

THE EMIGRATION CANYON METRO TOWNSHIP COUNCIL, STATE OF UTAH, MET ELECTRONICALLY ON TUESDAY, MAY 24, 2021, PURSUANT TO ADJOURNMENT ON TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2021, AT THE HOUR OF 8:30 P.M., VIA ZOOM.COM.

COUNCIL MEMBERS

ELECTRONICALLY PRESENT: DAVID BREMS
GARY BOWEN
CATHERINE HARRIS
JENNIFER HAWKES, Deputy Mayor
JOE SMOLKA, Mayor

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: SHERRIE SWENSEN, METRO TOWNSHIP CLERK
By: NICHOLE WATT, DEPUTY CLERK



Pursuant to Utah Code Annotated 52-4-207(5) the undersigned, as Chair of the Emigration Canyon Metro Township Council, hereby declares that providing an anchor location for the electronic meetings of the Council will present a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location for the following reasons:

The Township is located in Salt Lake County and is still under a “Moderate Level of Transmission” alert stage for the COVID-19 pandemic; and

The regular meeting place for the Council (the UFA Fire Station in the Canyon) does not have sufficient space in the meeting room to provide for the recommended physical distancing to keep people safe from infection.

This written determination shall expire 30 days from today. This meeting will not have a physical anchor location. All attendees will connect remotely via Zoom.com (<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83328451408>).



Deputy Mayor Hawkes presided over the beginning of the meeting.

Mayor Smolka, Chair, presided over the remainder of the meeting.



Emigration Canyon Metro Township General Plan – Chapter 7

Council Member Harris stated chapter 7 is just a summary of all the other chapters in terms of goals and objectives. It is restating things that have already been said.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes stated chapter 7 should be added to the appendix.

Council Member Harris stated there is not a narrative, it is just a list of action items, and it is helpful to have the action items in one place. Chapter 7 could be renamed as a chapter summary.

Council Member Brems stated it is called an overview.

Mayor Smolka stated he thinks chapter 7 can be taken out completely because it is a repeat of all the work items that are at the end of each chapter.

Council Member Brems stated the redundancy is not necessarily a problem, it just means that any changes made will need to be done in two different places.

Robert Pinon, Emigration Canyon Metro Township Planning Commission, stated it is simply a summary of what is in each section of the General Plan. If it gets removed, the document still has each of these items in each chapter.

Mayor Smolka stated the Council is in favor with leaving Chapter 7 in the General Plan.

Emigration Canyon Metro Township General Plan – Chapter 3

The Council reviewed Chapter 3 of the Emigration Canyon Metro Township General Plan and made the following amendments and recommendations:

- *General Comments and Concerns*

Council Member Harris

- The way things were presented seems haphazard.
- Outline what the big issues are and what the big picture is first. This will help the reader focus on what is really important.
- Present the information in a way that will capture the reader’s attention.
- Identify every organization and what the relationship is with Emigration Canyon.
- Some of the biggest issues are transportation, road safety, the tension between cyclists and motor vehicles, parking for recreational and restaurants, and rockslides.
- Emigration Canyon is an alternate for I-80 and should be included.
- There are comments from the transportation survey that are not possible options.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- Chapter 3 was hard to read and bounced all over the place. When she was done reading, she did not know what the main issues were. The content needs to be organized and flow better.
- Limit the unimportant details and focus on the important ones.

Council Member Brems

- All the information that should be in the transportation plan is there, arguably it could be reorganized.

Tim Harpst, Steering Committee

- The overall problems with the structure of the General Plan has to do with the writing style of the planner. With a new planner there is an opportunity to restructure the plan. Each chapter could start with the top three to five major strong points. Some of the material that is extraneous and go beyond, could go into the appendix.

- Page 61

Mayor Smolka

- Spelling correction under “Utah Transit Authority (UTA)” section, from “cab” to “and”.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- Clarification on Granite School District being in public transportation under the “Utah Transit Authority (UTA)” section.
- The roles, responsibilities, and governmental entities need to be defined and what role the entity has with Emigration Canyon needs to be specified.
- Should the “Utah Department of Transportation” section have a graph or should it be taken out.
- Under 3.1 “Importance of Transportation” the statement that because there is more traffic that goes through the canyon at certain times implies that the road is unsafe, it is just an assumption. Just because more traffic comes through the canyon at certain times does not affect road safety, it just means more traffic. How is that managed. The canyon is an alternate route between Salt Lake City and Summit County which adds to safety concerns associated with maintain roads. It addresses it but does not address it in the way it needs to be.

Council Member David Brems

- More traffic does increase safety concerns.

Tim Harpst

- The point should be made that there is a concern as population and traffic grows on I-80, it will put more stress on the canyon road. More people will divert to it.

- Page 63

Mayor Smolka

- Under “APAE Analysis (Transportation)” section; the reference to the “pull off at the mouth of Canyon” is not in Emigration Canyon Metro Township, it is in Salt Lake City.
- The reference to the “Share the Road” signs needs to be removed. Emigration Canyon follows the 3-foot guideline.
- Disagrees with the sentence under the “APAE Analysis (Transportation)” section; “Transportation and mobility items that were identified as needing to be eliminated included noise pollution, off-roading, the pull off at the mouth of the Canyon, and uncontrolled growth/development, which would presumably increase traffic.” He believes it is very controlled.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- The first sentence under the “Community Input” section has a lot of wording.
- Questioning the following sentence that is under the “APAE Analysis (Transportation)” section; “Transportation and mobility items that were identified as needing to be eliminated included noise pollution, off-roading, the pull off at the mouth of the Canyon, and uncontrolled growth/development, which would presumably increase traffic.”

- *Page 64*

Mayor Smolka

- There is redundancy throughout the page and a graph with the same information. The text could be eliminated and keep the graph because it provides more details.

- *Page 65*

Mayor Smolka

- Under “Some additional transportation-related concerns raised by survey respondents as a write-in option included:”, the 3rd bullet point it says “Shortage of culinary water is a major concern – some areas are just not suitable for increased development or mass transit.” This statement does not belong in transportation.
- The comment regarding the toll road is not relevant; legally Emigration Canyon can not implement one.
- Putting ideas from the public in writing is concerning.
- Some areas are not suitable for increased development.

Council Member Harris

- There are assumptions being made without information backing it up.
- Public input is very important; however, the most important issues should be highlighted and brought to the front.

Council Member Hawkes

- Everything below the graph could be taken out. There are comments from the public that appear to be making recommendations and they are things that can not be done. Public comment should be part of the appendix.
- Concerns regarding bullet points 3 and 6.
- The statement “Better enforcement of the existing noise ordinance will also reduce speeding/accidents and improve quality of life in the canyon”. I don’t think by enforcing the noise ordinance you are going to reduce the speed on the road, you will improve the quality of life for those on the main road. Comments like these need to be referenced but located in the appendix.

Council Member Brems

- The comments listed are from people that attended the meeting are relevant.
- The culinary water element is not traffic related.
- Mass transit could be further discussed.

- Page 66

Mayor Smolka

- He did not get anything out of this page and does not understand why it is there.

Council Member Brems

- The point of the statement is how close Emigration Canyon is to the city, why residents live there, and how beautiful and rural area is.
- The 10-minute drive to Salt Lake City is not correct.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- The statement says Emigration Canyon is a “mostly residential”; it is residential and in a natural peaceful place.
- Edit the statement enough so it fits, do not take it out.

Council Member Harris

- The statement could simply say “it is a quite residential community located a short drive to Salt Lake City.”

- Page 67

Mayor Smolka

- The paragraph on the right side of the page, does not have any data to back up the statement.
- The map is a problem, collector roads are identified but some of those are private roads. Incorrect information is not okay.
- Page 67 and 68 could be flipped.

Council Member Brems

- Does a statement about when I-80 is closed Emigration Canyon becomes an alternate route, need to be stated.
- Page 67 and 68 could be flipped.

Council Member Harris

- There are traffic concerns when I-80 is closed and Emigration Canyon is an alternate route. It is a well known commuter route and contributes to traffic concerns.
- Private roads need to be identified.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- Suggested changing the color or line width to make the map easier to read.
- The map comes before the street classification, it may make more sense to put the map after the roads are classified.

Tim Harpst

- A point of clarification; the map is giving the classification of roadways, not the ownership. It is not saying which ones are public and which ones are private. It is identifying what is a local, collector, or arterial road.

- *Page 68*

No additional comments.

- *Page 69*

Mayor Smolka

- Remove the statement under section 3.3.3 – Traffic Volume and Safety; “Obscured or obstructed access to the road from sharp turns, short drives, or garages at various points throughout the canyon can also contribute to safety issues.”

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- Agrees with Mayor Smolka's comment above.
- Clarify the information to show that there are more accidents below the fire station.
- Instead of having colors, show the intersections and the number of accidents.
- Be more clear on what the information is.
- The calculation does not take into account that the intersection was refigured. Were the accidents before or after the refiguration?

Council Member Harris

- She feels like it is extrapolating a lot from a number that has a really low denominator. There have been 116 traffic accidents in the entire canyon for a period of 10 years. She does not like the way it was depicted as if you could actually extrapolate information from that to be able to highlight red and blue areas. The most that can be said is that there are some areas that represent safety concerns. There are some spots that are known to be a little less safe but to put it in that sort of pseudoscience way, does not work.

Council Member Brems

- It does point out the areas of concerns, especially those by the fire station. It is better to have the information than to remove it.

- Page 70

Mayor Smolka

- The paragraph in the middle has information about "Share the Road", it is not applicable anymore and should be removed. The state standard that is followed now is the 3-foot rule.
- The statement "the conflicts between bicycles and motor vehicles has been of increasing concern to residents and recreational users alike." Is not accurate. Due to the efforts that have been made over the years (i.e. education and road improvements), both motorists and bicycles are learning and there have not been as many conflicts.

Council Member Brems

- The "Share the Road" signs are just saying to share the road, how else would it describe the conflicts between cars and bicyclists.

Tim Harpst

- The "Share the Road" sign is still an acceptable sign to be used on roadways. There is also a 3-foot rule, which means if you are sharing the road, you still have to give at least 3-feet.

Council Member Harris

- She does not understand the first paragraph, “Most of the employed population of Emigration Canyon commute to jobs outside of the Canyon, with over 95 percent of the working population employed in other locations in 2017 (Figure 3.7). In that year, only nineteen people (3.7 percent) lived and worked in Emigration Canyon (OntheMap Data, 2017; Appendix D).” How is this statement relevant, what is it saying, and where did the data come from. The number is irrelevant after this last year where everyone stayed home from work.

- Page 71

Mayor Smolka

- Section 3.3.5 – Active Transportation, it refers to “top tier destination”; the wording seems odd. What does it mean to be a top tier destination?

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- The graph needs to be updated from 2018 to current information.
- Section 3.3.5 – Active Transportation, it states “Emigration Canyon Road is popular with active transportation users and has the potential to be a top tier destination for them”. Who is “them”, is it cyclists, hikers? What is trying to be said, it needs to be clarified.

Council Member Brems

- The information on the graph is interesting and provides more information about how the road is used.
- “Active transportation users” needs to be defined.

Council Member Harris

- Section 3.3.5 – Active Transportation, at the end of the paragraph there are two acronyms, NACTO and AASHTO that need to be defined. The first time an acronym is used, it should show what it means.

- Page 73

Mayor Smolka

- How can there be little to no change in the middle of the canyon like it says in the following statement; “Because of these factors, the future we are planning for revolves around only slight population growth within the Canyon itself, but some enhanced use of the area by visitors. Annual average daily traffic (AADT) forecasts for Emigration Canyon Road reflect these uses, projecting a slight increase from 2020 to 2050 of between 1000 to 5000 vehicles (reaching a high of approximately 9,700 by 2050) for the upper and lower sections of the road (largely attributable to visitors), but

little to no change for the middle, more residential section (an increase of 0 to 1000 vehicles – up to 4,400) (Figure 3.8).”

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- What is being said in the following statement; “While traffic volume on the Emigration Canyon Road is likely to continue to keep pace with regional growth, Emigration Canyon’s population will likely stabilize before 2050 due to constraints on residential population growth such as 1) limited remaining buildable areas and 2) water-related restrictions (see Chapter 2 for more details).” It is not necessarily water related restriction as much as it is zoning in relation to the stream.

- Page 74

Council Member Brems

- Under 3.7 table – Proposed Improvement, the 5th point, it refers to 40-foot cycle lanes, it should be 4-foot cycle lanes. The typo needs to be fixed.

Mayor Smolka

- Under the 3.7 table – Proposed Improvement, the 2nd point, “Reduce speed limit to 30 mph in the stretch of roadway from Margarethe to Pinecrest (upper canyon).”, speed studies have been completed and recommend against changing the speed limit.
- The two additional studies should be added.

Council Member Brems

- The planner was asked to include the Lochner study, but to also include the more recent studies.
- Under the 3.7 table – 2020 Progress Towards Outcome, the 2nd point, “Conducting speed studies to see if and where reductions would be plausible.”, this is will always be ongoing.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- It is important to note that the Lochner study is an advisory study. There are some things that were recommended in the study but due to additional studies and accurate road measurements, it does not make sense and some recommendations were more of a liability. Just because it is a Lochner study that it will come to fruition.

- Page 75

Mayor Smolka

- The majority of the trails plan is so complete that a lot of this page can be taken out. Readers may think that this is the complete trails plan.

Council Member Brems

- When moving forward on plans, is it going to be based on the 2007 plan with the latest amendments that have been made.
- This page just alerts the readers that there is a Trails Master Plan being worked on and he does not think anyone would assume this is the Trails Master Plan.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- Concerns with the following statement “Emigration Canyon needs to begin building a trails network designed and constructed to withstand the increased visitor pressures, and to protect its existing natural resources.” It has been designed and constructed to withstand increased visitor pressure, and to protect existing natural resources. The Trails Master Plan was developed by the community and adopted by Salt Lake City but never implemented. Is the statement completely accurate or what parts have been implemented.

Council Member Harris

- It should be referenced that the Trails Master Plan was critically looked at again in 2019. The consensus that was reached in 2007 may not be valid in 2021. There is more focus on management of trails than there is on developing new trails.
- There needs to be a little more careful working to reflect the fact that priorities have changed somewhat.

- Page 76

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- Clarify what the following objective statement means; “Improve traffic and growth management to maintain the character and integrity of Emigration Canyon”.
- The following objective statement; “Increase enforcement to avoid and/or minimize light and noise pollution throughout Emigration Canyon.” implies that it is being enforced.
- Could it address noise pollution and not light pollution?
- Does the following statement, “increase trail head parking and related facilities” mean to provide parking at areas like restrooms?
- The objectives wording needs to be tweaked to read clearly.

Mayor Smolka

- Section 3.1.2, should not be in this section, it is not a transportation item.

Council Member Brems

- Noise pollution is a transportation issue; however, light pollution does not make sense.

Council Member Harris

- The goal is to reduce noise pollution. Measures that will reduce noise pollution need to be looked at and explored.

- Page 77

Mayor Smolka

- Section 3.1.1 – action items a, b, c, and d, under timeline, need to be changed to future.
- Section 3.1.2 – action items a and b, needs to be changed to immediate.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- Section 3.1.2 – action item b, should have the example portion of it removed. It implies it can be enforced but it may not be able to.
- Section 3.1.2 – action item b, enforcement of EPA compliance motorcycles may not be able to be enforced
- Section 3.1.1 – action item c, do the points fit there?

- Page 78

Mayor Smolka

- Section 3.1.3 – action items a, b, and c, needs to be changed to future.
- Section 3.2.1 – action items a and b, needs to be changed to high.
- Section 3.2.1 – action item a, states “Where practical, build and maintain all public roads to State and County standards.” The roads are not built to these standards.
- Section 3.2.1 – action item c, needs to be changed to intermediate.
- Section 3.2.1 – action item d, needs to be changed to future.
- Section 3.2.1 – action item e, needs to be changed to high.
- Section 3.2.1 – action item f, has been ongoing. This section may have been completed before the stripping was done.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- The cost column shows volunteer and staff time. Staff time is paid for but it implies that it is free. It needs to be clarified to factor in costs for staff time.

Council Member Brems

- Section 3.2.1 – action item f, the road may end up being resurfaced and restriped again, it should read ongoing.

- Page 79

Mayor Smolka

- Section 3.2.2 – action item a, needs to be changed to future.

Deputy Mayor Hawkes

- Section 3.2.2 – action item a, could read future and ongoing or divide it out and label the timeline accordingly.

◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS to come before the Council at this time, the meeting was adjourned.

SHERRIE SWENSEN, METRO TOWNSHIP
CLERK

By _____
Deputy Clerk

MAYOR, EMIGRATION CANYON METRO TOWNSHIP COUNCIL

◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆
◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆
◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆ ◆◆◆