



AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
AUGUST 18, 2026
WORK SESSION AGENDA

Members Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Staci Carroll	Council Member
Tim Holley	Council Member
Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Ernie John	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member *electronically*

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Assist. City Administrator
Anna Montoya	Finance Director
Stephanie Finau	Deputy Recorder
Sam Kelly	Public Works Director
Derric Rykert	Community Services Director
Ben Hunter	City Engineer
Cody Opperman	City Planner
Cameron Paul	Police Chief
George Schade	IT Director
Heather Schriever	Legal Counsel

Also present: Matt Dugdale, Joey Biaton, and 4 citizens in support of the gymnastics program.

Notice is hereby given that the American Fork City Council held a work session on Tuesday, August 18, 2026, at City Hall, located at 31 N. Church Street, commencing at 4:03 p.m.

WORK SESSION

The purpose of the City Work Sessions is to prepare the City Council for upcoming agenda items on future City Council Meetings. The Work Session is not an action item meeting. No one attending the meeting should rely on any discussion or any perceived consensus as action or authorization. These come only from the City Council Meeting.

Mayor Frost called the City Council work session to order at 4:03 p.m. He noted that all Council members were present, with Council Member Taylor participating electronically.

1. Discussion by Matt Dugdale on bonding.

Matt Dugdale of Stifel provided an update on the City's outstanding debt obligations and a post-issuance analysis of the bonds recently sold for the Public Works facility. He stated that American Fork had used bonding responsibly for essential projects and compared favorably with peer communities nationwide. Referring to several financial metrics, including long-term liabilities, fixed costs, fund balance, and liquidity, he explained that the City consistently outperformed national medians.

Mr. Dugdale reported that the city maintained an AA-1 general obligation bond rating, one level below the highest possible rating of AAA. He described the rating as evidence of the City's strong credit position, financial management, governance, and economic conditions.

Council Member Hunter asked whether the City's population limited its ability to obtain an AAA rating. Mr. Bunker responded that American Fork's size would make achieving that rating very difficult. Mr. Dugdale agreed, explaining that the City's AA-1 rating placed it among an elite group of municipalities nationwide and represented strong independent validation of its governance and financial practices.

Mr. Dugdale then reviewed the timing of the Public Works facility bond issuance. He credited City staff, particularly Mr. Bunker and Ms. Montoya, for completing the work necessary to bring the bonds to market in January. He explained that market interest rates had increased considerably since that time and stated that, using the same financing structure, issuing the bonds under current market conditions would have resulted in substantially higher costs. Based on a hypothetical issuance using the same structure under current market conditions, Mr. Dugdale estimated that the bonds would cost the City approximately \$2.5 million more over their term, increase annual debt payments by nearly \$89,000, and generate approximately \$1.5 million less in proceeds. He concluded that the timing of the issuance had been highly advantageous and reiterated that the City's debt portfolio and financial indicators compared exceptionally well with those of its peers.

Mayor Frost thanked Mr. Dugdale for his presentation.

2. Presentation on the programs and services offered at the Fitness Center.

Mayor Frost introduced the presentation regarding programs and services offered at the Fitness Center. He stated that the Council could provide directions following the presentation, but public comments would be accepted at a later time.

Mr. Rykert introduced Joey Byington, the Fitness Center Superintendent, and stated that the review process had allowed staff to examine the facility, its programming, and the use of available space. He identified three funding priorities:

- Locker room renovations,
- Aquatic facility maintenance
- Upgrades, maximizing the use of facility space and available programs.

Locker Room Renovations

Mr. Rykert presented a proposed locker room layout featuring family-style or individual changing areas. The east side would provide a dry changing area for individuals participating in facility programs, while the west side would include individual showers, toilets, and changing stalls for aquatic users. He explained that the proposed number of stations should accommodate large swim teams and other groups arriving simultaneously. Based on preliminary contractor estimates, the renovation was projected to cost approximately \$465 per square foot.

Mr. Rykert explained that the proposed locker room would be configured diagonally, with the entrance located at the existing men's locker room entrance and the opposite end aligning with the pool bubble entrance. This configuration would preserve the existing access points

while accommodating structural limitations created by the centrally located stairwell and elevator.

Council Members reviewed the proposed gender-neutral locker room layout, which would provide private changing, shower, and toilet rooms opening into shared locker areas. Mr. Rykert agreed to evaluate adding exterior poolside rinse showers for swimming teams and large groups. Although the proposed layout may contain slightly fewer fixtures than the existing locker rooms, additional restrooms would remain available near the daycare, upstairs, and on the east side of the facility.

Mr. Byington explained that the proposed design was modeled after newer recreation facilities in Provo and Spanish Fork. He noted that some private stalls would contain both showers and toilets, while others would serve solely as changing rooms.

Council Members Carroll and Holley supported the concept but asked staff to evaluate the loss of capacity and potential delays caused by replacing open showers with larger private stalls, particularly when swim teams of 30 to 50 students arrive. Mr. Rykert acknowledged that congestion would occur during peak periods but noted that teams could also use the dry-side changing stalls.

Mayor Frost asked whether the stall doors would close and lock and whether each room would provide complete visual privacy. Mr. Rykert confirmed that the individual rooms would be fully enclosed and lockable to provide complete privacy. He added that the gender-neutral layout would allow custodial staff to access and clean the facilities throughout the day. Under the current arrangement, staff cannot enter one locker room while it is occupied by users of the opposite sex, which limits cleaning access.

Aquatic Maintenance Upgrades

Mr. Rykert introduced the proposed aquatic facility maintenance and upgrades. He stated that the City's two pools were heavily used and that having a 50-meter competition pool was a significant community asset, although it required substantial maintenance and investment. He noted that contractors had consistently commented on the pool's good condition but advised that several critical improvements were necessary to maintain the current level of operation.

For the competition pool, Mr. Rykert identified the scheduled replacement of the plaster, which is generally required every 5 to 7 years, and replacement of the coping and perimeter water-return system. He also recommended replacing the sand filtration units, which had been installed in 2007. Although the filtration sand had been replaced periodically, the filter units themselves had not.

Mr. Rykert stated that the remaining drainage and concrete work along the south side of the pool deck also needed to be completed, particularly in the area where the air-supported bubble connected to the deck. He further proposed replacing the bubble's interior liner and skylights by sending it to the manufacturer in St. Louis for refurbishment. The replacement would address dirt, algae, and wear caused by repeatedly installing, removing, and storing the bubble.

For the leisure pool, Mr. Rykert recommended replacing the pumps, which dated to 2006 and were becoming obsolete. He also identified repairs to the pool liner as necessary to address

deterioration, expansion and contraction, and potential leaks while preserving continued operation of the pool.

Mr. Rykert confirmed that staff recommended completing the leisure pool liner work over five years at approximately \$40,000 annually, rather than paying \$400,000 or more for a full replacement. The work would occur each fall after the pool bubble is installed.

Mayor Frost asked how the proposed improvements would affect facility operations and whether staff had evaluated the necessary closures. Mr. Rykert responded that work on the leisure pool during its off-season would have little operational effect. Improvements to the competition pool would require extending its customary closure period. Staff would coordinate with the City's swim teams, local high schools, the public, and nearby facilities in Pleasant Grove and Lehi to mitigate the disruption.

Mr. Rykert stated that staff had not yet developed a firm construction schedule for the locker room renovation but believed spring would be the most practical time. Temporary restroom and changing trailers could be placed on the pool deck to preserve access to the portions of the Fitness Center that remained open during construction.

The locker room renovation is expected to require a six-week closure, with two weeks overlapping the pool closure. Mr. Rykert will consider phasing construction to keep one locker room open, although that could extend the project to eight or ten weeks. Subject to approval, the locker room and pool improvements are planned for spring 2027.

Mr. Rykert clarified that preliminary work could begin in fall 2026, with the larger coordinated project occurring after the pool bubble is removed. Temporary restrooms and changing trailers could allow other Fitness Center areas to remain open. Mayor Frost supported a temporary pool closure if it produced substantial savings and suggested coordinating with nearby facilities to accommodate users.

Mr. Rykert noted that Lehi's facility was currently closed for 8 or 9 days and that its members were using the American Fork Fitness Center during the closure.

Mr. Rykert confirmed that the remainder of the Fitness Center could remain open during the locker room renovation using alternate restrooms and access routes. Council Member Hunter asked staff to evaluate restroom and changing room use by non-pool patrons and consider dedicated facilities for those using the gym, weight room, track, and other areas.

Mr. Rykert agreed that the proposed locker room capacity should not be reduced because it would be necessary to support aquatic operations. However, he noted that staff had initially considered placing the gender-neutral locker rooms in the repurposed spin room immediately east of the proposed renovation area. He suggested that the spin room could potentially be relocated upstairs, allowing the centrally located space to be used for additional general-purpose restrooms or changing facilities. Council Member Hunter expressed interest in that option, and Mr. Rykert agreed to evaluate it.

Upgrades, maximizing the use of facility space and available programs.

Mr. Byington introduced the programming and space-utilization portion of the presentation. He stated that staff had spent considerable time evaluating alternatives and identifying options that would best serve the facility and its patrons.

Beginning with the gymnasium, Mr. Byington explained that it currently accommodated several programs, including Itty Bitty Gymnastics, cheer, dance, and tumbling classes. He presented historical revenue figures for those programs but emphasized that the reported amounts represented revenue collected rather than net profit.

Mr. Byington acknowledged that the Fitness Center and its programs were subsidized by the City as a community service intended to provide recreational opportunities. He explained that the figures identified as contributions to indirect costs represented program revenue remaining after direct expenses rather than overall profitability. He also noted that participation and revenue had fluctuated during the previous 4 years due in part to the opening of private gyms and nearby fitness facilities, including VASA.

Staff confirmed that VASA primarily affects demand for the Fitness Center's weight and exercise areas, while private gymnastics facilities compete with gym programming. Mayor Frost also asked staff to account for private community pools, particularly in the Lakeside area, when evaluating aquatic demand and future growth.

Mr. Rykert responded that the increasing number of neighborhood pools reinforced the importance of offering strong swimming-lesson programs so children could learn to swim safely. Council Member Hunter added that American Fork and surrounding communities had also experienced growth in privately operated commercial aquatic facilities during the previous 5 to 7 years.

Mr. Byington presented information regarding the ratio of resident to nonresident program participants. He stated that the city needed to understand whom the Fitness Center served and ensure that residents retained adequate access without being displaced by nonresident participation. In his assessment, the current participation levels reflected an appropriate balance.

Mr. Byington attributed the decline in gymnastics revenue—from approximately \$240,000 in 2022 to \$196,000 in 2025—to higher nonresident rates adopted in 2023 and increased competition from private facilities. He clarified that the four-tier pricing structure applies to most Fitness Center programs, including swimming lessons, based on residency and membership status.

Council Member Hunter supported allowing nonresidents to enroll in American Fork swim lessons if their fees fully cover the cost of service and residents are not subsidizing them. He emphasized that the city should not be responsible for addressing aquatic-program shortages in neighboring communities.

Mr. Byington introduced three options for improving the use of existing Fitness Center space. He explained that the primary objective was to maximize the facility's existing square footage and serve the greatest number of patrons.

- Option 1, the weight equipment and exercise machines would be relocated from the existing downstairs weight room to the upstairs gymnasium, more than doubling the space available for strength and fitness equipment. Gymnastics, tumbling, cheer, and dance programming would then move into the existing weight room. This option would not require expanding or structurally modifying the building, but it would reduce the space and capacity available for gym programming. Staff projected that approximately 200 participants could be served during each three-month session, although some existing equipment and program offerings could not be accommodated.
- Option 1A would also relocate the weight equipment upstairs but would convert the existing weight room and racquetball-court space for gym programming. Mr. Byington explained that the Fitness Center currently had three racquetball courts, each generally accommodating no more than four users per hour. Staff believed repurposing that space could serve more patrons. Under this option, gym programming could accommodate approximately 305 participants per three-month session.

Mr. Byington estimated that Option 1A would preserve approximately 85% to 95% of existing gym programming, compared with 50% to 60% under Option 1. He confirmed that ceiling-height limitations in the existing weight room would restrict activities such as tumbling and uneven bars, while the racquetball courts could accommodate them.

Council Member Carroll asked staff to compare proposed gymnastics capacity with current enrollment to show how many participants would be displaced. Staff explained that advanced recreational gymnastics would experience the greatest reduction, although preschool and other programs would also be affected. Option 1 would accommodate 40 recreational gymnastics participants and Option 1A would accommodate 75, compared with 222 participants in spring 2026, the program's busiest season. Staff also noted that the Fitness Center's small dance program operates through a 70/30 revenue-sharing agreement with a private instructor.

Council Member Hunter requested a side-by-side comparison of spring 2026 enrollment and projected capacity under Options 1 and 1A, including resident and nonresident participation. Staff clarified that the projected capacities of 40 and 75 included participation goals rather than only current enrollment. Council Member Hunter emphasized prioritizing American Fork residents and ensuring facility decisions do not displace resident participants primarily to benefit nonresident users.

Mayor Frost agreed that resident access was an important consideration, particularly because the proposal focused on maximizing the use of the existing facility rather than expanding it. He asked whether the city should consider providing a greater subsidy or otherwise adjusting resident access to ensure that American Fork residents were not displaced by nonresident participation. He emphasized that City residents had funded and continued to subsidize the facility.

Council Member Hunter stated that nonresident fees should reflect taxpayers' full contribution to constructing and financing the Fitness Center, with that per-resident cost incorporated into the rate difference. Because replacing the facility is not currently feasible,

he also suggested giving American Fork residents an early registration period before programs open to nonresidents.

Mr. Byington stated that some programs already provided American Fork residents with an advance-registration period ranging from approximately three hours to two days before registration opened to nonresidents. She said that this practice could be expanded to additional programs.

Mr. Rykert emphasized that staff intended to maintain or improve the current ratio of residents to non-resident users as facility spaces and programs were modified. He stated that prioritizing American Fork residents would remain central to decisions involving the weight room, gymnastics, and other programs.

Mr. Byington then reviewed the conceptual layouts. Option 1 would relocate gym programming into the existing downstairs weight-room footprint. Option 1A would also convert two racquetball courts, adding approximately 1,600 square feet for gym programming.

Council Member Carroll asked why Option 1A could not maintain current participation when it appeared to retain most gymnastics equipment. Mr. Byington explained that the spring floor would be approximately 10 feet smaller and the parallel bars would not fit. Option 1A would preserve approximately 85% to 90% of current programming, with the greatest impact on advanced gymnasts requiring more space and specialized equipment.

Council Member Hunter asked whether the racquetball court adjoining the proposed gymnastics area could be converted to create a larger contiguous space while preserving a different court for racquetball and volleyball. He also asked whether the gymnastics floor could be removed and stored between uses. Staff explained that the spring floor is integrated into the floor system and would be impractical and costly to dismantle regularly.

Council Member Holley asked whether Option 1A would require removing walls, including those separating the proposed foam-floor and dance areas. Mr. Byington responded that no load-bearing walls would be removed; only walls separating the racquetball courts would be affected. The principal opening between the other rooms would remain.

Mr. Byington explained that many gymnastics classes operated through circuits, with participants rotating between stations at timed intervals. For example, students might stretch or practice at the bars in one room before moving to another activity in an adjoining space.

Council Member Holley cautioned that dividing gymnastics among three rooms and using areas with lower ceilings could impair coaching, supervision, and programming more than the square-footage reduction alone indicated. Council Member Hunter questioned whether retaining a racquetball court was worthwhile, prompting Mayor Frost to request usage data for the existing courts.

Mr. Rykert emphasized that staff had not proposed eliminating racquetball courts lightly. He stated that many players had used the facility since it opened and that the courts were generally full during the early-morning and early-evening periods. However, the existing check-in system did not provide reliable usage data.

Ben Hunter identified himself as a Fitness Center racquetball player and stated that several participants were American Fork residents, including longtime users who had played there for 30 to 40 years, although he could not estimate the full resident-to-nonresident ratio.

Mr. Rykert explained that staff's central question was how to allocate the facility's fixed square footage to its most beneficial use. He noted that few new recreation facilities were constructing racquetball courts, but eliminating the remaining court would affect an established group of users.

Council Members requested usage data for racquetball and volleyball, including residents versus nonresidents and the availability of comparable courts nearby, emphasizing that resident demand and efficient use of limited space should guide decisions. Council Member John also requested a market comparison of nearby municipal and private weight-room facilities, including pricing, hours, availability, and services, before expanding the Fitness Center's weight area.

Council Member Carroll observed that private fitness businesses could provide many of the services under discussion but generally did not provide competition pools. She stated that the 50-meter pool filled a unique role in the community and should remain a priority for City investment despite its operational and maintenance costs. Council Member Holley agreed, noting that the competition pool supported community events and was heavily used by schools, churches, the school district, and other groups.

Mr. Rykert directed the Council's attention to survey results collected from Fitness Center patrons, which identified the services and improvements users most desired. He explained that staff was attempting to balance patron preferences, efficient use of limited space, and the goal of improving the Fitness Center's financial position by reducing the City subsidy. He noted that program revenue had been declining and stated that the greatest opportunity for increased revenue was through additional memberships. He explained that weight-training facilities were a primary driver of fitness-center membership.

Council Member Carroll questioned the assumption that expanding the weight room would necessarily result in increased membership, noting that current use or survey interest did not by itself demonstrate that additional equipment would attract more members.

Mr. Rykert acknowledged that the proposal relied on that assumption but stated that industry trends and available data supported it. He explained that staff did not intend to compete directly with large private gyms such as VASA but believed there was a segment of the community that the Fitness Center could serve more effectively with an expanded weight area. He stated that Option 1A offered the strongest opportunity to increase membership, improve the facility's financial performance, and serve more residents, while acknowledging that it would reduce capacity for certain class-based programs.

Council Member Holley questioned whether projected membership growth would justify spending approximately \$600,000 to relocate and expand the weight room, particularly given the Fitness Center's distance from growing Lakeside neighborhoods. Although the investment could be recovered over several years, he remained uncertain whether the expansion could attract and retain enough new memberships to cover the cost.

Mr. Rykert stated that staff had additional membership and programming data and asked whether the Council wished to focus on a particular area during the remaining presentation time. Mayor Frost responded that approximately 15 to 20 minutes remained before the next agenda item and encouraged staff to continue the discussion, noting that the Council's questions were productive.

Mr. Byington explained that staff were considering the proposed options because patron survey results indicated strong demand for additional weight-training space. He noted that the existing weight room became crowded with approximately 15 users, limiting movement and equipment access. Although future membership growth could only be projected, staff believed expanding the weight room would attract additional members.

He also discussed the utilization of the upstairs gymnasium, the Fitness Center's largest single room. Of the approximately 97 hours the facility operated each week, the gymnasium was programmed for about 33 hours, representing approximately 34% utilization. Staff had identified possible additional programs that could increase scheduled use to approximately 68%, but those programs had not yet been implemented.

By comparison, converting the gymnasium into a weight-training area would allow patrons to use the space throughout all operating hours without depending on scheduled classes. Mr. Byington emphasized that the existing gymnastics and related programs were successful but stated that the central policy question was whether they represented the most efficient use of the facility's largest space.

Mayor Frost asked about the ceiling heights in the existing gymnasium, racquetball courts, and downstairs weight room. Mr. Byington estimated that the gymnasium ceiling was approximately 35 to 36 feet high, about 10 feet higher than the racquetball courts. Mayor Frost suggested that the city consider using the gymnasium's vertical space to create additional floor area, such as by constructing a mezzanine or second level. He noted that the existing enclosed space could potentially be expanded internally without enlarging the building's exterior footprint.

Mr. Rykert explained that the City had previously added a floor within two racquetball courts to create party rooms. Staff had also considered constructing a mezzanine along the east side of the gymnasium. Although a full second level had not been evaluated, he stated that the mezzanine could potentially be extended if additional structural footings, beams, stairs, and related improvements were provided.

The Council discussed preserving existing recreation programs while improving space utilization. Council Member Hunter asked staff to determine the actual ceiling height required for gymnastics and provide reliable racquetball participation data. Council Member Carroll confirmed that volleyball should remain available under any option.

Council Member Holley supported Option 2 as a smaller weight-room expansion that would preserve more existing uses and allow the City to test whether added capacity increases memberships. The Council also discussed using the gymnasium for other programs outside the approximately 33 hours per week dedicated to gymnastics, with staff developing a plan to increase its overall use.

Mayor Frost asked whether the proposed weight-room expansion included the cardiovascular equipment currently positioned around the indoor track, such as treadmills and stair machines. Mr. Rykert clarified that staff classified those machines as cardio equipment rather than weights. He stated that staff wanted to remove equipment from the track area but acknowledged that patrons had become accustomed to its availability there.

Mr. Rykert explained that some cardio machines could be relocated into the expanded weight room because many patrons combine cardiovascular and strength exercises. Staff could also remove some equipment, with the goal of restoring the indoor track more fully to its intended use.

Staff explained that Option 2 appeared most financially favorable because its projections assumed renewed programming would increase participation from approximately 250 to 505 and raise gymnasium utilization from 34% to 68%. However, staff cautioned that the city had not historically achieved that participation level.

Staff explained that staffing costs vary because expanded programs and operating hours would require more part-time employees while also generating additional revenue. Under Option 2, increased use would come from new activities, rentals, and partnerships during currently unused periods, not simply larger gymnastics classes. Potential uses include daycare gym time, birthday parties, and additional fitness programs.

Mr. Byington identified several potential programs, including physical education classes for homeschooled students during the relatively unused noon-to-3:00 p.m. period, birthday party packages, general facility rentals, and small-group morning training. He noted that education funding available to homeschool families could help support daytime physical-activity programs. Although the Fitness Center had not historically offered these services, she believed there was an opportunity to test demand.

Council Member Hunter and John asked staff to identify programs that could use the Fitness Center gymnasium during currently available periods. Staff clarified that school-district court rentals would still be necessary because the City's weekend basketball program requires far more courts than the Fitness Center can provide.

Mr. Rykert explained that staff had compared the City's gymnastics pricing with nearby private providers. He stated that the city attempted to avoid unfairly competing with private businesses while recognizing that municipalities had an appropriate role in providing certain recreational services. The comparison showed that the City's fees were considerably lower than those charged by private gyms and had not kept pace with the market. If the City retained the existing programming model, staff recommend adjusting program fees and returning the proposed changes to the Council for approval.

Mr. Rykert then reviewed historical membership data. He explained that the larger price difference between resident and nonresident memberships had resulted in fewer nonresident memberships and reduced overall revenue, while resident membership levels had remained relatively stable. Staff's goal was to replace the lost nonresident participation by attracting more American Fork residents. He stated that repurposing space for an expanded weight room could create an opportunity to increase resident memberships. However, because the

Fitness Center had never offered that amount of weight-training space, staff could not predict the response with certainty. Mr. Byington had therefore prepared projections based on the number of patrons served within the existing weight-room square footage and the potential capacity of an expanded area.

Staff reported that resident membership remained nearly unchanged, while nonresident membership declined following the pricing changes. Council Member Hunter considered the decline acceptable if it improved access for residents who support the facility through taxes. Council Member Taylor noted, however, that stable membership amid substantial population growth meant the Fitness Center's share of resident users had declined and requested better data on which services would attract newer American Fork residents.

Mr. Rykert explained that the City's initial consulting study identified member attrition and the need to attract new users as significant concerns. He stated that one approach would be to modernize the Fitness Center's services and spaces to better reflect current preferences. Industry trends would support repurposing additional space for weights and fitness equipment, although doing so would reduce the space available for existing programs.

The Council discussed whether the Fitness Center could attract residents from newer developments south of the freeway despite traffic, VASA's convenient location, and private neighborhood amenities. Council Member Holley questioned whether major investments would overcome those barriers, while Council Member Taylor believed residents could still be attracted if the city offered sufficiently valuable and convenient services.

Mr. Rykert explained that this was why staff included Option 2. That alternative would preserve the existing programming space while allowing the city to invest in and expand those programs to maximize use of the facility.

Council Members requested racquetball usage data and projected membership and revenue for each alternative. They emphasized applying the same "highest and best use" analysis to racquetball courts as to gymnastics space and wanted stronger evidence before reducing an existing revenue-generating program in favor of expanded weight and fitness areas.

Council Member Holley suggested first converting one or both racquetball courts into weight and fitness space as a lower-cost test of membership demand, given projected payback periods ranging from approximately 6 to 20 years. Council Member Carroll noted that gymnastics may serve the most participants and represent the best use of space. Council Member Hunter supported retaining gymnastics but asked whether it could move to another City facility, allowing the underused gymnasium to serve additional purposes while relieving the overcrowded weight room.

Council Members agreed that limitations in the existing weight room support reevaluating how the Fitness Center allocates space. Council Member Hunter asked staff to explore alternative configurations for the upper-level spin area and space above the racquetball courts under Options 1 and 1A, including whether partial rather than full reopening could better accommodate cardio and fitness equipment.

The Council discussed whether removing the entire gymnasium floor could create a larger lower-level fitness area with substantially improved ceiling clearance, while allowing the

existing weight-room area to be repurposed for cardio equipment. Mr. Rykert noted that this would create approximately the same amount of space as the proposed expansion, but Council Member Hunter emphasized that it would provide better vertical clearance. Members acknowledged that, although the existing configuration has featured some patrons enjoy, it is not how they would design a new fitness facility, which would likely include higher ceilings, a more open layout, natural light, and improved ventilation.

Mayor Frost redirected the discussion toward identifying a practical path forward and suggested holding a future work session at the Fitness Center so the Council could evaluate the space firsthand. He noted that any expansion decision would require some reliance on industry trends and projected demand. Council Member Hunter supported an onsite tour and also expressed interest in visiting comparable facilities, including Spanish Fork, to review features such as individual changing rooms and alternative fitness-space configurations. However, he cautioned that the Council should establish realistic expectations and carefully evaluate how examples from newer facilities could be adapted to the City's existing building and available resources.

The Council agreed that additional review was necessary before selecting an option. Although visiting newer facilities could provide useful examples, Mayor Frost questioned whether those comparisons would establish unrealistic expectations and emphasized the need to identify the specific information required to move the decision forward.

Council Members Holley, Carroll, and John supported holding a future work session at the Fitness Center to tour the building and evaluate the available space together. Council Member Holley remained interested in Option 2 and suggested considering the conversion of all 3 racquetball courts into weight and fitness space if their current utilization does not justify the square footage. Council Member John requested comparable utilization data for the racquetball courts and gymnasium so the Council could evaluate both areas consistently based on participation and space. Mayor Frost also requested information about potential dual uses for the gymnasium and applicable industry standards, with the goal of increasing use beyond its current estimated 35% to 40% percent of the day.

The Council continued discussing how to compare the gymnasium and racquetball courts based on both overall usage and the number of patrons served per square foot. Mr. Byington estimated that the racquetball courts and gymnasium are each occupied approximately 35% to 40% of the Fitness Center's operating hours. However, he noted that racquetball use is generally limited to four players at a time, while gymnastics reaches a peak of 72 participants at approximately 6:15 p.m. Council Member John stated that these differences should be considered when evaluating the most efficient use of each space.

Mr. Rykert proposed giving recreation programmers a five-month period, through December, to increase participation and reverse the declining trends in gymnastics and other gym-based programs. The results could help determine whether retaining the current gymnasium space is justified or whether staff should pursue another way to expand the weight area. Mayor Frost supported the proposal. Council Member Hunter asked whether staff could increase use during off-peak periods, and staff indicated they would explore additional gymnastics, tumbling, and other programming during mornings and midday hours.

Mr. Byington advised that detailed participation data are available for every current program, including seven months of usage models and capacity information, and offered to provide any additional figures requested by the Council. Council Member Hunter also requested a comparison between the amount the city pays to use Alpine School District facilities and the rates the city charges others to rent its basketball courts. Council Member Carroll asked about the cost of retaining the existing configuration and addressing the gym's partition, and staff clarified that the partition remains operational but is visually large and awkward.

3. Discussion on amendments to the city code regarding external accessory dwelling units. Mayor Frost introduced the discussion regarding proposed City Code amendments for detached accessory dwelling units and emphasized the need for clear Council direction before the ordinance is forwarded to the Planning Commission and returned for final consideration.

Mr. O'Brien explained that he would review the draft ordinance directly because it covered the principal issues requiring Council direction. He stated that state law requires cities to permit detached accessory dwelling units on single-family residential lots of at least 11,000 square feet. Although the City cannot prohibit these units on qualifying lots, the Council may choose to allow them to be put on smaller lots as well. He identified the minimum lot-size requirement as the first major policy decision for the Council.

Council Member Hunter asked what parking requirements the city could impose on detached accessory dwelling units. Mr. O'Brien explained that state law allows the city to regulate certain characteristics, including building height, setbacks, lot coverage, square footage, and limited design-compatibility standards. The City may also establish owner-occupancy requirements for either the primary residence or the detached unit, determine whether both units may be rented, restrict or permit short-term rentals, and address applicable impact and utility connection fees.

Regarding parking, Mr. O'Brien stated that the city may require only one additional onsite parking space for a detached accessory dwelling unit of 650 square feet or less and no more than two additional onsite spaces for a unit exceeding 650 square feet.

Council Member Hunter asked whether the City could establish a minimum size for detached accessory dwelling units. Mr. O'Brien indicated that the City's authority appears to relate primarily to maximum size, while Ms. Schriever noted that any unit would still need to meet applicable habitability requirements. Council Members discussed whether basic standards, such as plumbing and other residential facilities, would effectively establish a practical minimum comparable to a small studio apartment or hotel room.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the draft ordinance included standards used by other cities as a starting point for discussion rather than as a specific staff recommendation. He also raised whether the Council wanted to limit each property to one accessory dwelling unit, either internal or detached. Under that approach, a property with an internal accessory dwelling unit could not add a detached unit, and a property with a detached unit could not later create an internal unit. The Council then asked how the City would identify and verify whether a property already contained an internal accessory dwelling unit.

Mr. O'Brien explained that identifying internal accessory dwelling units can be challenging because the city generally becomes aware of them only through building-permit applications and inspections. When an application is submitted as a basement remodel, staff evaluates whether the proposed improvements effectively create a self-contained living unit. Features such as a separate kitchen, independent living facilities, utility arrangements, and required fire separation may cause staff to classify the project as an accessory dwelling unit rather than a standard basement remodel.

Council Member Hunter noted that many internal units may share utility meters with the primary residence and include utilities in the rent, making separate metering an unreliable indicator. Mr. O'Brien agreed and stated that staff instead consider the overall configuration, including whether the space has a self-contained kitchen and appropriate fire-rated separation, even when an interior connecting door remains.

Mr. O'Brien added that staff also identify unpermitted units during inspections when possible. Council Member John then asked whether the city could require either the primary residence or accessory dwelling unit to be owner-occupied and whether other municipalities had adopted that requirement. Ms. Schriever responded that owner occupancy is expressly permitted as a regulatory option, although she had not surveyed how frequently other cities require it.

Mr. O'Brien stated that many municipalities require one of the two dwellings, the primary residence or the accessory unit, to be owner-occupied, with even stricter regulations common in resort-oriented communities. He also recommended prohibiting accessory dwelling units from being used as short-term rentals. He explained that accessory dwelling units are intended to provide affordable or alternative long-term housing, while short-term rentals do not increase the supply of housing available to residents, even if they provide supplemental income to the property owner.

Mr. Bunker explained that applications for detached accessory dwelling units would require permits, inspections, and compliance with the standards adopted by the Council. Because the City may not always be able to independently verify whether a property already contains an internal unit, applicants could be required to sign a statement affirming that the property has only one accessory dwelling unit and acknowledging that both an internal and detached unit are prohibited. Although some violations may still occur, the signed acknowledgment would document the applicant's understanding and provide a basis for future enforcement requiring the owner to retain only one of the two units.

Council Member Hunter raised concerns about detecting unauthorized rental units and enforcing owner-occupancy requirements. He cautioned that allowing detached accessory dwelling units could worsen parking and neighborhood impacts where properties already contain unapproved rentals, particularly on absentee-owned investment properties. Council Member John suggested requiring owner occupancy, but Council Member Hunter emphasized that the requirement would need a practical enforcement mechanism.

Council Member Holley cited Salt Lake City's reported efforts to identify unauthorized short-term rentals through online platforms as an example of the legal and practical difficulties cities face when enforcing rental restrictions. Council Members noted that unauthorized short-term rentals may reduce the availability of affordable housing and asked

staff to consider how the City could meaningfully monitor and enforce its proposed accessory dwelling unit regulations.

Mr. O'Brien explained that rental-property owners must obtain a city business license and register as landlords. When an owner applies to rent an internal accessory dwelling unit, the City requires identification, such as a driver's license, to verify that the owner resides at the property. Staff have encountered applications in which the identification showed an out-of-state address, indicating potential noncompliance with the owner-occupancy requirement.

Mr. O'Brien confirmed that accessory dwelling unit violations are enforced case by case when discovered, often through neighbor complaints or public rental listings. Council Member Hunter remained concerned that allowing detached units would increase enforcement challenges. Staff explained that violations are already subject to civil and criminal remedies and discussed recording an affidavit documenting the property's accessory dwelling unit restrictions.

The Council clarified that required parking for a detached accessory dwelling unit must be provided onsite in addition to the spaces serving the primary residence. Mr. O'Brien explained that even a three-car garage would not automatically satisfy the accessory unit's parking requirement because the city would require a separate, dedicated space. The intent is to prevent blocked or double-stacked vehicles from being displaced onto the street.

The Council also discussed where detached units should be located. Staff proposed prohibiting them from extending forward of the primary home's front elevation, generally limiting them to the defined side or rear yard. Council Member Hunter suggested a more restrictive standard requiring the entire detached unit to remain behind the home's rear building line. He stated that this could reduce the visual impact of a large secondary structure near the street and indirectly limit its size. Mr. O'Brien noted that this approach could be difficult on corner lots but agreed that clearer definitions of front, side, and rear yards would help prevent applicants from interpreting any area beside the house as a side yard.

Council Member Holley questioned whether imposing multiple size, placement, and parking restrictions could be viewed by the state as effectively preventing detached accessory dwelling units on otherwise eligible lots. He emphasized the need to ensure that the City's standards remain reasonable and do not conflict with the state mandate.

Mayor Frost redirected the discussion to the specific policy decisions needed for the ordinance. Council Members agreed that owner occupancy should be required, noting that absentee ownership and multiple rental units can negatively affect neighborhoods.

The Council then discussed maximum unit size. Staff explained that the city may regulate a detached accessory dwelling unit's size, dimensions, height, and relationship to the primary residence. Possible standards could prohibit the unit from exceeding the primary home's size or limit it to a specified percentage of the primary structure. Mr. O'Brien clarified that the City's existing 1,000-square-foot minimum for constructing a primary residence would not necessarily establish the minimum size of an accessory unit.

Council Member Holley cautioned that excessive size, placement, and parking requirements could effectively prohibit detached accessory dwelling units and prompt further state

restrictions on local authorities. Mr. O'Brien agreed that the city should adopt reasonable standards within state law, noting that existing lot dimensions and home placement would already limit construction opportunities.

Mr. O'Brien added that some property owners may find converting a basement into an internal accessory dwelling unit more financially practical than constructing a new detached unit. Converting an existing accessory structure may also be costly because it must be upgraded to residential habitability standards, potentially requiring extensive plumbing, electrical, insulation, drywall, and other improvements.

The Council discussed setbacks, building height, and utility requirements for detached accessory dwelling units. Mr. O'Brien recommended applying consistent setback standards to both new detached units and conversions of existing accessory structures so that a structure built under less restrictive standards could not later be converted into a dwelling and adversely affect neighboring properties. He also identified maximum building height as an important consideration.

Mr. O'Brien stated that detached units should be subject to applicable impact and utility connection fees because they constitute additional dwellings that place new demands on City systems. Council Member John asked whether applicants would also be required to dedicate water. Mr. Bunker explained that if a detached unit has separate water, sewer, and metering connections, the owner will pay the associated fees and provide sufficient water rights to serve the unit, with a minimum requirement of one equivalent residential unit.

Mr. O'Brien explained that internal accessory dwelling units generally do not require additional utility fees because they remain within the home's existing footprint and connections. Detached units create new utility, and stormwater impacts and may require additional water dedication because the property's original allocation covered only the primary residence.

Council Member John stated that constructing a separate dwelling creates new demand for both the water and sewer systems and should therefore require additional water dedication. However, he suggested that the city could consider a reduced requirement for smaller units of 650 square feet or less rather than requiring the full amount applicable to a standard residence. Mr. Bunker characterized a property containing both a primary residence and a detached accessory dwelling unit as a form of multi-unit development that creates additional infrastructure demand.

Mr. O'Brien explained that a sufficiently large lot—potentially around 22,000 square feet—might meet the dimensional requirements to be subdivided after a detached accessory dwelling unit is constructed, creating two independent residential lots. Although few properties in the City would qualify, he noted that Farmington had adopted provisions allowing detached accessory dwelling units to be separated from the original property as new lots. Mr. Bunker stated that this possibility provides another reason to require separate utility connections at the time of construction.

Council Member Holley cautioned that full water dedication, impact fees, and connection charges could make detached units unaffordable for homeowners seeking occasional family accommodation. Mr. O'Brien responded that the city must account for long-term

infrastructure demand because a future owner could convert the unit to a full-time rental after the City's opportunity to collect those fees had passed.

Mr. O'Brien responded that the regulatory concern is the additional dwelling's potential demand on City infrastructure, regardless of whether the owner initially intends to rent it. He noted that many properties capable of accommodating detached units are in older areas where infrastructure capacity may already be limited.

Mr. Bunker added that waiving the water requirement would shift the cost of the unit's additional consumption to existing residents. Council Member Holley acknowledged that appropriate connection charges may be necessary but questioned whether requiring a full acre-foot of water or similarly substantial dedication was proportionate for a unit used only occasionally. He suggested that the Council consider a more flexible or scaled approach based on the unit's anticipated impact.

The Council acknowledged the difficulty of balancing reasonable regulation with the need to protect City infrastructure. Council Member Hunter expressed skepticism that the city could reliably distinguish an occasionally used family unit from a full-time rental, noting that most applicants could claim the unit would be used only for visiting relatives. Council Member Holley agreed that such an exception could be abused but maintained that the Council should avoid imposing disproportionate costs on homeowners who genuinely intend to use the unit only for limited family accommodation.

Mayor Frost emphasized that existing residents have made substantial investments in the City's utility systems and should not be required to subsidize the additional impacts created by new detached dwellings. However, he suggested that water dedication requirements could potentially be scaled according to unit size. A small studio unit of approximately 350 square feet, for example, may warrant a lower requirement than a much larger detached dwelling approaching the size of a primary residence.

The Council supported exploring a prorated water dedication requirement based on the detached unit's square footage. Council Member John noted that many properties in older neighborhoods could potentially accommodate detached units, but existing water and sewer systems may not have sufficient capacity if a substantial number of homeowners construct them. Mr. O'Brien agreed that this is particularly concerning in older areas where infrastructure was not designed for the additional residential demand, unlike newer developments where utilities may have been sized with greater density in mind.

Mayor Frost emphasized that requirements should account for the unit's long-term potential use rather than only the current owner's circumstances. Although a household may use relatively little water today, future occupants could include a much larger family. Mr. O'Brien suggested estimating demand based on a reasonable rental scenario while also accounting for periods of vacancy and agreed to develop potential prorated water requirements for the Council's review.

Mr. O'Brien then returned to the remaining policy questions, asking whether the Council supported the proposed requirement of one additional parking space for units of 650 square feet or less and two spaces for larger units. He also requested directions regarding maximum unit size, building height, and setbacks.

The Council discussed limiting the size and occupancy capacity of detached accessory dwelling units. Mr. O'Brien explained that the City may establish a maximum floor area and potentially limit the number of bedrooms. Mr. Bunker added that the City's existing lot-coverage and impervious-surface standards must also be considered. On larger lots, a sizable, detached dwelling combined with the primary residence, other accessory structures, parking, and amenities such as swimming pools could consume a substantial portion of the rear yard and create an overly crowded site.

Ms. Schriever suggested preparing a graphic of a typical 11,000-square-foot lot showing required setbacks, existing parking, and the remaining buildable area for a detached unit. Mr. O'Brien agreed to prepare a SketchUp model and explore a vertical rendering comparing the height and visual impact of detached units placed near typical single-story and two-story homes, including how they could affect the streetscape.

The Council discussed limiting the height of detached accessory dwelling units to reduce their effect on neighboring properties. Council Member John suggested establishing an absolute maximum height of approximately 24 feet or prohibiting a unit from exceeding the height of the primary residence. Under that approach, a detached unit behind a single-story rambler could not be constructed as a substantially taller two-story building.

Council Member Holley asked whether the city could simply limit detached units to one story, which could also prevent excessively large units. Mr. O'Brien confirmed that the city may regulate both the number of stories and maximum building height. He explained that height standards could address both the eave and roof-ridge elevations. He also noted that structures under 600 square feet with an eave height below 10 feet may qualify for different fire-protection requirements. Council Member Carroll emphasized that building height could significantly affect adjacent properties and should be carefully restricted.

The Council emphasized that setback, height, and square-footage standards must work together to prevent an excessively large, detached dwelling from negatively affecting neighboring properties. Mayor Frost acknowledged the need to consider worst-case scenarios while also accounting for the range of legitimate uses.

Mr. O'Brien then asked whether exterior materials should be required to match those of the primary residence. He explained that a matching-material requirement would be the simplest objective standard and would help preserve neighborhood character. Council Member Holley was hesitant to require an exact match, noting that an accessory unit behind an older brick home should not necessarily have to use brick and could still be compatible using modern residential materials. Staff and Council Members agreed that some material restrictions may be appropriate to prevent incompatible designs, while recognizing that defining "compatible" materials could be difficult to administer consistently.

The Council discussed how to establish design standards that preserve neighborhood character without requiring detached accessory dwelling units to exactly match the primary residence. Mr. O'Brien explained that detailed material standards could become lengthy and still leave regulatory gaps, so he recommended initially requiring exterior materials to be "similar" or "compatible" with those of the primary home.

Council Members agreed that compatibility could allow reasonable flexibility, such as using siding or stucco with an older brick home, while preventing a prefabricated shed-like structure from being used as a dwelling. Mr. Bunker suggested authorizing the official building to determine whether proposed materials are compatible. Mr. O'Brien acknowledged that the discretionary standard could result in occasional appeals to the Board of Adjustment but believed it could be administered.

The Council agreed that a compatibility standard would help prevent detached accessory dwelling units from resembling prefabricated sheds or industrial metal buildings. Mayor Frost confirmed that impact fees had been addressed, and Mr. O'Brien noted that the ordinance must proceed through the Planning Commission and receive approval before the October deadline.

Council Member Hunter then asked how the proposed placement standards would apply to a casita constructed with a new home, noting that some southern Utah designs place the casita toward the front of the property. Mr. O'Brien explained that a detached unit located in the front or side yard could create parking and site-layout complications. He recommended retaining a 30-foot setback and requiring parking to be located near the detached unit rather than displacing vehicles serving the primary residence. The discussion also raised questions about unusually configured lots where the existing home sits far back from the street and how the city would distinguish the primary dwelling from the accessory unit in those circumstances.

The Council discussed how the ordinance should address conversions of existing buildings and properties with unusual layouts. Council Member Hunter described a large parcel where the existing home is located far from the street and a new primary residence could potentially be constructed closer to the frontage, allowing the original home to become the accessory dwelling unit. Under the proposed size standard, the new primary residence would need to be larger than the original building being converted.

Council Member Holley recommended including a process for exceptions when strict application of the placement standards would produce an unreasonable result. Although detached units generally should not be located in front of the primary residence, he believed unusual lot configurations may justify flexibility. Mayor Frost asked whether an appeal process could address those circumstances. Ms. Schriever cautioned that, because these requirements would be land-use regulations, the City's discretion would be limited once objective standards were adopted.

Mr. O'Brien noted that some similar requests have involved creating an additional building lot rather than merely converting an existing structure. Council Member Hunter clarified that he was not asking the City to tailor the ordinance to one project but was using current examples to identify situations the regulations should reasonably accommodate.

The Council discussed emergency-access requirements for detached accessory dwelling units located in rear yards. Mr. O'Brien noted that the city must ensure the Fire Department can reach those structures with its equipment and hoses. Ms. Schriever emphasized that detached units must comply with all applicable zoning, building, and fire codes. Depending on access and proximity to a hydrant, a unit may require fire sprinklers, which could add substantially to the construction cost.

Mr. O'Brien agreed to refine the ordinance language and prepare clearer definitions and illustrations based on the Council's direction. The Council reached a general consensus to forward the revised draft to the Planning Commission rather than schedule another work session, recognizing that it could make further changes when the ordinance returns.

4. Adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:31 pm.



Stephanie Finau
Deputy Recorder