighborhood, asked whether the proposed insignificant land resolution should first be reviewed by the Planning Commission, noting the Commission's advisory role in considering land use and plan amendments under the City's code. She also requested information on the City's fireworks expenditures, and staff responded that Vineyard Days fireworks cost **$15,000**, while the July 2 fireworks display cost **$12,500**.

David Hyte, living in the Maples neighborhood, spoke in support of the proposed insignificant land resolution. He explained that his property includes longstanding improvements on a small parcel he believed was part of his lot when he purchased the home. He asked the Council to consider a solution for similarly situated homeowners that would avoid requiring them to effectively pay twice for property they reasonably believed they owned.

4. CONSENT ITEMS

4.1. Approval of the June 23, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER MCCUMBER MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT ITEM AS PRESENTED. COUNCILMEMBER HOLDAWAY SECONDED. COUNCILMEMBERS NAIR, LAURET, WOOD, MCCUMBER AND HOLDAWAY VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. WORK SESSION

5.1. Discuss 400 South Road Design and Construction (Council Member Holdaway)

Councilmember Holdaway introduced the discussion by explaining that negotiations to acquire a small portion of property from his father had been unsuccessful, prompting consideration of alternative road designs. He reviewed the history of prior work sessions and stated that he had met with affected property owners in an effort to develop a compromise that would allow the project to move forward while addressing concerns over right-of-way requirements.

Councilmember Holdaway argued that the City's recently adopted 83-foot collector road standard had not been applied to existing collector roads elsewhere in Vineyard and contended that requiring the additional right-of-way from only a small number of property owners was inconsistent and unfair. He presented comparisons to other collector roads throughout the city, asserted that existing roadway widths adequately accommodate emergency vehicles, and outlined a compromise design he felt would maintain traffic lanes, parking, sidewalks, and a continuous bicycle route while minimizing additional property acquisition. He stated that the proposal would treat affected property owners more equitably and reduce the potential for litigation.

Councilmember Holdaway invited Vineyard resident Shawn Herring to comment on the estimated cost of redesigning the 400 South roadway. Herring stated that, based on his professional experience, revising the plans would likely require only a day to a day and a half of engineering work which he approximated would be around $1,500 to $2,000 and could still be professionally engineered and stamped, which contrasted with the higher redesign cost estimate included in the staff report.

Following Herring's comments, Councilmember Holdaway questioned several assumptions contained in the staff report, including projected redesign costs, roadway design considerations, and overall project expenses. He argued that his proposed alternative could reduce construction costs, avoid the need for eminent domain, and potentially shorten the project's timeline compared to proceeding under the City's current design.

Mayor Stratton clarified that his earlier statement regarding potential litigation being irrelevant was based on his position that he would not support using eminent domain to acquire property for a trail project. He stated that, in his view, because he would not pursue eminent domain, discussion of lawsuits related to that approach was not applicable to the Council's decision.

Councilmember McCumber stated that he was opposed to using eminent domain for the

project and expressed concern about increasing costs to taxpayers while the City is working to reduce expenditures. Although he was interested in obtaining more detailed cost estimates to better understand the potential savings of the proposed alternative design, he emphasized that he was not supportive of incurring unnecessary redesign or engineering expenses. He concluded that the City should continue working collaboratively with staff and affected property owners to reach a mutually agreeable solution without resorting to litigation or eminent domain.

Councilmember Lauret expressed support for Councilmember Holdaway's proposed alternative road design, stating that he believed the concept had been misrepresented in the meeting materials. After reviewing the existing roadway configuration and visiting the site, he outlined what he viewed as a practical compromise that would preserve travel lanes, improve bicycle connectivity, and maintain sidewalks while avoiding additional property acquisition or the use of eminent domain. He concluded by commending Councilmember Holdaway's efforts to work with affected property owners to develop a compromise solution.

Councilmember Nair emphasized the importance of evaluating both the financial and time impacts of the project, noting that while the staff report contained preliminary cost estimates rather than final bid amounts, those estimates should still be considered alongside the potential costs of redesign and project delays. He requested additional clarification from staff regarding the assumptions behind the estimated costs.

Nair also raised concerns about elements of the proposed alternative roadway design, specifically questioning the offset curb alignment and suggesting it could create operational or safety issues at the intersection. He stated that any evaluation of the alternatives should consider both direct construction costs and the broader impacts of delaying the project.

Following discussion with Councilmember Holdaway regarding existing roadway conditions, Councilmember Nair maintained that past inconsistencies in roadway design should not justify repeating those practices in new construction. He emphasized that the City should strive to build infrastructure that reflects current standards where practical.

Councilmember Nair further noted that the 400 South project is part of the City's broader transportation planning efforts, referencing the adopted Transportation Master Plan and the public process used to establish the City's future roadway network. He indicated that the project should be considered within the context of those long-term planning objectives rather than solely as an isolated roadway segment.

The Council discussed the merits of the various roadway design alternatives, focusing on roadway consistency, project costs, and long-term planning objectives. Members debated whether the proposed alternatives would create inconsistencies with existing roadway geometry, the feasibility of modifying the design to better align with current conditions, and whether redesign costs would be offset by potential construction savings.

Ryan Bybee, representing Cadence Homes, explained that the existing development agreement established the roadway right-of-way dimensions relied upon during construction

of the development. He expressed concern that substantially modifying the roadway design at this stage could require amendments to the agreement and further delay completion of 400 South, which he described as an important access route for the development.

Mr. Bybee suggested that a potential solution could be a land exchange between the developer and the affected property owner to preserve the planned roadway width while addressing property impacts. He also discussed bicycle infrastructure, stating his preference for conventional bike lanes over the proposed cycle track and emphasizing roadway safety. Councilmember Holdaway responded by citing discussions with bicycle advocates who supported a protected bike lane for children traveling between the elementary school and the park. The discussion concluded with additional questions regarding the costs associated with bicycle infrastructure improvements and roadway modifications before Mayor Stratton returned the discussion to the broader agenda item.

Public works director Naseem Ghandour explained that the cost estimates included in the staff report were preliminary planning-level estimates intended to inform Council deliberations rather than final construction bids. He stated that staff developed the estimates using input from the project design engineer, consultants, contractors, and previous project cost data, emphasizing that the figures represented reasonable approximations based on the information available at this stage.

Addressing the proposed roadway alternatives, Mr. Ghandour stated that changes to the alignment could require modifications to recently completed roadway improvements, utility infrastructure, and future transportation planning. He explained that staff's estimates accounted for potential roadway reconstruction, utility relocation, and design revisions necessary to maintain roadway safety and accommodate the City's long-term Transportation Master Plan.

5.2. Discuss Motorized Bikes, Scooters, and Other Means of Transportation (Deputy Chief Holden Rockwell)

Chief Deputy Holden Rockwell reviewed recent and upcoming changes to state law governing electric scooters, e-bikes, electric motorcycles, and other high-powered electric devices. He explained the different classifications, age and helmet requirements, and how local governments may regulate their use on sidewalks, paths, and trails.

Chief Deputy Rockwell also noted that enforcement can be complicated because some high-powered electric bikes may fall under multiple legal classifications depending on their design and use. He indicated that the City may need to update its local ordinances to address areas that state law will leave to local regulation beginning in 2027.

The Council reviewed and discussed Vineyard’s existing regulations for electric mobility devices on sidewalks, trails, and in parks. Chief Deputy Rockwell explained that current rules include a 15mph limit on sidewalks and trails, restrictions on off-highway vehicles, and a requirement that mobility devices be operated safely within City parks.

The discussion also addressed enforcement challenges involving electric motorcycles, particularly difficulties with registration, titles, and vehicle identification compared with traditional motorcycles. Rockwell noted that upcoming state requirements will provide clearer notices to purchasers regarding registration and insurance obligations, and the Council asked

him to advise the City if additional local regulations become necessary.

Chief Deputy Rockwell concluded by outlining the Police Department's current enforcement approach, explaining that the City's focus has been on education and voluntary compliance rather than impounding electric motorcycles except in more serious situations, such as when riders flee from law enforcement. He emphasized that the Department's primary concern is preventing injuries by encouraging safe operation and helmet use.

John Pettingill, living in the Holdaway Fields neighborhood, expressed concern about repeated unsafe operation of electric motorcycles in the Holdaway Fields neighborhood, describing instances of underage riders speeding and performing stunts on residential streets. Citing a recent fatal accident involving youth riders in another community, he urged the City to increase enforcement efforts before a similar tragedy occurs in Vineyard.

Keith Vincent, living in the Villas neighborhood, expressed concern about the increasing number of electric scooters and similar devices using the lakeside trail, stating that he and his wife have experienced several close calls while walking. He encouraged the City to focus on public education regarding safe operation and applicable rules to help prevent accidents.

The Council discussed potential approaches for regulating electric mobility devices on sidewalks, trails, and shared paths, balancing public safety with recreational use. Members generally supported continuing the Sheriff's Office's education-first enforcement approach while exploring whether additional local regulations would be appropriate before upcoming state law changes take effect.

Councilmembers also discussed possible policy options, including enhanced public education, improved trail signage, restrictions on certain high-powered devices, and regulations tailored to Vineyard's trail system. Staff was asked to work with the City Attorney to develop recommendations for future Council consideration, with an emphasis on maintaining safe public spaces while allowing for responsible recreational use.

5.3. Discuss Resolution 2026-31: Insignificant Land Resolution (Council Member Ezra Nair)

Councilmember Nair presented a proposed policy to address minor property line encroachments involving City-owned land. He explained that the resolution would establish a process for homeowners to resolve insignificant boundary issues through an application process, allowing the Council to consider waiving certain land acquisition costs in appropriate cases while requiring applicants to cover administrative expenses.

Councilmember Nair stated that the proposal was prompted by recent changes in state law and requests from residents, and was intended to provide a practical, lower-cost method for resolving small boundary discrepancies that arose during the City's development.

Mr. Hyte described the history of a boundary encroachment affecting his property, explaining that improvements including landscaping and fencing were installed before he

purchased the home and that the discrepancy was not disclosed during the sale. He stated that after discovering the issue, he approached City officials in hopes of finding a practical resolution for the minor encroachment.

The Council discussed potential refinements to the proposed resolution, including eligibility criteria, application thresholds, and the appropriate review process. Members expressed support for creating a process to resolve longstanding, minor boundary encroachments while emphasizing the importance of preventing the policy from encouraging future encroachments or creating unintended precedents. The discussion concluded with general direction to refine the proposal, incorporate the recommended review process, and return the resolution for formal consideration at a future meeting.

6. COMMUNICATION ITEMS

There were no items discussed in this meeting.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:49

MINUTES APPROVED ON: _____

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: _____
TONY LARA, DEPUTY CITY RECORDER

MINUTES OF A REGULAR
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
July 14, 2026, at 6:01 PM

Present	**Absent**
Mayor Zack Stratton	
Councilmember Parker McCumber	
Councilmember Jacob Wood	
Councilmember Jacob Holdaway	
Councilmember David Lauret	
Councilmember Ezra Nair	

Staff Present: Chief Deputy Holden Rockwell with the Utah County Sherrif's Office, City Manager Brian Voeks, Public Works Director Naseem Ghandour, Assistant City Engineer Patrick James, Chief Building Official Cris Thomas, City Attorney Jesse Riddle, Public Works Coordinator Dareli Villegas, City Recorder Robin Bond, and Deputy City Recorder Tony Lara

Others Speaking: Jason Bird, with the Utah County Health Department, Vineyard Residents Max Stratton, Malerie Walker, and Daria Evans

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Stratton called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (BY INVITATION)

Max Stratton offered a prayer and led the pledge of allegiance.

3. PRESENTATIONS

3.1. Utah County Mosquito Abatement Program Presentation (Jason Bird, Utah County)

Jason Bird with the Utah County Health Department, provided an overview of the County's mosquito control efforts, emphasizing a prevention-first approach focused on reducing mosquito populations before they become a public health risk. He described the program's use of surveillance, larval treatments, drone technology, GIS mapping, and disease testing to guide targeted mosquito control efforts and minimize the spread of mosquito-borne illnesses.

Councilmembers asked questions regarding the County's mosquito abatement efforts, including the incidental effects of mosquito treatments on midge flies, the program's

qualifications and operations, and potential strategies for addressing Vineyard's recurring midge fly concerns.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Malerie Walker, living in the Elms neighborhood, expressed concerns regarding the 400 South roadway project. Ms. Walker expressed support for completing the project with an emphasis on public safety, timely completion, and long-term roadway functionality. Her comment also raised concerns regarding Councilmember Holdaway's participation in the matter and requested that he consider recusal due to a perceived conflict of interest. The full written comment is attached to these minutes.

Daria Evans, living in the Villas neighborhood, asked about the City's irrigation practices for public parks, expressing concern about water usage and standing water in landscaped areas. She also requested an update on the City's fire hydrant collar installation program.

5. CONSENT ITEMS

5.1. Acceptance of the West Rail Trail from Utah County

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER WOOD MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT ITEM AS PRESENTED. COUNCILMEMBER MCCUMBER SECONDED. COUNCILMEMBERS NAIR, LAURET, WOOD, HOLDAWAY AND MCCUMBER VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

6.1. Approve Resolution 2026-31 Insignificant Land

Staff and Council continued their discussion of the proposed insignificant land resolution, considering revisions to the eligibility criteria, including application thresholds, qualifying dates, and review standards. Council discussed balancing flexibility for property owners with safeguards to discourage future encroachments, ultimately expressing support for allowing applications that meet most of the established criteria while preserving Council discretion to review exceptions on a case-by-case basis. Staff also noted that administrative procedures to implement the policy would continue to be developed following adoption of the resolution.

Motion: COUNCILMEMBER MCCUMBER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 2026-31, INSIGNIFICANT LAND DISPOSAL POLICY AS AMENDED TO REQUIRE THAT APPLICANTS SATISFY AT LEAST THREE OF THE FOUR LISTED ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS. APPLICANTS NOT MEETING THREE OF THE FOUR REQUIREMENTS SHALL SUBMIT A WRITTEN EXPLANATION DESCRIBING WHY THEIR REQUEST SHOULD BE CONSIDERED BY THE CITY COUNCIL. COUNCILMEMBER NAIR SECONDED. THE ROLL CALL WAS AS FOLLOWS: COUNCILMEMBERS NAIR, LAURET, WOOD, HOLDAWAY AND MCCUMBER VOTED IN FAVOR. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

DRAFT

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:52

MINUTES APPROVED ON: _____

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: _____
TONY LARA, DEPUTY CITY RECORDER

DRAFT

From: Malerie Walker
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 6:41 PM
To: Robin Raines-Bond <robinr@vineyardutah.gov>
Subject: 400 South statement

City Council

I am Mal Walker, I live in the Elms.

I'm speaking my concerns about 400 South.
I have loved having this connecting road, it has been so helpful and quick! My current concern for the road is to support kids getting to the park and the school, safely… and not having the timeline drag out to provide that safety. I have personally ridden on the paved trail and have really liked it. It is a bit awkward at the roundabout to change which side of the road I'm on and then change back to arrive at the park. I am of the mentality of "let's get it right the first time" — especially will how many crossings, roundabouts and corners have had to be re-done and added to throughout the city. I feel grateful to spend no time driving on Holdaway road,(as I would imagine the citizens of Holdaway road are also) and not having to see over the blind spot due to the hill, landscape and tractor.

I have a few questions and concerns regarding Jake Holdaway and this project. I am publicly asking Jake to recuse himself in this matter, and I have a few reasons why, but would love to hear responses… from both Jake and other council members.

- what I witnessed last week was, in my opinion embarrassing. Jake, I hope you went home with some humility for your behavior.
- Based on the actions last week, I do not believe Jake has the skills, or desire, to be professional. Jake spent a lot of time blaming others, and wanting to be the most right

and was very focused on being heard but not doing much listening.

- It would appear Jake is of the belief that there is a conspiracy that was put into motion from the prior administration, and he would like to get even about that. Tit for tat, feels a bit revengeful more than really seeking what is best. I guess that's what you call a sore winner.
- Jake spoke highly of his integrity, going on several side quests while speaking about his integrity, to really drive the point home. It didn't land, Jake. I heard no integrity, I heard a need to be right. Arguing and "hear say".. I would challenge Jake, that if his integrity is what he says it is, to recuse himself on this matter. Speak as a citizen, not as a council member.
- The professionalism really got off to a shaky start. Jake regularly swapped the words "Father and Keith", depending on the sentence. I would assume to drive emotion.. If I didn't know Keith was Jake's father, it would be confusing to keep up.
- I'm really sentimental, I relate to the importance and meaning of property and family land. It is my understanding that the Holdaways chose selling (whether agreed upon as a family or not) compared to keeping family land, which comes with losses and gains for the family.
- The developer made a VERY generous offer regarding the land, which made a whole lot of sense to me. I personally, would love to be gifted 2000 sq feet of property.. especially if it means I'm 1,550 sq feet more than I was before, with better land, which is still old family land.
- I would love to hear Keith's, not Jake speaking on his behalf, reasons for why the 450sq feet against the road is so important and so sacred — especially with a trade on the table.
- Let's not have the poor design of Holdaway road influence what amazing roads we could have, especially as a commuter road.
- To reference Jake's property specifically off of Holdaway road, that tractor and hill has got to go. The tractor might be sentimental to the family, but I have yet to meet a single citizen that adores that dang tractor. It is such a dangerous corner, and I fear there will be a terrible accident. I am unclear if there is dispute about Jake's landscaped portion that belongs to the city, or if the only dispute is Keith's 450sq feet.
- Imminent domain feels messy and is messy, and I understand not wanting to enforce. But truly, what's the game plan if Holdaway's choose to not practice integrity and choose make it a battle?
- I would love to hear from other council members on why you believe Jake should stay seated during this matter. Again, it is worth repeating, based off of behavior last week, I do not believe Jake has the skills, maturity or desire to behave in a respectful and reasonable manner. He blatantly ignored and disrespected and the Mayor… he treated the meeting like a trial, talking over others. I do not believe he is willing to hear other plans aside from the one he wants, based on his actions and words. To put it simply: he was a bully. And because of that behavior I do not believe he is thinking beyond his own conflicted interest and he is not considering the city, the function or citizens.
- In conclusion; I desire the road, sidewalk and trail to be completed. I desire safety and well being. I look forward to seeing, what I refer to as junk and debris, cleared away from the side of the road. I desire functioning driving lanes. I appreciate the trail on the north side and sidewalk on the south side, to accommodate all neighborhoods and developments. I appreciate the wideness of the road; heaven knows we needed that width throughout the city. So why are we caring what the other roads widths are, we can all admit that most the roads got it wrong the first time. Let's not waste costs on "re-do's"… but also, If you guys want to come take 4' of drive strip in the elms, let's do it.

Landscaping and paying for over 400 sq feet was annoying, but I'd still welcome the 8' wider road.

- David Lauret talked how the road has been functioning fine for 15-20 years, and I believe that was true-ish, 15-20 years ago.. and now the population grew, and the traffic changed… so that point feels irrelevant in current time. I have sat passenger seat while my 15 year old learns to drive; passing cars north of the roundabout and guiding him on what to do, and to essentially telling him "ignore the lines in the road" to avoid collisions.
- Let's not have this road be about Jake, Keith or the name Holdaway. Jake feels targeted because of his family name, but he's the only one who is making it about him. I can assure you Jake, no matter the owner, this conversation would be happening. The difference would be that we'd be working with a reasonable family who wants resolution. I thank the staff for the spectacular job they've done. Let's keep the focus on the city, the citizens, and what is truly in the best interest of the people; remembering costs, safety and timeline. school is starting soon… with the question pending if busses will be available now that the road is completed… which means kids will be commuting via bike and walk, along the trail and sidewalks.. with multiple crossing points. There are reasonable solutions on the table.. I urge all council members to not get sucked into the drama this has the potential to be. I urge you to challenge Jake, don't let him bully or manipulate. Please, listen to your voters, i'm asking you to remember that you vote on behalf of what your citizens are asking you for. Not on your loyalty's and friendships within the council. So please, take the time to listen.

Thank You!
Malerie Walker

NOTICE OF A REGULAR
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
August 4, 2026, at 4:00 PM

Present:
Mayor Zack Stratton
Council Member Jacob Holdaway
Council Member David Lauret
Council Member Parker McCumber
Council Member Ezra Nair - Began the meeting online. Arrived in person at 4:15 pm.
Council Member Jacob Wood

Staff Present: Building Director Cris Johnson, Chief Deputy Holden Rockwell with the Utah County Sherrif's Office, City Attorney Jesse Riddle City Manager Brian Voeks, City Recorder Robin Bond, Community Enrichment Director Brian Vawdrey, Deputy City Recorder Tony Lara, Deputy Mayor David Herring, Finance Director Evan Smith, Media Specialist Braile Tyler, Public Works Coordinator Dareli Villegas, and Public Works Director/City Engineer Naseem Ghandour.

Also Present: Jared Tamez, Daria Evans, Cody Smith, Nate Hutchinson, Dave Hyte, Kent Blackburn, Trinity Ewing, Terry Ewing, Kim Cornelius, Karen Cornelius, Tim Blackburn, Emmeline McCummber, and others who did not sign in or whose handwriting was illegible.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to Order at 4:00 pm by Mayor Stratton.

2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (BY INVITATION)
An invocation was offered by Daria Evans, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. WORK SESSION

3.1. Discuss Resolution 2026-33 400 South Road Design and Construction Proposal
Mayor Stratton announced that the planned discussion regarding 400 South would be removed from the agenda to allow staff additional time to review newly received information. The item was deferred for future consideration.

Motion: Council Member McCumber Motioned to continue item 3.1 to the next City Council meeting, pending a legal review. **Seconded by** Council Member Wood. **Yes:** Council Members, McCumber, Lauret, and Wood **No:** Council Member Nair. **Abstained:** Council Member Holdaway. **Motion Passed 3-1.**

DRAFT

3.2. Discuss design work and build out of Gammon Park Extension (Pumpkin Patch Area) (Brian Vawdrey)
Discuss design work and build out of Gammon Park Extension (Pumpkin Patch Area)

Community Enrichment Director Brian Vawdrey presented information regarding the Central Corridor Master Plan and requested City Council direction concerning proposed updates to the plan prior to preparation of construction documents.

Staff recommended several modifications to the previously adopted concept plan, including:

- Removal of the proposed all-abilities playground due to the recent construction of a public all-abilities playground in Utah City.
- Removal of on-street parking in favor of expanded off-street parking.
- Removal of the proposed backstop from the multi-purpose field area to increase recreational flexibility.
- Removal of proposed dog parks due to similar amenities being developed in Utah City.
- Removal of certain trails crossing active recreation spaces.
- Removal of the proposed pump track, pickleball courts, and slackline area.

Staff presented four potential options ranging from a complete redesign of the Central Corridor Master Plan to moving forward with the existing plan and preparing construction documents for the entire park area.

Council discussion included:

- The need for additional programmable recreation fields, particularly soccer and baseball facilities.
- Preservation of the historic baseball field area at Gammon Park.
- Maximizing green space and recreational programming opportunities.
- The desire to avoid extensive delays and additional planning costs.
- Potential funding opportunities through the Redevelopment Agency (RDA).
- Parking needs associated with future park development.
- Consideration of feedback from the Robbins family, former property owners associated with the original park acquisition.

. Council generally expressed support for:

- Proceeding with construction documents for the multi-purpose field areas.
- Treating proposed changes as a minor amendment where appropriate.
- Continuing evaluation of parking configurations and future park elements.

Staff was directed to move forward with development of construction documents for the multi-purpose fields and associated improvements.

3.3. Discussion on Geneva Ponds Lease Proposal
The Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands' proposed sovereign lands lease

DRAFT

and land exchange with Geneva Acquisitions, LLC, including the upcoming public meeting and state review process.

The City Council discussed a proposed Geneva Ponds land exchange currently being considered by the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands. Councilmembers reviewed information regarding the potential cleanup and future use of the Geneva Ponds area, including questions related to environmental remediation, public ownership, development rights, and the overall public benefit associated with the proposal. Discussion also included the possible use of Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funds for cleanup efforts and the relationship between remediation activities and any future development that may occur on the site.

Councilmembers noted that the property is owned by the State of Utah and is located outside Vineyard City limits. Discussion centered on the City's potential role in future conversations regarding the property and the importance of understanding how future plans could affect Vineyard residents and the surrounding lakefront area. Staff informed the Council that the State had scheduled a public information and comment meeting for August 12, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. in the Vineyard Council Chambers, located at 125 South Main Street.

Several council members stated that additional information was needed before the City could take a formal position on the proposal. Council members expressed an interest in hearing the State's presentation and receiving public input during the upcoming meeting before determining whether further City action or comment would be appropriate. Staff confirmed that information regarding the public meeting had been shared through the City's communication channels.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS (3 MINUTES)

"Public Comments" is defined as time set aside for citizens to express their views. *Public comments can be submitted ahead of time to robinr@vineyardutah.gov.*

Jared Tamez expressed opposition to the proposed Geneva Ponds land exchange. He advocated for retaining the land under public ownership and utilizing it for open space, environmental restoration, and public recreation rather than transferring development rights to private interests. He stated his intention to provide additional written comments regarding the proposal.

Cody Smith, Elms, expressed concerns regarding the postponed 400 South discussion. He requested greater transparency and communication regarding the project and noted safety concerns related to school access, pedestrian facilities, bicycle accommodations, and roadway design. He encouraged additional opportunities for public engagement.

Kim Cornelius, representing the Villas HOA, reported recurring issues with irrigation backflow preventers allegedly caused by debris in the City's water system. She stated that repairs had resulted in significant costs to the HOA and requested review of the City's water infrastructure and coordination with affected neighborhoods.

DRAFT

Staff acknowledged the concern and agreed to investigate the matter.

Nate Hutchinson, Utah City, commented on discussions related to the Geneva Ponds property. He stated that development and cleanup discussions have occurred publicly over several years and expressed support for collaborative efforts to improve the lakefront area. He encouraged continued dialogue focused on facts, public process, and long-term community benefits.

Dave Hyte, Maples. Mr. Hight thanked City staff and elected officials for their assistance with a separate property-related matter and requested an update regarding future application processes and next steps. Staff indicated they would provide additional information following the meeting.

Tim Blackburn, resident and Heritage Foundation representative offered the following comments:

- Encouraged the City to consider a future cemetery location within Vineyard.
- Proposed incorporating historic farming equipment or agricultural-themed displays within the 400 South roundabouts to recognize Vineyard's agricultural heritage.
- Provided an update regarding planned interpretive signage for the historic Geneva Steel ladle monument near the Megaplex Theater, including educational displays and QR code access to historical information.

Council members expressed appreciation for the Heritage Foundation's efforts.

Council Member Holdaway provided comments regarding the postponed 400 South item. He stated that he did not request removal of the item from the agenda, expressed support for advancing the project, and addressed concerns regarding information contained in the staff report. He stated that his family's proposal provided the required right-of-way dedication and off-street bicycle path facilities and emphasized his desire to complete the project as soon as possible.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 pm by Mayor Stratton.

MINUTES APPROVED ON: August 11, 2026

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY: _____

ROBIN BOND, CITY RECORDER

DRAFT

VINEYARD CITY, UTAH
ORDINANCE NO. 2026-07

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 14.06.020 OF THE VINEYARD CITY MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO REQUIREMENTS FOR PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS, INCLUDING THE REMOVAL OF THE CITY PLANNER FROM REQUIRED PLAT SIGNATURE BLOCKS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Vineyard City Council finds it necessary to clarify and update requirements related to subdivision plat title blocks; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to modify the list of required approving officials; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that removing the City Planner from required signature blocks will streamline administrative processes while maintaining necessary oversight; and

WHEREAS, requiring attestation by the City Recorder continues to ensure validity and proper authorization of City approvals; and

WHEREAS, the amendments set forth herein are in the best interest of the public health, safety, and welfare of Vineyard City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF VINEYARD CITY, UTAH:

Section 1. Amendment of Section 14.06.020

Section 14.06.020, titled *"Requirements for Preliminary Subdivision Applications,"* is hereby amended as follows (deletions shown in ~~strikethrough~~, additions in bold):

14.06.020 Requirements for Preliminary Subdivision Applications

All Preliminary Subdivision Applications filed with Vineyard City shall provide the following application information:

(4)

(j) A title block, placed in the lower right-hand corner of the plat, showing:

(iv) Signature blocks for the dated signatures of the following City officials:

- ~~City Planner~~
- City Engineer
- City Manager, representing the will of the Mayor and City Council
- City Attorney

The City Recorder shall attest all required City signatures. Such attestation shall include the City Recorder's signature and, where applicable, the official seal of Vineyard City, certifying that the signatures affixed are duly authorized and executed in accordance with Vineyard City requirements.

Section 2. Severability

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Ordinance is held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

Section 3. Effective Date

This Ordinance shall take effect upon passage and publication or posting as required by law.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Vineyard City Council this _____ day of _____ 2026.

_____
Zack Stratton
Mayor, Vineyard City

SEAL

ATTEST:

_____
Robin Raines-Bond
City Recorder, Vineyard City

	YES	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Jacob Holdaway	_____	_____	_____	_____
David Lauret	_____	_____	_____	_____
Parker McCumber	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ezra Nair	_____	_____	_____	_____
Jacob Wood	_____	_____	_____	_____

EXHIBIT A

14.06.020 Requirements For Preliminary Subdivision Applications

All Preliminary Subdivision Applications, filed with the city, shall provide the following application information

(4)

(j) A title block, placed on the lower right hand corner of the Plat showing:

(iv) Signature blocks for the dated signatures of the City Engineer, City Manager (representing the will of the Mayor and legislative body), and the City Attorney. City Recorder attests city signatures.

14.06.020 Requirements For Preliminary Subdivision Applications

All Preliminary Subdivision Applications, filed with the city, shall provide the following application information

(4)

(j) A title block, placed on the lower right hand corner of the Plat showing:

(iv) Signature blocks for the dated signatures of the ~~City Planner,~~ City Engineer, City Manager (representing the will of the Mayor and legislative body), and the City Attorney. City Recorder attests city signatures.

VINEYARD CITY, UTAH
RESOLUTION NO. 2026-34

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE

WHEREAS, Section 10-3-717 UCA authorizes cities to establish the amounts of fees to be charged for municipal services to be set by resolution, and

WHEREAS, The City Ordinances, in various locations, provides for the establishment of fee amounts for certain municipal services, by resolution of the City Council.

WHEREAS, this Resolution would establish a new Insignificant Land Disposal Application Fee of $150.00 for requests involving the disposal of certain City-owned land parcels.

WHEREAS, a Public Hearing was duly noticed and was held on the 4th day of August 2026 on the proposed amendments.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF VINEYARD, UTAH AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The City Council hereby adopts an Insignificant Land Disposal Application Fee of $150.00 for requests involving the disposal of certain City-owned land parcels.

Section 2. This resolution shall take effect upon passage.

Section 3. All other resolutions, ordinances, and policies in conflict herewith, either in whole or in part, are hereby repealed.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Vineyard City Council this _____ day of _____ 2026.

ATTEST:

_____ _____

Zack Stratton
Mayor, Vineyard City

Robin Bond
City Recorder, Vineyard City

	YES	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
Jacob Holdaway	_____	_____	_____	_____
David Lauret	_____	_____	_____	_____
Parker McCumber	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ezra Nair	_____	_____	_____	_____
Jacob Wood	_____	_____	_____	_____