

Approved February 2, 2021

MINUTES OF THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2021, IN THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1020 EAST PIONEER ROAD, DRAPER, UTAH

PRESENT: Mayor Troy K. Walker, and Councilmembers Mike Green, Tasha Lowery, Fred Lowry, Cal Roberts, and Marsha Vawdrey

EXCUSED:

STAFF PRESENT: David Dobbins, City Manager; Mike Barker, City Attorney; Laura Oscarson, City Recorder; Scott Cooley, City Engineer; Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resource Director; John Eining, Police Chief; Rhett Ogden, Recreation Director; Christina Oliver, Community Development Director; Clint Smith, Fire Chief; Britnee Johnston, Communications Director; and Bob Wylie, Finance Director

This meeting was held electronically.

This meeting will be an electronic meeting according to Draper City Municipal Code 2- 1-040.

Determination 2020-25, pursuant to Utah Code Annotated 52-4-207(4)

I, Mayor Troy K. Walker, do hereby determine conducting an electronic meeting of the Draper City Council with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location and hereby authorize the Draper City Council to conduct electronic meetings without an anchor location.

The foregoing determination is based on the following facts:

- Federal, state, and local leaders, including the Draper City Mayor and City Council, have all recognized a global pandemic caused by the spread of the COVID-19 virus.
- COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations in Draper continue to fluctuate at high levels, both of which pose a risk of overburdening the local health care system and health care providers.
- It is difficult, if not impossible, to predict the number of attendees at any meeting and to manage issues regarding social distancing in order to comply with state and local health departments' health orders.
- COVID-19 poses a continuing and immediate threat to the health, safety, and welfare of Draper City residents.
- The City has the technological capability to provide means by which the public may hear, or view and hear, the open portions of the meeting and to participate in public hearings.

To participate, please see the options below:

- Listen through the Draper City website - <https://www.draper.ut.us/95/Agendas- Minutes>.
- Email comments to public.comment@draper.ut.us. These will become part of the public record.

- Those wishing to speak during the meeting, send a request and include your name, address, and phone number which you will be calling from, for the Zoom meeting ID to public.comment@draper.ut.us.

Study Session

1.0 **Presentation: Utah Transit Authority Micro Transit Pilot Program and 5-year Service Plan – Carlton Christensen**

1.1 Carlton Christensen, Utah Transit Authority (UTA), said that from the beginning both Draper and Mayor Walker had been strong advocates for the micro-transit service that UTA was test piloting. Mr. Christensen explained that Jaron Robertson, a member of the Innovative Mobility Group, would first update the Council on the pilot's progress. UTA was also in the process of updating its Five-Year Service Plan and currently was receiving public comment on it. Mr. Christensen said that the plan will guide UTA on modifications and new elements to the transit service. Laura Hanson, UTA Director of Planning, would talk about the plan.

1.2 Mr. Robertson thanked the Mayor and Council. He reminded the Council that the pilot program started in November of 2019 and had just passed its one-year mark. The pilot was a public-private partnership with a company called Via. Via specialized in providing on-demand transit service. The goals of the pilot program centered on improved mobility. They include: (a) coverage-based transit; (b) provide first and last-mile connections to UTA rail stations; (c) improved customer experience and (d) improved operating efficiencies.

Mr. Robertson noted the impact that COVID-19 had on the pilot program. He explained that during the first months UTA saw pretty significant growth in ridership and use of the service. However, in response to COVID, there was a decrease in ridership. UTA was able to implement improved cleaning and safety procedures and to make quick adjustments to the service.

Mr. Robertson then highlighted some trends that emerged during the pilot. From November until March UTA's on-demand service saw strong growth in use. By mid-March, the program approached about 500 trips per day, exceeding initial targets for the service. When COVID hit there was a 22.8% decrease in the service's use. From April to September, people did return to service at an average of 16%. This was interrupted in October when there was a resurgence of COVID.

Apart from usage, one of the highlights of the service was the Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles (WAV). This increased mobility of community members who were otherwise restricted. Whereas in November of 2019, the on-demand service had just 3 riders, by September 2020 there were 180 WAV riders. Another goal of the program was to increase the number of shared rides such that 30% of all trips were shared rides. The data indicated

that they were on track to hit that by February. However, because of COVID, UTA self-imposed some limits as safety measures. This limited shared rides to three people per ride. He explained that until the agency decides to take away the limits on shared rides, they will continue to hover from 9-15%.

Lastly, Mr. Robertson talked about the first mile/last mile (FMLM) connections. These are trips that start or end at a rail station. Before COVID half of the trips started or ended with UTA rail. This suggested that people were using the service as a connection for transit. He displayed a visual of the UTA service area compared to a plot of one day's service data. This revealed how mobility changed from a fixed route service; trips covered the entire service area and created clusters around rail stations. The top two locations were the Draper Front Runner Station and the TRAX Daybreak Station.

Regarding the next steps, UTA plans to extend the pilot through August 2021. UTA also intends to look at the flex routes operating in the service area. During the first course of the pilot, the on-demand service and flex route services were run side-by-side. This led to a drop in ridership on the flex routes. One of the flex routes was already suspended in response to COVID. UTA is going to investigate suspending the rest of the routes to be able to evaluate the pilot as a stand-alone service. Currently, they have an April 2021 change day scheduled. Some additional features UTA hopes to add to the pilot are integration with the transit app and UTA electronic fare media. Also, UTA is looking to provide first and last-mile connections through its paratransit service. If there were paratransit customers in the service area, they would be able to use the on-demand service to help improve mobility for people with disabilities. Finally, UTA was doing some evaluation of how micro-transit can serve other communities by connecting to other transit networks.

- 1.3 Laura Hanson said that she was there to share with the Council a draft copy of UTA's Five-Year Service Plan. She explained that the Local Advisory Council and the Board of Trustees would be considering the adoption of the plan in February. Currently, they were collecting public input from different stakeholders and partners.

To begin, Ms. Hanson outlined what the five-year plan was and was not. UTA viewed the five-year plan as a vision and as a guide for what UTA thinks they will be doing in the next five years in terms of service changes. She stated that the plan was certain to change because there was a lot that was unknown about financial resources and new travel patterns. That said, the three goals of the plan were to (a) increase ridership and gain back riders that might have been lost during the pandemic; (b) strengthen customer confidence and (c) align services with resources to strengthen financial stability. UTA is thinking about 2021 as the time to stabilize its labor, workforce, and financial systems. Because of this, UTA is not thinking about implementation until 2022.

Before diving into the plan. Ms. Hanson provided an overview of UTA's planning process. Phase one consisted of strategic planning. This was the work of the regional metropolitan planning organization. The strategic plan is updated every four years and looks 30 years into the future about transit needs. However, the strategic plan does not look at the local

level and certainly not at the micro-transit level. Because of this, the Five-Year Service Plan, or phase two, was necessary. It is at this level that planners look at the 30-year overall structure and ask how local services fit within that vision. The Five-Year Service Plan is organized as five rolling years and outlines what changes UTA anticipates making in each of those time frames. In phase 3, operations planning, UTA takes the ideas suggested in the Five-Year Service Plan and considers them for actual implementation. She noted that the first step in operational planning was to meet with affected local governments. If UTA has a service with a possibility of change, they make sure to ask local governments if the change meets their vision as a community and then adjusts as necessary based on the feedback received. Also, UTA goes through a public hearing process and a Title XI analysis regarding the Civil Rights Act to ensure that changes are not disproportionately impacting minority or low-income populations. The board has to approve the plan before moving towards stage four, implementation.

Ms. Hanson explained that the Five-Year Service Plan was organized around a series of guiding frameworks or principles. The first of these frameworks is service choices where UTA reaches out to the community. UTA asked the public questions such as if they felt UTA should focus on increasing ridership or coverage. Other elements of the plan include system-wide planning. Ms. Hanson said that this was one of the first times that UTA had pooled all of its resources into a single pot to think about how the service network was working as a whole. As a result, some resources had been shifted from one mode to another. UTA also talked about implementing a core route network. The idea behind this was to have a series of bus routes of the best service, operating early in the morning and late at night, seven days a week. Another change in the plan is a move towards all-day service. The pandemic had caused a shift in ridership from peak periods to a steady all-day demand stream. The service plan also explores new technologies.

Some of the highlights included in the plan related to Salt Lake County include:

1. Improve service on the west side of Salt Lake County with new connections to the airport and Inland Port via 3600 West, 5600 West, and 3100 South.
2. Improve frequency and hours of service on many routes.
3. Implement a network of high-frequency core routes.
4. Adjust local bus routes to prepare for future Midvalley Connector, 5600 West, and South Davis Bus Rapid Transit service.
5. Improved connections to Rose Park and Glendale as part of the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan.
6. Improved connections from the FrontRunner to the University of Utah and Research Park
7. Consider continued innovative mobility solutions like micro-transit in Herriman, Riverton, South Jordan, Bluffdale, and Draper in south Salt Lake County.
8. Construct a new transit hub on the west side of Salt Lake City.
9. Improve all-day service on many routes.

Ms. Hanson also expressed that UTA was planning for the future with expanded rail and bus services, a cleaner fleet, and continued studies on transit patterns.

Regarding the timeline, UTA expects that the Local Advisory Council and Board of Trustees will adopt the Five-Year Service Plan in February. Following this, UTA intends to reach out to different transit leaders, municipalities, and city staff to better understand community needs and what areas are growing. Information from the Five-Year Service Plan will inform upcoming operational plans and future implementation.

** Councilmember Green joined the meeting at 5:53 p.m.

1.4 Councilmember Roberts asked if UTA had a sense of how many of the micro-transit rides were repeat users. He was interested to know if people were using it as one-off transportation or if there was a core group of users who were using it a lot.

Mr. Robertson said that he did not have specific data offhand, but that they do see a lot of repeat users. He said that especially during the pandemic most riders were consistent users.

Councilmember Roberts asked if the right way to think about the micro-transit program was as the last mile/first mile public Uber. He wondered how to put the performance of the program in context.

Mr. Robertson said that for UTA what they want to test is another mode of public transit. He said that they did put a big emphasis on the first and last mile connections, but they also want to make sure that they provide local and community service. If someone wanted to connect to a home to a library to a doctor's office to a grocery store, that was an element that UTA wanted to be able to provide from a public transit perspective. That was the reason why UTA emphasized shared rides as opposed to going door to door unless someone required a wheelchair accessible vehicle.

Mr. Christensen added that a couple of places that he would label as successes from the perspective of the board was the number of requests that were for wheelchair accessible vans. He said that one of the primary locations that people used the micro-transit to commute to was Walmart. The service supported a lot of folks in getting groceries. Also, it allowed many who were aging in place to still have mobility. He said that while UTA always loves high ridership numbers, giving folks mobility to access basic needs was a positive outcome.

2.0 Legislative Update: Representative Jeff Stenquist

2.1 Representative Stenquist said that he wanted Draper to know that he was available and that it was an honor for him to represent Draper again at the legislative session. He said that it was an interesting year all around. The legislative session was going to look a little different. Representatives would be COVID tested twice a week and would have social distancing measures in place changing normal public access. One of the silver linings was that there would be increased opportunities for people to participate remotely. The public

would be able to join committee hearings and provide testimony. In the past, the public was able to listen to audio in conjunction with hearings and watch a video of floor time, but there was not a way for the public to participate.

Representative Stenquist said that one never knows what will pop up during a legislative session. He did not know what the big controversial items would be this year. He did know that there would be a discussion about the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches, particularly during times of pandemics. He said that he did not think that the conversation would have a major impact on the current pandemic. He said that by the time it is voted on, passed, and signed by the Governor, he anticipates that they would be coming out of the pandemic. He said that one of the good things to note was that last year after the budget was set, they came back in a special session and wiped the budget out to the bare bones, and cut \$850 million out of the budget. That included several bills that had been funded and some that were not funded. As the pandemic has unfolded, the revenue numbers did not end up being as bad as it was feared they would be. Because of this, it looks like a lot of funding will be restored, and that there is a pretty healthy budget surplus that has led to talk of a targeted tax cut that might happen.

In particular, there was a huge compromise, which was perhaps forgotten in everything that happened in 2020, on Constitutional Amendment G to provide a more stable mechanism for funding education. A lot of that money had to be pulled in the special session. It was anticipated that it would take a few years to restore that funding. The funding included a six percent increase in Weighted Pupil Units (WPU) and other money that was promised for items such as raises for state employees. The six percent WPU was a big commitment on the part of the legislature to fund education. Even though it was initially thought that it would take a couple of years to restore, the legislature will be able to do all of that in 2021, plus a \$1500 per teacher bonus. He said there was a real commitment to making sure that education funding was their top priority.

From a municipal standpoint, Representative Stenquist said that he did not know the big things that would happen from a local government standpoint. He said that he was running a couple of bills that have ties to local government. One of those bills was one where he was working with the Governor's Office of Economic Development to create a revolving loan fund that municipalities could tap into for large regional infrastructure projects that would be beyond their bonding capacity. He said that he did not know if there were proposed projects in Draper that rose to the level to take advantage of that type of fund.

Another bill that he was working on was one for Ranked Choice Voting. It would force Salt Lake County to support Ranked Choice Voting. Cities in Salt Lake County would not have to go outside of the county to run their elections. He said that he knew that Ranked Choice Voting was something that Draper had discussed. He said that Draper could go with either Salt Lake or Utah County, but that he wanted Draper to know that cities in Salt Lake County had the option. He said that as he has spoken with people, there weren't technological barriers to run Ranked Choice Voting elections. He said that regardless of if someone liked that method of voting or not, it should be an option and not something the county refused to do.

Finally, Representative Stenquist asked the Council if there was anything, they wanted him to look out for regarding how to benefit shared constituents.

- 2.2 Councilmember F. Lowry said that he hoped that Representative Stenquist continued to pursue the Ranked Choice Voting. He said that he also had concerns about the separation of powers and how it could impact a similar dynamic between the powers of the state and cities. He said that he hoped that Draper would be able to maintain its rights within the city regarding zoning because cities needed to be able to have a local voice.

Representative Stenquist said Councilmember F. Lowry's concern had been a topic of conversation for forever. He said that this year there was added pressure because of the skyrocketing cost of housing in the state. There was a lot of discussion around affordable housing and how to address the affordable housing issue. He said that it was true that one way, perhaps the primary way, to address affordable housing would be to build more units. However, it was cities, local governments, and zoning laws that had control over density and height. The state could either sprawl out or build up. He said that he thought that as land prices continued to get more expensive, there would be a push to go vertical and build higher density. Those decisions tend to come with a lot of push back, mainly from residents. He said that he felt that Draper could say that they had done their part in terms of providing adequate housing and doing so in a smart way in terms of where high-density housing was allowed to be developed; near transit and transportation corridors.

Representative Stenquist highlighted his experience with local governments and that this was known by his colleagues. He also noted that several of the new representatives had local government experience and had served on City Councils. He said that he had hopes of being able to come up with solutions that prevented continued sprawl that put additional pressures on transportation and air quality. Overall, he felt they just needed to be smarter about development.

Representative Stenquist noted that he had some new committee assignments. These included the vice-chair of the Economic Development and Workforce Services Committee, the Transportation Committee, and the Infrastructure and General Government Appropriations Committee. He explained that the Infrastructure and General Government Committee set the budget for transportation. Because he also served on the Transportation Standing Committee that addresses policy, he felt he was well-positioned to do a lot with transportation and look out for Draper's interests. He said that he was also committed to continuing to focus on outdoor recreation. He reminded the Council that the Outdoor Recreation Committee passed a bill last year that was supposed to come up with a strategic plan and vision for outdoor recreation in Utah. This was one of the bills stopped due to COVID. However, Representative Stenquist was still the chair of that committee despite it not having any funding. He hoped that the funding would be restored this year. Also, he had recently spoken with Deidre Henderson about the Governor's budget proposal. Although his budget proposal was more of a recommendation, he was trying to push for greater recreation infrastructure and grants that Draper City could take advantage of.

3.0 Discussion: Ranked Choice Voting

- 3.1 David Dobbins, City Manager, explained that the item had been added to the agenda to get a feel for if the current council wanted to pursue Ranked Choice Voting for the November election.
- 3.2 Laura Oscarson, City Recorder, said that the recorders from cities in Salt Lake County, as well as Salt Lake County Clerk's office and the Utah County Clerk's office, met yesterday with Kory Holdaway with Ranked Choice Voting Utah. Sherrie Swensen was present and said that Salt Lake County just signed the contract to get their new machines on December 31, 2020. She was not sure when they would arrive and once they do, she will want to run tests to make sure that the software works and there are not any glitches. Because of this, Ms. Swensen was not able to indicate if Salt Lake County would be able to run a Ranked Choice Voting election in November.

Mayor Walker asked if Ms. Swensen was able to provide any sort of timeline.

Ms. Oscarson said no she didn't. She furthered that as a city, Draper has until April 15th to declare that they want to participate using Ranked Choice Voting. The city would send a Letter of Intent to the Lieutenant Governor's Office. She said that she was hopeful that Ms. Swenson would have an idea by March but that she came away from the meeting a little discouraged. Ms. Swensen was given funding for new machines last November by the County. These machines are capable of running an election using Ranked Choice Voting. Then the County decided that they wanted to have their IT people look at different machines which delayed the process by a month or more.

Mayor Walker asked about the Utah County clerk. He said that it was his understanding that Utah County was willing to run an election by Ranked Choice Voting.

Ms. Oscarson said that they keep getting different information from Utah County. What she heard was that Utah County was encouraging cities in Salt Lake County to form a co-op and the County would help that co-op run a Ranked Choice Voting election. It did not sound like they were willing to do the election. That information she was still not sure about.

Mayor Walker asked if the Council wanted to talk about the concept of Ranked Choice Voting.

- 3.3 Councilmember Green said that he would like to do it.
- 3.4 Councilmember T. Lowery said that she felt as though the concept of Ranked Choice Voting was positive for Draper. She said that she was having increasing concerns about whether Salt Lake County would be in a position to execute the election and if Utah County would be willing to take on Draper.

- 3.5 David Dobbins, City Manager, said that if the Council wanted staff to pursue it, they could have those discussions with Utah County to nail down if they really can facilitate the election. He said that he felt that staff had been a little hesitant to go that far because they did not want to get too far ahead of the Council.
- 3.6 Councilmember Roberts said that he was supportive. He asked if the issue with the machines was that they were set up a certain way and Salt Lake County did not have the right machines.
- 3.7 Mr. Dobbins said that the county had already purchased new machines but that there was a software that went with the machines that the county had to verify was programed and safe against fraud.
- 3.8 Mayor Walker asked if there was anyone who wanted to talk about the concept of Ranked Choice Voting; what it means or if there were concerns about the change in the process.
- 3.9 Mr. Dobbins said that what he would recommend unless the Council felt otherwise, was that the Council add the item to their agenda and adopt a formal resolution to state officially that was the Council's position.
- 3.10 Councilmember F. Lowry said that the Council needed to adopt a resolution to help Salt Lake County feel the pressure to move forward and get the system tested. He said that if they could get other communities to follow suit that would make a big difference.

Councilmember T. Lowery said that Riverton had already moved forward and adopted a resolution. She felt that if Draper also did so, they might see a lot more communities join in to help get the ball moving.

Councilmember Vawdrey said that she felt that education about Ranked Choice Voting would be huge, too. She felt that Draper needed to have a plan on how to inform constituents.

Councilmember Green said that he liked the concept of not having a primary election. He said that during the last two election cycles, people get really tired. He said that they were coming off of an awful four-year cycle that was contentious. To bring another election, it would be nice to give people a break until August where they do not have to see any political signs or rhetoric. He said that he felt that the community needed calmness for the next eight months.

Councilmember F. Lowry noted the financial savings for the city and candidates.

Councilmember T. Lowery said she felt these were both good points. Ranked Choice Voting made elections less contentious, encouraged people to be more positive towards one another and build relationships, and it did have a cost savings effect.

Mayor Walker asked if the Council would like to put Ranked Choice Voting on the next agenda as a formal resolution. Councilmember Green said yes, please. The rest of the Council also said yes.

4.0 Discussion: Bond Payoff and Defeasance – Bob Wylie

- 4.1 Bob Wylie, Finance Director, said that he wanted to present to the Council an opportunity that Draper had to defease two bonds.

The first bond eligible was the Sales Tax Revenue Bond was issued in October 2012 to refund the Bangerter Parkway 2004 bond and the bond for City Hall from 2002. The outstanding principal and interest amount are \$3,170,400. With the Bangerter Parkway refunding included in the Series 2012 B, a portion of the defeasance would be paid for by the Draper City Redevelopment Agency (RDA) (approximately 35.3%). The remainder of the funding would come from the General Fund.

The second bond eligible was the Municipal Lease Revenue Refunding Bond, Series 2016. The original Municipal Building Authority (MBA) Lease Revenue Bond was issued for SunCrest Fire Station. The outstanding principal and interest on the bond are \$1,584,528. The funding for the defeasance would be appropriated from the General Fund.

Mr. Wylie went over the financial impact the defeasance of the bonds would have on the city. The defeasance of the Series 2012B bond would result in an \$84,865 savings in interest from now until the bond matured. The Series 2016 bond would have an \$82,273 savings. He said that those two savings amounts were not that much of a savings. But what he looks into is the future budgeting process of Draper City. The city was starting the Fiscal Year 2022 (FY22) budget process. If the bonds were not defeased, he would need to budget \$747,803 in the General Fund for the bond payments and \$286,400 in the RDA, almost a million dollars budgeted for debt service. Those budget items would extend until the bonds were paid off. If the bonds were defeased this year, then the \$747,803 would remain in the General Fund for operational budgeting and that \$286,400 would also be in the RDA. The RDA project area entailed the West Bangerter project area. That would mean that in the next several years, Draper would have a new source of revenue for General Fund operational expenses that they would be able to budget for versus just having it in General Fund balance.

Mr. Wylie then provided a snapshot of Draper's outstanding bonds. At the end of FY21, Draper had seven outstanding bonds, totaling \$19,691,000. If the two bonds were defeased the outstanding bond liability would drop to \$16,170,000. In the next five or six years, the remaining bonds would also be paid off.

If the Council approved to defease the bonds, Mr. Wylie would bring forward a resolution at the next council meeting to get official authorization for the city to act. The city would have to give 30 days' notice to the bondholders and then look at closing the accounts around the end of February. He said that this was just one recommendation to use the General

Fund and RDA balances to free up some of that cash for the operational budget going forward.

- 4.2 Councilmember Roberts asked what some of the uses would be for the new operating cash that would be made available by paying off the bonds. Mr. Wylie said that would be up to the Council.

Councilmember Roberts asked if the advantage were that instead of having one-time funds that could only be spent on one-time projects, the city would gain operating cash flow to use for recurring expenses. Mr. Wylie said yes, that would work.

Mr. Dobbins said that the money could be used for ongoing expenses. He said that there had been discussion about the Fire Department and Public Safety pay scales. Those were ongoing expenses. He said that staff had not yet identified what the use would be, but that there were one-time funds now that would give the Council more flexibility to use the money.

Councilmember F. Lowry asked if it would allow them to use one-time funds to finance the all-abilities park. Mr. Dobbins said that there would essentially be \$750,000 of funds that could be used next year towards either one-time use or recurring expenses. He said that what he would recommend would be that since the amount dropped down to a quarter-million in three years that some of that money be dedicated to ongoing uses, but the rest go towards one-time uses such as capital projects or to save up for the all-abilities park.

Councilmember Vawdrey asked if the Aquarium had been able to keep up with their bond payment through COVID. Mr. Wylie said that they had. He said that this month they had returned to making their full payment.

Mayor Walker asked what the rate was that bondholders were getting. Mr. Wylie said about three percent. For the 2012B bond, the city would buy State and Local Government Series (SLGS) Securities and the CPA firm would verify how much would be needed to be dropped in there. The 2016 series was a callable bond. The city could just pay it off. Both mechanisms would allow the bonds to be taken off the city's books and the bondholders would get paid the amounts through the callable period without a pre-payment penalty.

Councilmember T. Lowery said that she thought this was a very proactive measure to take. The rest of the Council agreed and requested that Mr. Wylie bring the resolution before the Council next week.

5.0 Update: Engineering Projects – Scott Cooley

- 5.1 Scott Cooley, City Engineer, presented the projects that were completed in 2020 and the proposed projects for 2021.

1. The first project completed in 2020 was the Highland Drive Widening from Bangerter Parkway to just east of Minuteman Drive. The stretch of road was widened from three to five lanes and a bike lane was added.
2. The second project was Bangerter Parkway and Traverse Ridge Road improvements between Highland Drive and 13800 South. The project was milled and overlaid, was widened from three to five lanes, and was re-striped. Also, a new traffic signal was added at 14000 South and there were safety upgrades under the railroad bridge. Just east of Highland Drive there were access management improvements in the form of a raised median.
3. The city completed its first full-depth reclamation with the 300 East reconstruction from 11400 South to 11800 South. Mr. Cooley said it went well. He encouraged the Council to drive that stretch of road because the project went so well that staff plan on using the technique in places that it was practical and feasible throughout the city. He said that some of the advantages of the process were that from the beginning of construction from the milling of the pavement to when it was completed was only eight days. He said that normally it would be a two to three-month project. He said that was a significant impact on residents and those who needed access to the roads. Normally during a construction project, staff receive tons of complaints. However, with this reclamation project, they received a lot of praise from residents who were amazed at the speed of the project.
4. Because the 300 East reconstruction projects went so well, staff implemented the same process with the Oak Vista Waterline Replacement and Roadway Reconstruction project.
5. The fifth project completed, although a bit controversial, was the Traverse Ridge Road Storm Drain improvements. A detention basin was constructed off Traverse Ridge Road. The design required the city to design to a ten-year storm. There had been significant flooding issues that affected downstream properties. Staff looked at the opportunity to use the area as a detention pond to make the road compatible with the 100-year storm than a ten-year storm. The project will provide additional safety to an area that was located on a huge landslide. Mr. Cooley stated that Traverse Ridge Road and its utilities, particularly the waterline, were his biggest concern in the city. He added that there had been discussions about what the project would look like and explained that the area had been seeded and would grow grass to look more native.
6. The next project completed was the widening of Lone Peak Parkway. Two sections were widened from three lanes to five with the addition of curbs and a sidewalk. One section was widened from three lanes to four because the city was not able to secure the right of way on the east side from the landowner at the time of the project. However, there were ongoing negotiations with the Harberts. The project, however, was finished.
7. A traffic signal was installed at 13490 South and Vista Station Boulevard. Increased new development made traffic flow an issue. Mr. Cooley said that the staff was seeing more problems like this throughout the city.

Proposed projects for 2021 outlined by Mr. Cooley included:

1. The first proposed project would occur at the intersection of 900 East and Draper Parkway. It is proposed to reconstruct the Draper Parkway pavement, complete the 900 East frontage improvements (curb, gutter, and sidewalk, and upgrade the traffic signal. It is an RDA funded project.
2. It was also proposed to widen 12200 South and add a curb, gutter, and sidewalk on the north side of the street.
3. A signal would be installed on 450 East by UDOT. For them to do that the city needed to widen the south leg of the street. Mr. Cooley said that this would be a critical element for businesses and the new homes just north of 12300 South.
4. Next, there would be some intersection improvements at the intersection of Highland Drive and Vestry Road. A new traffic signal would be added. Also, Highland Drive would be widened with a curb, gutter, and sidewalk installed to accommodate turn lanes.
5. The next item, a HAWK (High-Intensity Activated Cross Walk beacon) signal at SunCrest Drive and Eagle Stone Way, was a project that Mr. Cooley wanted to talk about with the Council. He explained that it was a needed traffic control device. The staff did a study to determine if a full traffic signal was needed. The study determined that the HAWK signal would be best. A HAWK signal essentially allowed pedestrians to stop traffic with the push of a button. Instead of being a flashing light that warns, it stops traffic. Mr. Cooley said that the traffic committee had discussed the pros and cons of different traffic devices. Because of the high speeds on SunCrest Drive and there was a bus stop on the east side of the road that kids on the west side have to cross the street to get access to, the committee felt a more aggressive signal was necessary. The staff knows that some residents will not be happy about the change. He wanted to let the Council know in advance that there might be some push back from residents. Mr. Cooley said that they were also going to extend a trail so that people would cross SunCrest at the signal. He believed that Parks and Trails intended to extend the trail after crossing at the signal on the other side of the road.

Mr. Dobbins asked if the Council was okay with staff proceeding with the signal. He asked if they wanted staff to go to residents first to get their feedback. Councilmember Roberts said that the signal was needed. He said that obviously, people did not like to have flashing lights in their homes, but he felt that the signal did a good job of mitigating the problem. He said that it was a needed signal for an area that was super dangerous.

Councilmember T. Lowery said that residents had been asking for something at the intersection for a long time.

Mr. Dobbins said that one element of the signal that he thought was nice was that the lights were only activated when there was a pedestrian present. In the middle of the night, the lights would not be seen.

6. Addressing the roundabout at 1300 East was also proposed. The project entailed adding a second lane in both the northbound and southbound directions and both east and westbound right turn lanes.

Councilmember F. Lowry said that last time he had heard about the 1300 East intersection the plan was to remove the roundabout and install a traffic signal. He wondered if this improvement was something that staff wanted to try first.

Mr. Cooley said that what was perpetuating the possibility of putting in a signal was if in the future tracks came in and extended the tracks line across the intersection. If that occurred, then the roundabout would probably fail. Because there was a high probability that the tracks would not extend as anticipated, staff were recommending this as a long-term solution.

Councilmember F. Lowry asked if Mr. Cooley felt that the roundabout would be as effective as a signal.

Mr. Cooley said that that it would be as effective, if not more effective. He said that the roundabout would be preferable for non-peak hours. He said that it was possible to go to a metered roundabout that controlled the amount of traffic that could enter to be able to clear out some lanes that were getting congested.

7. The Deer Ridge Road reconstruction would be ongoing during 2021 as well.
8. Staff had begun outlining a pavement maintenance program for the coming year. The treatments would include slurry seal, mastic seal, crack seal, and spot repairs. The city had done a good job at treating its roads lately. He said that some of the roads highlighted would be treated for the second time since Mr. Cooley had been with the city. This indicated that the city was doing a good job at keeping up with road repairs delaying the need for full road reconstruction. He said that the road treatments would cost in the order of \$2 million.
9. There was also a road reconstruction planned for 13200 South from 1500 East and Minuteman.
10. Two additional traffic signals would be added. One would be added at Bangerter Parkway and Vestry Road to address an expected increase in traffic due to residential growth and Pluralsight. The second signal would be added at 12200 South and Lone Peak Parkway due to business development in the area.
11. A pedestrian refuge island was proposed at Traverse Ridge Road and Oak Summit Drive. There was a sight visibility issue at the intersection in addition to some

vehicles traveling a lot faster than the posted speed limit. With the presence of the new SunCrest Park, the island would help pedestrians to be able to cross the road safely.

12. Improvements would be done at the 300 East Carlquist Road roundabout. A light would be installed in the center of the roundabout. Both the crosswalks across the southbound and eastbound traffic patterns would be moved back to meet compliance. A crash barrier would also be installed between the southbound and westbound points to protect walls that keep getting hit.

Councilmember F. Lowry asked how many times the walls had come down. He thought that it had happened at least three times in the last couple of years.

Councilmember F. Lowry stated that it was unique to have accidents like that happen so many times in the same place. He asked if any commonalities had been determined.

Mr. Cooley said that the biggest commonality was drunk driving. The last accident was a novice mistake: someone hitting the gas pedal when they should have hit the brake. He said he was not even sure if the driver had their license or if they only had their permit. Mr. Cooley said that it was unfortunate because he felt the intersection was pretty safe. However, to be on the precautionous side, they were going to install the improvements.

13. A possible project that might not happen because the design was only in its initial phases and not completed, in addition to the right of way acquisition negotiations, was the widening of the 300 East and 12300 South intersections. Staff received a lot of complaints about the area. The project would widen both legs to add a turn lane, making dual turn lanes in both the north and south directions. The north leg of 300 East would be widened to extend the right run lane. The pavement on 300 East would be reconstructed. These improvements would greatly improve traffic flow.

6.0 Discussion: Residential Zones – Chickens – Christina Oliver

- 6.1 Todd Draper, planner, said that staff was preparing to bring an ordinance before the Council based on comments, they had received about the chickens for familial gain ordinance. Some of the things staff considered were to respect Draper City's historical ties to the raising and keeping of chickens. Also, staff analyzed ordinances of 16 nearby cities and Salt Lake County. They found a wide variation in regulations between jurisdictions allowing between two and 250 chickens on residential lots (up to an acre of land).

The current ordinance (9-27-005) allows for a maximum of six chickens, without consideration to lot size, in all residential zones. They are allowed for familial gain only, meaning that no sale or income from chickens is permitted. Roosters are not permitted. There are currently setbacks and sanitary standards for pens, coops, and run areas.

The proposal that staff intended to bring forward would result in a reduction in the number of chickens allowed to five for smaller lots eight-thousand square feet ($8,000\text{ ft}^2$). The new ordinance would allow for an increase of one chicken for each additional two thousand square feet ($2,000\text{ ft}^2$) in property size above ten thousand square feet ($10,000\text{ ft}^2$). This would provide for a maximum of 20 chickens. Regulations would be added allowing chicks and juvenile chickens (pullets) equal to 40% of allotment. Finally, the new ordinance would clarify the specific zones where the keeping of chickens is allowed: RA1, RA2, RH, R3, R4, A5, and A2).

Mr. Draper displayed a chart of the number of chickens allowed regardless of lot size in nearby cities. They ranged from 50 chickens in Millcreek to just five chickens in West Jordan. He also showed examples of cities with a gradual increase based on lot size. Most cities were in the four to six number of chickens range. Holladay City allowed for 25-250+, but Mr. Draper did not think that they had updated their ordinance in a while.

- 6.2 Councilmember F. Lowry asked where 20 chickens came from.
- 6.3 Mr. Draper said that one aspect that he reviewed in writing the ordinance were some of the best practices. The best practice for raising free-range chickens was set at about 50 chickens per acre. Mr. Draper said that if the chickens were for familial gain, then a home would already be on the property, at least half of the property would be taken up by the building itself. The remaining undeveloped property would allow for about 25 chickens to stay within husbandry best practices. That number was reduced a little to account for the setbacks for the coops and property lines.
- 6.4 Councilmember Vawdrey asked if Mr. Draper could show the Council the proposal again.
- 6.5 Councilmember F. Lowry asked why the Council was considering the proposal. He said that he recalled that Councilmember Vawdrey had asked that the item be addressed.

Councilmember Vawdrey said that she had a resident reach out to her and say that the limit to the number of chickens was a hardship. In the meantime, she had spoken with a friend who worked at IFA who shared that they were going nuts to try and get enough chicken feed. She felt that chickens were something that people needed and wanted. The resident who spoke with Councilmember Vawdrey represented that their family needed the chickens as her husband was out of work because of COVID. She felt that Draper just needed to be reasonable.

Councilmember F. Lowry asked if the city had been enforcing the current ordinance. Councilmember Vawdrey said that the resident in question was on a one-acre lot and restricted to six chickens. The resident did not feel that was reasonable. Councilmember Vawdrey said that she did not think that it was reasonable either.

Mr. Dobbins asked if the item was scheduled to go before the Planning Commission on Thursday. Mr. Draper said the item was initially noticed for the Planning Commission, but that it had been pulled off.

Mr. Dobbins clarified that it would go to the Planning Commission and then would come back to the City Council for formal adoption. He asked if the Council had any input now. He said that if the Council felt that it was too lenient or too restrictive, now was the time to give staff direction.

Councilmember F. Lowery clarified that currently no rooster was permitted anywhere in residential zones. Councilmember Vawdrey said that roosters were a problem because they were noisy. Councilmember F. Lowry agreed and added so were hens.

Councilmember T. Lowery asked if there was a point in which chickens became a problem. She asked if any research was done on that aspect. Mr. Draper said that it seemed everyone had a different opinion about chickens generally. He did look into the issue. He said that the question he looked into more was what the purpose of raising the chickens was for. Some city ordinances restrict the use of chickens to eggs only. Draper City's ordinance did not. A lot of eggs could result from 20 chickens. At the same time, some residents with higher numbers might be raising the chickens for poultry.

Councilmember F. Lowry asked that if according to Ms. Oliver the ordinance had been enforced in certain areas, how many of those enforced would exceed the proposed ordinance.

Christina Oliver, Community Development Director, said that the code enforcement officer had been working with a couple of property owners that had roosters. Staff actively pursue anyone who is breaking the current ordinance. She said that she felt that kids and families should be able to have more than six chickens depending on the area of a property. With the setback and sanitary standards included in the code, she felt that 20 chickens for egg production and a family's ability to partake of the entire chicken, was allowed.

Councilmember T. Lowery said that she likes the way that it was stepped to fit the different property sizes. She felt it was a good structure for the ordinance.

Councilmember Vawdrey said that the problem before was that the same number of chickens were allowed for small and large lots.

Councilmember T. Lowery said that was unfair. She felt the ordinance was a good way to address the problem.

7.0 Council/Manager Reports

- 7.1 Britnee Johnston, Communications Director, said that staff wanted a resolution added to next week's agenda to adopt a new logo. She displayed the logo that had the most overall support from the residential and employee survey. She explained that the color version

would be the main logo with the black and white and grayscale versions as alternatives based on the application. Once the logo was approved, Ms. Johnston would develop a style guide that would explain when it was appropriate to use a color versus black logo. The style guide would be something that the Council could review as well. The city just needed an approved logo before she could move forward with the style guide. She wanted to bring the item up to make sure that there were not any additional questions or concerns before staff moved forward.

Councilmember F. Lowry told Ms. Johnston that she had done an awesome, amazing, and patient job. He thanked her. He asked if it was necessary to have Utah on the logo. Mayor Walker said the answer was yes.

Ms. Johnston said that she felt that it would be good. For example, outside Utah, people do look at the Draper City website. She felt like Utah could be removed from street signs because it would be so small that the word would not be seen. She said she could see the use/non-use of Utah on a case-by-case basis. She said that would be included in the style guide.

Councilmember Roberts said that he wanted a white t-shirt with the black logo on it. He said that it looked so good. Ms. Johnston agreed.

Mayor Walker said that for all the iterations and input Ms. Johnston got it turned out well. He said Ms. Johnston did a great job. He also thanked her for executing the second round of the Draper Deals and expressed that she did a great job on that, too.

Business Session

1.0 Call to Order: Mayor Troy K. Walker

2.0 Public Comments

3.0 Consent Items

- a. Approval of December 8, 2020, and December 15, 2020, City Council Meeting Minutes**
- b. Approval of Resolution #21-01, appointing Andrea Page to the Draper Youth Council Advisory Board**
- c. Approval of Resolution #21-02, updating the temporary COVID-19 Pandemic Policy**

3.1 Councilmember T. Lowery moved to approve the Consent Items. Councilmember Roberts seconded the motion.

3.2 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Green, Lowery, Lowry, Roberts, and Vawdrey, voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.0 Adjournment

4.1 Councilmember Green moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Roberts seconded the motion.

4.2 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Green, Lowery, Lowry, Roberts, and Vawdrey, voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

4.3 The meeting adjourned at 7:14 p.m.