

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2022, AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD
HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL WORK ROOM LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL
BOULEVARD**

Members Present: Mayor Mike Weichers, Council Member Douglas Petersen, Council Member Scott Bracken, Council Member Shawn E. Newell, Council Member Ellen Birrell

Staff Present: City Manager Tim Tingey, City Attorney Shane Topham, Records Culture and Human Resources Director Paula Melgar, Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, Police Chief Robby Russo, Public Works Director Matt Shipp, Finance and Administrative Services Director Scott Jurges, Assistant Fire Chief Riley Pilgrim, IT Manager Matt Ervin

1. WELCOME – Mayor Weichers.

Mayor Mike Weichers called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2. REVIEW OF BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA – Mayor Mike Weichers.

The Business Meeting Agenda items were reviewed and discussed. Mayor Weichers stated that Agenda Item 5.1 would be one of the Staff Reports and would not be addressed during the Business Meeting.

City Manager, Tim Tingey, addressed Agenda Item 5.2 and reported that the Mayor inquired as to whether the City Council had adopted a Resolution on the National Incident Management System (“NIMS”). He reported that because the Council had not done so, it would consider this Resolution during the Business Meeting. He explained that if this Resolution were adopted, the City would be part of the Federal Management Training Systems and practices of NIMS when an incident occurs. He confirmed that this would be required for the City to be able to seek Federal Emergency Funding. Mr. Tingey stated that staff would recommend approval of the Resolution.

With regard to Resolution 2022-51, Mayor Weichers reported that it would declare certain property surplus. Police Chief, Robby Russo, explained that the City has a couple of spare vehicles in the event one of the police cars is involved in an accident or breaks down. They have had one vehicle for several years that is out of warranty and having issues. By selling it and putting the money back into the budget, it would cover a portion of the newly purchased vehicles. Finance and Administrative Services Director, Scott Jurges, stated that the vehicle is a 2014 Ford F-150, The winning bid would be approved by the City Manager.

3. **STAFF REPORTS.**

a. **Wasatch Front Regional Council Project Selection – Public Works Director, Matt Shipp.**

Public Works Director, Matt Shipp reported that each year the Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) invites municipalities and other groups to submit projects for consideration for Federal Aid Projects. They received notification on September 6 that the WFRC will be accepting Letters of Intent that will be due on September 29, 2022. They will need to provide a list of proposed projects along with cost estimates and brief descriptions. Once the Letters of Intent are submitted, the WFRC will grade the projects for eligibility and request formal applications for those selected. The formal applications will provide further detailed information, which will go through various committees for approval. The WFRC will advise of either approval or denial in Spring 2023.

In response to an inquiry, Mr. Shipp confirmed that the City could submit as many projects as they wish and the WFRC will provide feedback on those submitted to help the City pare down its list of projects. Mr. Shipp noted that in the past, Cottonwood Heights fared fairly well and received funding for projects. He noted that last year, they received funding for the hawk signal and one other. Mr. Shipp clarified that the WFRC awards funding for projects based on merit only and does not award projects to each entity that submits a Letter of Intent. He explained that the WFRC goes through a rigorous judging process and noted that for Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (“CMAQ”), there was only \$5 million available for all of the cities in the entire Salt Lake Valley. He referenced Cottonwood Heights’ roundabout CMAQ project that cost \$2.3 million. There were four categories of projects. Council Member Birrell expressed confusion regarding the four categories of projects in relation to the Transportation Improvement Program (“TIP”) and asked if the timing for submission of the Letters of Intent applies to all of the programs. Mr. Shipp explained that the categories will be where the projects will be identified and provide better options for receiving funding.

Council Member Petersen asked about the criteria used by WFRC to grade the projects. Mr. Shipp stated that historically the WFRC was good about providing feedback on which category a project should be included in to increase the chance for funding. Mr. Shipp expressed his belief that WFRC had done a good job using a qualitative analysis that justified the reasons for an award or a denial.

In response to an inquiry from Council Member Birrell, Mr. Shipp clarified that they could look at projects other than the five presented to the Council. He noted that the projects they submitted had been discussed in the past. Mr. Shipp addressed the four categories of projects and noted that the CMAQ and the Carbon Reduction Program (“CRP”) involve similar funding. The biggest difference was that CMAQ monies will be available in 2029, whereas the CRP monies will be available in 2025.

Mr. Shipp explained that Federal Aid Projects require an Environmental Study paid for by the City. In addition, the City must also pay for Preliminary Engineering, which is anywhere from 20 to 30 percent of the engineering design. He stated that Project Costs would include actual construction, design, construction engineering, Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”), contingency, and

land acquisition if needed. He noted that after the Preliminary Engineering and the Environmental, the City would pay 6.77% of the actual cost of the project.

Council Member Birrell asked about the range of the City's costs for the least expensive project. Mr. Shipp clarified that the Project Cost would not include the Preliminary and Environmental as those costs would be borne 100% by the City. He noted that for the Bengal Boulevard Project, they preliminarily budgeted \$90,000 to \$100,000 for the Preliminary and Environmental costs. He stated that the Roundabout Project carried a similar estimate.

Mr. Shipp introduced the project for the Roundabout at Bengal Boulevard and 3500 East. He clarified that the graphic was not a design but a concept drawing. He highlighted traffic calming ideas as part of this project, which involve necking the road down and including islands and a roundabout. This project would also include improved pedestrian crossings. He noted that one of the challenges of the project was access to two homes, which would be impacted by the island depicted on the graphic. Council Member Birrell stated that this is in her district and she would require data supporting a roundabout in that location. Based on her observations of that intersection, she did not view the need for this project and stressed that cars are not stacking up at that intersection and idling. Council Member Birrell added that because vehicles come to a stop at that intersection, it has made it a safe area. She felt that roundabouts were to demarcate an entrance to a neighborhood to get the vehicles to slow down, and vehicles are already slow moving in this area. She was not aware of the traffic that would be reduced. She would prefer to see a number of other projects for District 4 before this project.

Council Member Bracken noted that this project would also touch District 2. He disagreed with Council Member Birrell's comments. Based on his observations, there are times when there are multiple cars at that intersection. He noted that this is an area with an abundance of rolling stops. He maintained that encouraging people to ignore stop signs was bad public policy. Creating a situation where compliance was the default rather than an exception would make this project worthwhile. Mr. Shipp confirmed that they submitted this project three years ago as a Road Improvement and not a CMAQ. He stated that his department receives calls all the time about speeding and vehicles not stopping in this location, although he acknowledged that he does not have hard numbers.

Council Member Birrell reported that she has spoken extensively with her constituents, particularly those who live along 3500 East and they have stated that people speed in a different locations. She would be far more in favor of additions that would allow residents to get across the road and enter the supermarket area, which would also slow the traffic in the area. She stressed that she would like to see a design that slows traffic in a different area. She was opposed to this project because the City is in dire need of safe crossings across arterials and collectors consistent with the General Survey that residents want connectivity, traffic calming, and bicycle access.

Council Member Bracken reiterated his disagreement with Council Member Birrell's statements based on his observations.

Mr. Shipp next referenced the project on Fort Union Boulevard, between Union Park and 1300 East, which they have identified as a Cycle Track Trail. He stated that this piece of roadway is part of the

Mid-Valley Transportation Plan. He explained that this project will include a 10-foot multi-use trail on the north and south side of the road that will be grade separated from the road. This project will also include some intersection improvements. There was discussion regarding whether the Mid-Valley Active Transportation Plan Element would lend itself to increased chances of an award. Mr. Shipp felt it would since that Plan was funded through the WFRC and this would implement something the WFRC funded at the planning level.

Mayor Weichers expressed support for the project. It was noted by Council Member Birrell that they were trying to help those who live in Cottonwood Heights to be able to come into the area of the Target and Home Depot and this area is impassable by bicycle. She agreed with Mayor Weichers and stated that she was strongly in favor of this project. Mr. Shipp noted that this location is quite wide and they could do a lot within what they have versus trying to go outside the right-of-way. The Council expressed support for the project.

Mr. Shipp next discussed the Wasatch Boulevard Project and clarified that it involves the City's portion of Wasatch Boulevard and not SR-210. The project was proposed two years ago and did fairly well. The concept would be to add shoulders and bike lanes along Wasatch Boulevard. He recalled that five years ago, the City re-striped the road and added unprotected bike lanes. This project will include sidewalks and widening the asphalt for the shoulder and the trail. The widening would not add any capacity to the roadway. There was discussion regarding the current roadway configuration.

Council Member Birrell asked why the City would install a sidewalk when it would be left to a developer to do as part of development in that area. Mr. Shipp stated that there were sections of missing sidewalk so they proposed to add sidewalk on the west side. He pointed out that they would end the sidewalk at the tree farm but add shoulder and bicycle trail capacity on the east side. Council Member Birrell was not in favor of a wider road. It was clarified that the project would entail widening the asphalt for a bike lane, not an additional vehicle lane. Council Member Birrell reiterated that she was generally not in favor of widening but would have to see the precise plans. She stated that they needed to slow speeds down, not widen roads. Mr. Shipp confirmed that the widening would provide a safe bike lane only.

Mr. Shipp next addressed the project at Highland Drive and pointed out that the City already has obtained funding for a portion of the project, which was highlighted in yellow on the graphic displayed. The project proposed for the additional funding request was to extend the trail to Fort Union Boulevard and create a 10-foot multi-use trail. He noted that the City already has a lot of property along this stretch, and much of this could work within the existing sidewalks. The proposal contemplates removing the sidewalks and replacing them with a 10-foot-wide trail.

Council Member Bracken asked if the area of the trail highlighted in yellow would also be protected. Mr. Shipp confirmed that to be the case and added that the trail would extend up to the High School. Mr. Shipp added that this project would bring to life some of the City's bicycle transportation plans, as well as connectivity between trails and pedestrian safety for the students in the area.

Council Member Birrell mentioned a neighborhood bypass route that could allow both pedestrians and cyclists to avoid the entire area. Mayor Weichers expressed his support for the project. Council Member Petersen asked if it would rate well with WFRC. Mr. Shipp stated that it will fall within the Alternative Transportation category. The fact that they already received funding for the trail along Bengal Boulevard might help.

Mr. Shipp next addressed the Fort Union Boulevard Roadway Cycle Track Trail Project and noted that they submitted the project last year and it scored very well. This project proposed to install a multi-use trail without adding lane capacity. The project would include curb and gutter on the north side with the bike lane going on top of that, and improvements to the sidewalks on the south side. The trail will tie into the existing Big Cottonwood Trail or the parking lot and take it down to the existing sidewalk on Sagebrush Way. Council Member Petersen noted that there is a lot of room in that area and Mr. Shipp acknowledged that there will be challenges due to the location of two of the homes. He added that the project will improve the roadway and they would look at pedestrian crossings. He mentioned the hawk signal.

Council Member Birrell emphasized improving mobility within the City. She stressed that the trails and bike lanes will only be as good as they can get people across the arterials and collectors. She thanked Mr. Shipp for considering how the residents in the area will access the trail safely. As they work toward the kind of connectivity they want for the City, they need to keep in mind safe crossings.

Council Member Bracken emphasized that they have to be extremely judicious in terms of installing a mid-block crossing on a highway since if there are too many hawk signals, they can be ignored. He mentioned the crossing at Bella Vista across Fort Union Boulevard. There was discussion regarding whether the Council could reach a consensus on any of the projects presented. Council Member Bracken liked the Roundabout Project and added that it was different from some of the other projects and could potentially go in a different pot from the bike trail projects.

It was pointed out that the Fort Union Boulevard project will be expensive. Mr. Shipp stated that there might be the potential for some Tax Increment Financing for the project. There was Council consensus on the project.

With regard to the Wasatch Boulevard Project, Council Member Birrell would like to see more details and could not support the design as presented. It was agreed that they would pass on submitting the project. It was agreed that the Highland Drive Project would be submitted. The Council also expressed support for the Fort Union Trail Project. Council Member Bracken reiterated his support for the roundabout, stating that it would accomplish the traffic-calming goals. Mayor Weichers felt that if the neighborhood had concerns about a roundabout in this location, they should spend more time evaluating it.

Council Member Birrell wondered if traffic calming in places like 3500 East would involve relatively expensive improvements, would fall within these requests. Mr. Shipp explained that in order for a project to score well, it needs to be on a road with high volumes and connectivity and the Regional Transportation Plan. Smaller, neighborhood projects would not fall within the WFRC categories. Council Member Bracken mentioned 1700 East and 7200 South, which are collectors

for the neighborhood. It was noted that Bengal Boulevard is one of the few east/west connectors in the City. He reported that these projects were submitted previously.

Mayor Weichers reiterated that the Roundabout Project needs citizen comment before being submitted. Council Member Birrell remarked that if money was not an issue, she would support a roundabout in that location. She referenced the recent surveys that show a clear focus on traffic calming, slower speeds, and connectivity. Council Member Bracken commented that the Roundabout Project will address each of these issues. Council Member Birrell disagreed. Mr. Shipp indicated that the Council reached a consensus on upper Fort Union Boulevard, Fort Union to the east, and Highland Drive.

b. General Plan Discussion - Community and Economic Development Director, Mike Johnson.

Community and Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson stated that they would like the Council's feedback on this update, after which they will draft a Land Use element for the General Plan. The General Plan will then be presented to the public for Town Hall input, public input, and open houses. Mr. Johnson identified the existing Land Use categories in the current General Plan and commented that they were not recommending changing these categories in the New General Plan. He noted that each Land Use category contains the corresponding zones. He explained that a General Plan develops a long-range land use vision for City development over time. Within each Land Use category, a zone was identified as to where the particular land use would be allowed. He reported that the Commercial Land Use category contains the corresponding zone of Regional Commercial. This encompasses the major commercial nodes along Fort Union Boulevard, Highland Drive, and other intense commercial areas.

Mr. Johnson explained that the Neighborhood Commercial and Residential Office Land Use category was intended to include slightly smaller commercial developments directly adjacent to residential neighborhoods. With respect to the Mixed-Use category, Mr. Johnson stated that they would be proceeding with a text amendment to the Mixed-Use Ordinance regarding vertical integration of different types of uses. The Office Land Use designation corresponded to the large office parks, namely Cottonwood Corporate and Old Mill Center. He explained that the Civic Land Use category included public facilities such as parks and other City facilities and utility stations. Mr. Johnson commented that Religious Institutions were mentioned in the General Plan, but generally are allowed within residential zones without a corresponding zoning designation. He explained that the different Residential categories included Rural/Agricultural, which is very low density and corresponds to the zones with the largest minimum lot size of one-half acre and above. Residential Low Density corresponds to most of the residential zoning in the City.

Medium and High-Density Residential were also included in the Land Use categories. He explained that Medium Density is six to 10 units per acre, while High Density is 11 to 24 units per acre. Mr. Johnson stated that Open Space will include City zoned Public Facility. Sensitive Lands areas encompass the Foothill Residential zones that are unique to the foothills of Wasatch Boulevard.

Mr. Johnson presented the Land Use Map and noted that the areas highlighted in tan and yellow are all Residential designations. For much of the current Commercial areas, they recommended Mixed-Use as a future land use because it will provide flexibility. He noted that the land use pattern is largely residential with core areas that they do not propose to change.

Mr. Johnson presented the current Zoning Map and commented that the pattern is largely the same as the Land Use map, as current zoning fairly closely matches the land use designations. He identified the key resources used in preparing the General Plan Update and specifically referenced the General Plan, the Fort Union Corridor Area Plan, and the Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan. He presented a graphic showing the areas along Fort Union Boulevard as it currently exists. He explained that this information is not currently in the General Plan but was included in the Fort Union Corridor Plan. Mr. Johnson highlighted the three different areas, ranging from intense Commercial on the west end, to Community District in the middle, to the Canyon District at the end of this corridor.

Mr. Johnson described the Future Land Use Concept and noted that it was shown at the Open House in March 2022. This concept was, in many ways, a manifestation of what was in the Fort Union Plan. He commented that the areas targeted for growth and redevelopment are no different than those included in the current plans. He mentioned the Civic Town Center area, and a few high-capacity areas at the Professional Office Park, which, from a long-range perspective, could handle more intense development without creating a disproportionate immediate negative impact on adjacent residential areas. He noted that this would also apply to the Gravel Pit. He stated that the City Center area will be treated differently because it is in a residential area. The areas highlighted in green on the map represented small-scale neighborhood-style centers.

Mr. Johnson explained that the targeted infill and redevelopment means there are some mixed-use opportunities along the Fort Union Corridor. Mixed-use needs to be developed properly and within the proper context. They were not looking at major redevelopment for the rest of the residential areas of the City. To implement more affordable housing, they are mandated by the State to permit Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADU”), which is a valid tool to provide affordable housing in the City.

Mr. Johnson stated that if they were to draft a Land Use element to the General Plan today, the land use pattern would look very similar to the current pattern, with mixed-use being the predominant commercial redevelopment tool to be used only in the commercial areas. He recommended going a step further to quantify that mixed-use would not look the same everywhere, which is where Form-Based Code development comes into play. They would make different recommendations for what redevelopment would look like depending on where it was located, especially along the Fort Union Corridor. He noted that going from west to east, development would involve a higher intensity or density of uses and then taper off and be developed in a manner that would be contextual to the surrounding areas. He added that once this is established, they will recalibrate the Open Space and Transportation elements of the General Plan.

Mr. Johnson reiterated that these ideas were already in the Fort Union Master Plan and they recommended taking the step to implement them and define what they would look like. He felt that this would resolve some of the concerns in the current land use applications regarding mixed-use redevelopment. He stressed that they need to develop these areas in a way that will be more

contextual and responsive to where a proposed development is located in the City. They will develop a Draft Land Use Element to be presented to the public that will not be much different than what currently exists in the General Plan.

Council Member Birrell referenced the recent General Survey that showed that many residents are interested in small shopping malls. She felt that in terms of walkability, having neighborhood sheds where someone could walk to a small café or boutique grocery store would be desirable. She was interested in knowing the appetite of the residents for small nodes that will allow walkability to a small, commercialized area.

Council Member Bracken commented that they need to be realistic since many in the Survey stated that they like Single-Family homes with large yards. Council Member Birrell did not see the correlation between that and walkability and requested clarification in the Town Hall meetings.

Council Member Bracken suggested renaming the City Center area to avoid confusion.

Council Member Newell stated that the City Council denied an up zone on property in an area designated for duplexes. He referenced the outcry from those who wanted that area to remain single-family. He stressed that they need to listen to the residents during this process.

c. **Affordable Housing Report - Community and Economic Development Director, Mike Johnson.**

Mr. Johnson noted that Affordable Housing and housing, in general, will be an element of the General Plan. He stressed that the report was mandated by the State to be presented before October 1. He referenced the tables that included data from the U.S. Census Bureau showing the different types of housing along with different affordability bands. With respect to the table for Rental Housing Need by Income Bracket, he highlighted that Cottonwood Heights has 475 households whose median income would qualify them for less than 30% Area Median Income (“AMI”), which is severely cost-constrained housing, yet the City only has 210 rental units available. He explained that if a household spends 30% of its annual income on housing, it would be considered cost-constrained.

In response to an inquiry, Mr. Johnson stated that two ADUs have been licensed with the City. He did not know if the illegal ADUs would be included in the 210 occupied units as shown on the table. With regard to Projected Growth of Households, Mr. Johnson explained that the data reflected a decrease in available housing units over the next five years. He noted that they were not projecting massive growth in the City and felt that the information in the Census Report showed that based on the age and growth elsewhere in the County, the population of Cottonwood Heights was projected to slightly decline. He noted that this projected trend was also seen in the neighboring cities as well.

Mr. Johnson reported that the projected Change in Household Size increased slightly but remained fairly static. He felt that the Projected Median Income was interesting and showed a significant gap between owner-occupied and renter-occupied income. The median household income was just over \$95,000. Council Member Bracken clarified that the median household income of \$95,000 was the

number used in the other tables. Mr. Johnson explained that AMI takes into account a number of factors such as the size of the household and earners within the household. He stated that the median income for a family of six would be different than someone living on their own. The \$95,000 figure was the citywide AMI. Council Member Bracken commented on the 210 units at less than 30% AMI and noted that an ADU could potentially fit within that category. He expressed that actual income for these residents was a major decrease from the citywide AMI.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the goals and strategies previously identified. He noted that they included ADUs as allowed by the State. The first strategy was to allow residential uses within commercial zones. He noted that mixed-use zoning allows this. In addition, he listed the strategy of implementing zoning incentives for low to moderate-income units on a long-term basis. They view the Planned Development District as achieving this because it mandates developer-funded, deed-restricted affordable housing units.

Another strategy was identified as utilizing a moderate-income housing set aside from a Community Reinvestment Agency (“CRA”), Redevelopment Agency (“RDA”), or Community Development and Renewal Agency (“CDRA”). Any CRA would require a 10% set aside for affordable housing. He added that 10% of each of the old CDA projects was earmarked to be set aside for affordable housing. He listed the ordinance allowing ADUs as the final strategy.

Council Member Petersen was interested in knowing the impact ADUs are having on affordability and referenced the project at Fort Union Boulevard and 1700 East and commented that renters are paying more for rent than people are paying for their mortgages. Council Member Birrell agreed and felt there was a lot of work to do to be more innovative to come up with incentives beyond what is currently being offered to developers. Her objections to ADUs as a solution was that dispersing housing will add more cars throughout the City. They know that lower-income residents need good transit, so lower-income housing opportunities should be located where transit and active transportation are to be developed.

Council Member Newell noted that one of the realities of the community is that it is built out, and there is not a lot of opportunity to build out truly affordable housing. If they look at Moderate-Income Housing, they can start to look at how to mitigate some of these issues.

Council Member Birrell did not suggest imposing affordable housing in existing neighborhoods but referenced opportunities in the areas identified by the Planning Director, specifically the Hillside Plaza.

Council Member Newell reiterated his point that this type of housing would not be able to be affordable because developers need a return on their investment. It places the City in a difficult position to try to come up with a plan. Council Member Birrell commented that it would be interesting to see what the City could do. She did not disagree that the developers need a return on their investment.

Council Member Bracken added that the people at Hillside have already expressed a disinterest in affordable housing in their neighborhood. He noted that the reality is that the City is built out.

d. Council Position on the Little Cottonwood Canyon Environmental Impact Statement – City Council.

Mayor Weichers explained that a few weeks ago, an Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) was issued that addressed phasing an enhanced busing option as well as the desire to begin busing in The Canyons on peak days within the year. The Council was in favor of both options. He noted that the EIS also listed Gondola B as another option.

Mayor Weichers stated that the Council’s position was clear and the EIS was consistent with that position in the short term; however, the EIS also contained the opposite of what the Council wanted in the long term. He expressed his significant disappointment and specifically referenced the Gondola Base Station Parking. He recalled that originally, 1,500 parking spots were called out, which the Council felt was too much because it would not stop traffic through the neighborhoods and Wasatch Boulevard. He stated that the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) came back with 2,500 parking stalls, which he felt was an insult. Mayor Weichers would like the Council to discuss the existing statement and how they could make it stronger.

Mr. Tingey stated that at every point in the process, the City provided input to UDOT. In addition to those listed on the graphic, Mr. Tingey reported that he met on several occasions with UDOT representatives to re-emphasize the City’s points. The City provided UDOT with a five-page detailed memorandum as well as a follow-up letter requesting a collaborative approach to the design elements at their most recent meeting. He also noted that this year, the Council passed a Resolution that was submitted to UDOT requesting that speeds be reduced to 35 MPH on Wasatch Boulevard. Mr. Tingey stressed that the City has consistently and strongly opposed the gondola alternative at every step. The City was supportive of a phased bus priority option focused on local input. He emphasized that there were significant concerns about neighborhood access on Wasatch Boulevard and the City advocated its positions, which included mobility for all users, roadway speed, traffic congestion, neighborhood access, and transit-prioritized solutions.

With respect to the City’s prior input, he listed the discussions regarding local access and corridor mobility as a sub-component. There was a stronger emphasis on safe neighborhood access, especially on King’s Hill Drive. They also provided input on the added capacity for flex lanes or transit-only lanes. The City also requested updated traffic data to ensure that the data being used is accurate, extends shared use paths, and enhances pedestrian crossings.

Mr. Tingey reported that they provided input regarding reducing speeds and noise through roadway design. Coordination in the process of designing Wasatch Boulevard was a significant part of the input. They also provided input regarding reducing shoulder widths to ensure that the design is unique and evokes a Boulevard feel. A significant emphasis by the City was to not treat Wasatch Boulevard as an arterial but as a gateway element to The Canyons that will also be conducive to enhancing access and pedestrian elements. He stated that they provided input on traffic calming measures and not adding capacity before it is warranted.

With respect to the City’s input on enhanced busing, they emphasized the promotion of transit and disincentivizing personal vehicle use during peak hours. They also provided input that the bus solution yields the lowest travel times and focuses on bus alternative components and future

flexibility for buses to be used throughout the valley year-round. In addition, there would be a better long-term investment if planned properly.

Mr. Tingey addressed the City's comments regarding the gondola option and reiterated that the City opposed the gondola as it is incompatible with the Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan. In addition, the location would not resolve any traffic issues on high-traffic days and would not remove Canyon traffic from Wasatch Boulevard. They also advised UDOT that the gondola parking would be under-utilized during non-peak times, would not scale or provide flexibility, and would result in longer travel times than a bus or personal vehicle.

Mr. Tingey presented slides depicting the visual impacts of the proposed gondola. Council Member Birrell pointed out that the illustration presented was created using the 1,500-parking stall garage, whereas UDOT's current plan nearly doubles the parking. UDOT's plan would result in a massive commercial parking garage at the gateway to Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons.

Mr. Tingey presented the recommendations for the Final EIS and stated that the City has until October 17 to provide input to UDOT. He recommended that they reiterate the points made previously including expanding on the gondola parking impact and additional impacts by virtue of UDOT's increase in parking from 1,500 to 2,500 stalls; emphasizing the bus phasing effort; and highlighting the EIS's lack of consideration of local impacts.

With regard to reiterating the City's prior input, Mr. Tingey stated that would include those just discussed and stressed that Cottonwood Heights would feel the most direct impact of any EIS decision. He mentioned the adoption of the Wasatch Master Plan to formalize priorities and ensure that UDOT addresses the issues included in the Wasatch Master Plan. They will reiterate the City's consistent opposition to all gondola options. They would also want to emphasize corridor design and reduction of speeds and the strong need for Cottonwood Heights to play a significant role in roadway design. Mr. Tingey stated that with regard to the expanded gondola parking impact, they recommended advising UDOT that more parking will exacerbate corridor traffic issues on peak days. In addition, delays to get to the gondola hub would result in vehicles not using the gondola.

They recommended advising UDOT that more parking will result in a lower level of service on peak days that will create a self-inflicted need to widen the roadway, which UDOT should not be considered at this point. In addition, transit hubs should be outside the Wasatch corridor and gondola travel time would likely exceed vehicular travel times. Mr. Tingey commented that all of these elements show how the gondola option does not make sense, particularly with the impacts on the community.

With regard to the bus phasing effort, Mr. Tingey included a recommendation to provide a more detailed description of the bus phasing strategy and that bus phasing should be done as a priority with creative solutions to incentivize ridership and develop a well-detailed innovative bus solution. He stated that this might address the concerns prompted by the EIS. They also recommended input on the implementation of tolling, transit priority, and creative resort partnerships, as well as the development of a year-round plan to utilize bus investment beyond the Little Cottonwood Resort demand. He added that flexibility in approach would be a better investment of public funds and could create less negative local impact.

In terms of the local impact, Mr. Tingey listed several recommendations and noted that several residents were present to express significant concerns that should be emphasized to UDOT. He mentioned consideration of the local impact and the lack of priority given to Cottonwood Heights as the community most impacted by the EIS; the significant impact to neighborhood access caused by a five-lane highway design and 2,500-stall garage; better available options that provided the same solution; quality of life for residents and the significant impact on safety and neighborhood character; and the important components of the Wasatch Master Plan.

Mr. Tingey stated that they recommended these points be included in a letter to be submitted to UDOT by October 17. He would be happy to add any additional points of concern. Staff invited input from the Council after which a letter would be drafted and distributed to the Council for review prior to October 17. Mr. Tingey commented that these recommendations addressed the concerns raised by the residents, the needs of the residents and neighborhoods, and the impacts of UDOT's decision.

Council Member Bracken addressed the recommendation that the transit hubs should be outside the Wasatch corridor and recalled that they had discussed a transit hub and transit-oriented development at The Gravel Pit. He felt this language should be rephrased somewhat in light of that. Mr. Tingey stated that the EIS scope area begins at Fort Union. Council Member Bracken requested this recommendation be rephrased and noted that the Gravel Pit would be a great place for people to park because of its proximity to the freeway.

There was further discussion about parking at The Gravel Pit. Council Member Birrell reported that the Project Manager stated that they would begin with one parking tower with 1,500 parking stalls and noted that the long-term plan was to have two parking towers at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. It was noted that this would entail UDOT negotiating something for the South Gravel Pit, as this was not part of the Gravel Pit development already approved.

Council Member Bracken remarked that if there are that many cars they would prefer to have them off the road before Fort Union Boulevard.

Council Member Birrell explained that 9400 South could become a real choke point before the intersection of 9800 South and Old Wasatch Boulevard. Additional choke points exist where motorists travel from the west on Fort Union Boulevard and for those coming off I-215 onto SR-190/SR-210 at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. She hoped that the City would get behind addressing Foothill congestion by not creating fancy, intermodal hubs; but rather by thinking about repurposing the unused portions of many of the strip mall parking lots throughout the valley as transit and carpool hubs. She acknowledged that this would require a collective will by the City as well as the cities of Salt Lake County, the County itself, and the State Legislature.

Council Member Birrell invited the Council to envision something long-term that would alleviate this issue and commented that while building a 1,500-parking stall tower at the mouth of Big Cottonwood would be helpful, the current UDOT plan for a 2,500-stall garage at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon will induce demand not only through the neighborhoods of Cottonwood Heights but also the neighborhoods of Granite and Sandy. She stressed that now is the time for the

extended community to come together around a vision that will not only solve transit challenges for recreationists but for the many residents of Salt Lake County who do not have east/west connections and commuters.

Mayor Weichers recommended focusing the discussion on the City's response to UDOT. Council Member Birrell commended Staff for the information prepared. She expressed concern regarding UDOT's planned removal of trees along Wasatch Boulevard within the gateway to Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons. UDOT stated specifically that they would accommodate better commuter service by removing the old-growth pine trees in favor of road widening to either the equivalent of six or seven lanes. There were also concerns that UDOT was using antiquated or incorrect data in its lane widening analysis for an imbalanced lane. She felt that they should include something about the preservation of the existing mature pine trees in the response to UDOT.

Council Member Newell liked the idea of reiterating the points previously raised with UDOT that were dismissed and not addressed. Mayor Weichers suggested starting by emphasizing the points raised and ending with the fact that the City felt disrespected that the concerns about a 1,500-stall parking garage were not only disregarded but increased to 2,500 stalls.

Council Member Birrell also requested that emphasis be put on the fracturing of the community, noting that District Four is already problematic for those living on both sides of Wasatch Boulevard.

Council Member Bracken stressed that they are addressing the EIS and how the City should respond to it. The focus should remain on those issues that have to do with the EIS and the project. Council Member Birrell felt that the Wasatch Boulevard expansion was a key element of the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS.

Mayor Weichers suggested language on the imbalanced lanes. Council Member Petersen recalled that they spoke in great detail about trying to alleviate the problems with the 24 to 26 peak days. He noted that it will take two years to increase bus capacity and 18 months or more for tolling. They do not know to what extent the problems will be mitigated for those 26 days. Mayor Weichers suggested a statement emphasizing that the City will expect the tolling and enhanced busing to receive valid metrics on whether it will alleviate peak day traffic. It was noted that other measures, such as carpooling, would be easier to implement and much less expensive.

Council Member Birrell requested they include a statement that before UDOT implements a two-lane imbalanced design, they look at alleviating the commuter traffic by viable transit, not necessarily on Wasatch Boulevard. She commented that they already have existing north/south arterials in the southeast quadrant of the Salt Lake Valley and implementing a valuable commuter service on Highland Drive up to the East Bench Cultural District could alleviate the need to build out Wasatch Boulevard. She emphasized that no scanning was done on viable transit alternatives to diminish the forecasted need. She stated that currently there is no level of service below a "C" on Wasatch Boulevard through Cottonwood Heights. She stressed that they were talking about a 2.6-mile stretch from the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon to the High-T intersection, the expansion of which was for commuters, not ski traffic. The City should ask for viable alternatives based on current ridership numbers.

Council Member Bracken stated that the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) has ski bus pickup areas throughout the County and will have ridership information. Council Member Petersen noted that the 9400 South bus is highly used. There was discussion regarding the viability of this service on peak days. Council Member Newell commented that the viability of service must be based on ridership. He noted that UTA can determine ridership based on the data they collect. He suggested reiterating the prior input by the City and noted that it was dismissed by UDOT. Mayor Weichers recognized that UDOT has a mission to provide a higher level of service and in respecting UDOT’s mission, perhaps UDOT would respect the City’s concerns.

With regard to the justification for increasing the parking garage from 1,500 to 2,500, Council Member Birrell noted that UDOT refused to conduct a Capacity Study; however, the U.S. Forest Service indicated that they could conduct a Visitor Capacity Study and were willing to move that from 2024 to 2023. Council Member Bracken explained that UDOT shied away from a Capacity Study because it involved too many ways to count or evaluate capacity.

Council Member Birrell commented that the parking lots at Snowbird and Alta fill up. She considered the use of taxpayer dollars spent to deliver customers to Snowbird and Alta 20 days out of the year to be unconscionable. She noted that the U.S. Forest Service stated that the trails can accommodate more visitors in the summer.

Council Member Birrell asked that the article for the October newsletter include comments from the City’s elected officials who have made very astute observations. Mr. Tingey expressed concern about making the article too extensive and suggested they just cover the main points. He would prepare a draft and circulate it to Council for comments. He understood that the Council was agreeable to reiterating the City’s recommendations to UDOT and adding the removal of the trees, the City’s extreme disappointment at the change from 1,500 to 2,500 parking stalls, and the impacts related to that. There was discussion about the wording related to the City’s disappointment. Council Member Petersen commented that they were trying to develop a symbiotic relationship with UDOT. Council Member Newell added that they want to keep open the channels of dialogue with UDOT. Mr. Tingey stated that one of the main elements the City would have to be involved in the design of Wasatch Boulevard and must partner with UDOT.

Mr. Tingey mentioned the addition of language regarding the fracturing of the east side and west side of Wasatch Boulevard with respect to access, egress, and ingress without effective design on Wasatch Boulevard. He would also include the comment regarding the 24 to 26 peak days and ensuring that tolling and enhanced busing alternatives will be evaluated before funding the gondola. Council Member Birrell felt that the suggestion was that they wanted to see the implementation, not the consideration, within the next 18 months. It was noted by Mayor Weichers that they would want to see measurable ways to evaluate these alternatives before going to the gondola.

Mayor Weichers suggested that Mr. Tingey highlight that Cottonwood Heights is the city that is most impacted by this EIS. Council Member Birrell suggested including impacts on the neighbors in Granite and Sandy and questioned whether other cities should be included. Council Member Bracken stated that they were elected to represent Cottonwood Heights City and should speak for the City. The neighboring cities have representation and can submit their own comments.

Mr. Tingey agreed to include the fact that Cottonwood Heights will be the most impacted as well as viable transit alternatives to alleviate needs. He requested direction on the newsletter, especially related to additional comments. He stated that the article will focus on the discussion points. Council Member Newell liked emphasizing the leadership of Cottonwood Heights since neighboring cities have their own representation.

Council Member Birrell felt that the residents were anxious for comprehensive, holistic representation of these issues and noted that many local and State leaders have been vociferously opposed to the gondola. Many of her constituents feel very disheartened and she felt that providing more information to residents will give them hope that their concerns are being represented. Mayor Weichers felt these were good points and did not want to see disrespect within the Council.

4. REVIEW OF CALENDARS AND UPCOMING EVENTS.

- a. **Monster Mash will be held October 28 from 5:00 p.m. through 7:00 pm. At the Cottonwood Heights Community Recreation Center.**
- b. **Trunk or Treat will be held October 31 starting at 3:00 p.m. in the City Hall Parking Lot.**
- c. **Light the Heights will be held on November 28 from 6:00 p.m. through 9:00 p.m. at City Hall.**
- d. **Future City Council Meetings will be Held October 4, and 18, November 1 and 15, and December 6 and 20, 2022, at City Hall Starting at 4:00 p.m. Unless Otherwise Noticed.**
- e. **Future Planning Commission Meetings will be held October 5, October 19, and November 2 starting at 5:00 p.m. unless otherwise noticed.**

5. POSSIBLE CLOSED MEETING TO DISCUSS LITIGATION, PROPERTY ACQUISITION, AND/OR THE CHARACTER AND PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to go into Closed Meeting to discuss property acquisition issues. The motion was seconded by Council Member Newell. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

The City Council was in Closed Session from 6:00 p.m. to 6:25 p.m.

6. ADJOURN CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION.

MOTION: Council Member Newell moved to Adjourn the Work Session. The motion was seconded by Council Member Birrell. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

The Work Session adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS MEETING
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2022, AT 6:30 P.M. IN THE COTTONWOOD
HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL
BOULEVARD**

Members Present: Mayor Mike Weichers, Council Member Douglas Petersen, Council Member Scott Bracken, Council Member Shawn E. Newell, Council Member Ellen Birrell

Staff Present: City Manager Tim Tingey, City Attorney Shane Topham, Records Culture and Human Resources Director Paula Melgar, Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, Police Chief Robby Russo, Public Works Director Matt Shipp, Finance and Administrative Services Director Scott Jurges, Assistant Fire Chief Riley Pilgrim, IT Manager Matt Ervin

1.0 WELCOME – Mayor Weichers.

Mayor Mike Weichers called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and welcomed those present.

2.0 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

The Pledge was led by Records, Culture, and Human Resources Director-City Recorder, Paula Melgar.

3.0 CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS

3.1 Committee Reports by Council Member Doug Petersen.

Council Member Petersen reported that he had participated in a couple of ribbon cuttings over the last month to welcome new businesses to the City. These businesses thanked the City for welcoming them. He referenced the Mosquito Abatement Committee and commended them for their efforts. He had the opportunity to meet with many in the City and noted that traffic calming is a serious issue. The following evening, he would be working with Council Member Bracken and City Manager, Tim Tingey on issues pertaining to La Cresta. He recently had the opportunity to work with people in his district who are having animal control issues involving deer, raccoons, skunks, and foxes. He commented that a few gardens have been decimated and they are trying to find ways to mitigate the problem.

Council Member Petersen commented that more is happening in the City now ever. He mentioned the Dover Project and looking for a citywide high-speed fiber vendor. He felt that high-speed internet will become a very important utility.

3.2 Committee Reports by Council Member Scott Bracken.

Council Member Bracken reported that he serves on committees within and outside the City. The Youth Council has begun looking at a Legacy Project. At the last meeting, they hosted

Sustainability Specialists from Wasatch Front Waste & Recycling, who answered questions on what can and cannot be recycled. They were looking at either conducting an educational meeting and/or distributing fliers to help with recycling efforts. They also arranged an upcoming project involving tree planting on the north side of City Hall with plants repurposed from Ferguson Park.

He reported that Wasatch Front Waste & Recycling collects garbage, recycling, green waste, and glass. The City has been doing fairly well in terms of recycling. Council Member Bracken noted that the pandemic hit personnel hard and the Neighborhood Dumpster Program experienced changes due to its inability to hire temporary drivers for the last several months. The situation has made the program untenable. There is a reservation system where residents can take a car or truckload to the dump without paying a fee.

Council Member Bracken reported that they are moving into the budget season and they postponed a projected fee increase for the last two years. He commented that it is likely that they will look at a monthly fee increase of \$1 to \$2 to maintain the current service levels. He expected the Executive Director to speak with the City Council before any action is taken.

3.3 Committee Reports by Council Member Shawn Newell.

Council Member Newell reported advised that he serves on a number of committees, one of which is the Legislative Committee where he serves with the Mayor and City Manager. The Committee Members have the opportunity to share ideologies and issues that cross all municipalities along the Wasatch Front and throughout the State. The committee provides for robust conversations and they dive deep into issues. They share potential solutions, and opportunities to grow, and develop mechanisms to help them provide greater environments for their respective communities.

Council Member Newell also serves on the Arts Council and mentioned that the recent musical was a great success. The Arts Council was looking for additional volunteers and participation. He announced that a five-ton boulder was being used as artwork at City Hall.

Council Member Newell also mentioned the recent Bark in the Park event, which was very successful. He commented that it was not only an event for pets but a great way for residents to interact. He reported that The Children's Choir was phenomenal and participation continues to grow. He lauded the talent that exists in the community. He had also heard great things about the Choir and the overall experience for participants. Council Member Newell mentioned the Fall and Spring Children's Choir and invited those interested to get involved.

3.4 Committee Reports by Council Member Ellen Birrell.

Council Member Ellen Birrell reported on the Historical Committee and stated that their current focus is on a Veterans and First Responders Monument that they plan to install in the City Hall patio area. They plan to include interesting geological rock to tie in the glacial Little Cottonwood Canyon and the stream created at Big Cottonwood Canyon.

Council Member Birrell mentioned Jerry Christensen, the Brighton High School Ambassador. He connected her with various teachers in an effort to see if students might be interested in learning

more about the Little Cottonwood Canyon EIS. She serves as an Alternate on the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) Local Advisory Council and reported that at the most recently meeting, Cottonwood Heights was being considered for a Small Area Project that could bring on-demand transit service to the City. She commented that UTA is working innovatively to help communities access transit.

Council Member Birrell mentioned the Horrocks Fort Union Boulevard Study and noted that there were residents from the Apple Valley and Canyon Center areas who were interested in a better understanding of how they might remedy some of the traffic congestion on Fort Union Boulevard during the peak ski season.

3.5 Committee Reports by Mayor Mike Weichers.

Mayor Weichers thanked the City Council Members for their efforts. He recently attended the unveiling of the Sandy City Gold Star Families Memorial Monument. South Jordan City held a similar event two weeks prior. The Mayor explained that the cities joined an organization to create a monument at their respective City Halls for those who have died protecting our country. Mayor Weichers stated that there are Gold Star families in Cottonwood Heights and recommended that they begin the process of becoming a Gold Star Family City that will provide a monument at City Hall to recognize the importance of those who defend our freedoms. The process will take approximately one year and involve fundraising.

Mayor Weichers reported that he also serves on the Transportation Committee for the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) which recently selected a provider for the Big Cottonwood Canyon map. The CWC intends to fix and help alleviate transportation issues in Big Cottonwood Canyon in advance of any mandate being put forward by the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”). He stated that the Commission is in the process of retaining an independent company that will look at possible solutions.

4.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS

Runar Boman mentioned an article authored by Council Member Bracken in the April 30, 2021, *Council Spotlight Newsletter*. The article discussed selecting good candidates for political office, namely the City Council. He found the article to be well written and he took it to heart. He read an excerpt from the article. He referenced Resolution 2019-66, which is aimed at pursuing a goal of achieving 100% renewable electricity for City operations by 2022 and within the City by 2030 without compromising affordability, reliability, and environmental stewardship.

Mr. Boman referenced an email he sent to Council and stated that he felt strongly about it. He loves the outdoors and wanted to see the City’s open lands protected. He was annoyed by those who push an agenda of renewable energy as a way to save the planet. He stated that these things are destructive and will destroy stretches of national and public lands. He was upset to see the City Council supporting such destruction. Mr. Boman stated that Resolution 2019-66 was written by someone with an agenda and he expressed concern that the City Council was using this flawed document to pursue its renewable energy goals going forward.

Lucy Peifer, a 17-year-old Alta High School student, addressed the gondola in Little Cottonwood Canyon. She has lived in Utah her entire life and has used the canyon for as long as she can remember. He was opposed to the gondola because it is not the right alternative for the canyon. She felt that the cost alone is expensive and she did not want to see 200-foot-tall towers when she drives up the canyon. She felt that the gondola will detract from the canyon's natural beauty. She was angry and stated that the gondola will result in a 50-minute ride to the top of the canyon when it only takes 20 minutes to drive in a private vehicle.

Ms. Peifer thought it was unfair that everyone will have to pay for the gondola, even though many do not use the canyon on a regular basis. Being forced to pay for the gondola would be an environmental injustice, especially when the majority of those that go up the canyon can afford a season pass. She stated that other alternatives should be considered. She mentioned eco-friendly buses, charging tolls, or carpooling.

Mayor Weichers encouraged residents to visit the City's website and watch the Council's Work Session where they spent time discussing how the City wants to address UDOT and their decision to build a gondola. Earlier in the meeting, the Council discussed ways they could make a stronger statement to UDOT and why a gondola is a wrong alternative. He also suggested that the public submit comments directly to UDOT prior to October 17.

Mayor Weichers applauded Ms. Peifer for speaking before the Council at age 17.

Roman Fisher, a 15-year-old Alta High School student stated that since the age of five, he has been going up the canyon. He commented that no one wants to drive up the canyon and see 200-foot-tall towers. Mr. Fisher considered the plan to be ridiculous. He asked what the gondola will do to wildlife in the canyon. He also asked how the gondola will impact taxpayers who do not use the canyon but who will be required to pay higher taxes. Mr. Fisher was upset because he is too young to vote but stated that these decisions are being made for him. He submitted a comment on UDOT's website but questioned whether they are really listening to the public. He urged the City Council to stand up to UDOT. He reiterated his frustration and stated that he uses the canyon frequently. He felt there were other ways to access the canyon without constructing a gondola.

Zoey Marty thanked the Council for their time and had no doubt that the Council has the desires of the community at heart. She is a teacher in the Canyons School District and echoed the comments made about geological formations, art, and youth in the community. She uses the canyon often and knows that the City has addressed the gondola, the environmental and economic impacts, and the environmental injustices. She understood that the Council was aware of these issues. Ms. Marty wanted the Council to be aware of the youth and the students who are watching the Council make these decisions and communicate with UDOT with a sense of grace. She stated that students are showing up in droves in her classrooms and at rallies protesting. Students are angry and want to see change. She thanked the Council and stressed that young people are watching and participating in the policy. Ms. Marty thanked the Council and echoed the comments of Ms. Peifer and Mr. Fisher about the environmental injustices. She added that additional environmental impacts include habitat displacement, road widening, and water contamination. She stated that she has contacted UDOT and Save Not Pave. She applauded the Council's stance with UDOT and for taking steps to rectify issues in Big Cottonwood Canyon before UDOT takes action.

Micki Harris thanked the Council and believed that the Council was trying to do a good job. She appreciated the Council listening and making an effort to understand the potential community impacts. She attended the Work Session and appreciated the Council's message. She observed that the residents feel frustrated and helpless. The community is happy to share the canyon but not at the expense of safety. Ms. Harris agreed with Council Member Petersen's comment that Cottonwood Heights is doing far more giving than receiving. She understood that the City's relationship with UDOT is tricky. She stated that they need to keep the door open but did not feel that the current situation was working. Ms. Harris suggested that the City be firm and express its disappointment. She felt that joining forces with some other communities might be a solution.

Niya West, a senior at Corner Canyon High School, felt lucky to have grown up in a small cabin just below the ski resort. Her parents are avid outdoorsmen and conservationists who taught her from a young age to leave no trace and always respect wildlife and the mountain. These lessons have carried over into her outdoor activities. She mentioned skiing at Alta Ski Resort, where she grew to love Little Cottonwood Canyon almost as much as Big Cottonwood Canyon. In theory, a gondola could be a nice respite from traffic and winter roads; however, she felt this was a selfish justification. The benefits of using a gondola to travel up the canyon would not outweigh the environmental and financial impacts the gondola will have on the canyon and the City. Ms. West mentioned the layout of the gondola and felt that the idea that the gondola will aid the canyon as a whole was a myth. The gondola will support the ski resort and funnel more money into their pockets, rather than support the entire canyon and the local community. She imagined what \$550 million could do for conservation, wildlife efforts, or climate change, which she felt was continuing at an accelerated rate.

Ms. West stated that the biggest claim in support of the gondola was that it will solve the traffic problem. She understood that increased funding for bus systems, implementing a toll, or incentivizing students to carpool could be more cost-effective and environmentally friendly. She felt that reducing the number of vehicles traveling up and down the canyon was the best option. She commented that the fault is with the resorts and UDOT. She asked that the City find alternative solutions that will not have permanent impacts on the canyon.

Roger Tobar agreed with the prior speakers regarding the gondola. He felt that the problem is traffic flow. He felt that a good solution was to improve the two-lane road and provide a third flex lane for uphill traffic until 1:00 p.m. and downhill traffic after 1:00 p.m. He stated that this would resolve the backup issue on Wasatch Boulevard. Mr. Tobar was in favor of a flex lane and noted that he has been a season pass holder since 1978 and uses the road often. He was in favor of paying a toll to fund the road.

Mike Hansen recognized the importance of working through disagreements. He stated that some of the exchanges in the Work Session brought back bad memories from the past. He felt that the Council was doing a good job and negotiating with UDOT. He observed that the City was keeping things respectful while understanding that the City has a vision that needs to be voiced to UDOT. Mr. Hansen mentioned the roundabout and stated that he has followed the discussions on the roundabout over the years. He felt that the roundabout was a great addition and they were seeing its benefits. He referenced Council Member Birrell's comments that the issue on Wasatch Boulevard

is a commuter problem. While he agreed, he also pointed out that Highland Drive has a similar problem. He grew up in the area, and Wasatch Boulevard and Highland Drive did not have traffic problems until the freeway was constructed.

Mr. Tingey submitted 10 written public comments to the record regarding concerns about Wasatch Boulevard, the EIS, and the gondola. The comments were summarized as follows:

Gary Sandberg was very concerned that UDOT might have bowed to political pressure, limiting the alternatives to Little Cottonwood Canyon. Broader proposals that included Big Cottonwood Canyon and the other resorts in our treasured Wasatch mountains seemed to have been ignored. He noted that the final comment period on the EIS opened on September 2 and closes on October 17. All were encouraged to comment on the final EIS. Mr. Sandberg stated that if elected to represent Cottonwood Heights in the State Legislature, he will push to have the Final Record of Decision put off until the Legislature has an opportunity to review the work done by UDOT, the alternatives that were considered, the proposed alternatives that were not considered, and assurances that the NEPA process was followed. He will also insist that the State Legislature be given a full accounting of the alternatives, including those that address the congestion issue in a wider context.

Diane Forster-Burke stated that she can observe traffic from her home. The only time there is considerable traffic on Wasatch is on “fresh powder days” on the weekends. This occurs only from late November to early March. With climate change, she believed there will be fewer fresh powder days except when the resorts make their own snow. The gondola is not needed and is extremely expensive. She did not want any of her tax dollars used for such a devastating plan. She saw no reason to add additional lanes of traffic. She stated that speeds along Wasatch Boulevard need to be reduced and the winding nature of the road maintained.

Leslie Kovach urged the Council to come together and support the residents who do not support the gondola, the parking structure, or the widening of Wasatch Boulevard. She had spoken to many residents and taxpayers who consider the Little Cottonwood EIS process to be a sham and a waste of taxpayer money. She urged the Council to lower speeds, expand bike lanes, and build walkways on both sides of Wasatch Boulevard. She did not want her tax dollars to support a proposition that will only benefit Snowbird, Alta, and CW Management. She also urged the Council to not allow any rezoning of property along Wasatch Boulevard

Brandon Patterson a resident who lives and works in Salt Lake City and recreates in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons, supported increasing transit infrastructure before constructing a gondola.

Dagmar James expressed frustration with UDOT for not listening to the citizens who live on Wasatch Boulevard. He questioned how a gondola will solve the traffic problem. He suggested that there simply be more buses on busy days. He also suggested that the speeds along Wasatch Boulevard be reduced. He stated that it is common for cars to travel 60 to 70 MH along Wasatch Boulevard, which is dangerous.

Michelle Cowan, a long-time City resident, disagreed with the gondola. She urged the Council to listen to the community. She stated that the traffic problem is not going to be resolved by putting more cars on Wasatch Boulevard. She instead suggested a UTA hub be placed near the gravel pit.

She recommended that improvements be made to Wasatch Boulevard in the form of expanded bike lanes, and a lower speed limit.

Mary Ellen Van Engelenhoven, a 32-years resident, grew up skiing and did not believe that a gondola will not solve the problem. She was not in favor of a massive commercial parking garage for those who decide to take the gondola up the canyon to access the ski resorts. Instead, she asked that the Council consider using existing transit infrastructure. She stated that UDOT's preferred plans will not decrease canyon ski traffic. She did not want Cottonwood Heights to become known for sitting by the sidelines while the gondola is constructed. The City has a rare opportunity to be part of the solution and promote infrastructure changes to improve safety, walkability, bike-ability, and mobility. Wasatch Boulevard can become more connected to Fort Union and Bengal Boulevards through improvements and projects the City Council can approve. She urged the City Council to make improvements to enhance the walkability and safety along Wasatch Boulevard now and continue to unite those who are opposed to the gondola.

Gwendolyn Adams, a Cottonwood Heights business owner, resident, parent, and neighbor, was discouraged by UDOT's choices. She stated that it seems that they do not care about what is best for the community. Wasatch Boulevard is already unsafe. Zion National Park has 5 million visitors per year and keeps its gateway roads safe and friendly for bikers, walkers, and all user groups. She suggested their example be followed. She asked that the Council do what they can to support the community.

Heather Dance, a five resident who lives east of Wasatch Boulevard stated that she has five young children with friends who live west of Wasatch Boulevard. She was concerned about the speed of traffic on Wasatch Boulevard. She stated that the Golden Hills intersection was poorly designed and is not conducive to foot traffic. She stated that a very large neighborhood east of Wasatch Boulevard will be separated from Cottonwood Heights if the road is widened and speeds remain at 50 MPH. She compared Wasatch Boulevard to Bangerter Highway, which is a freeway.

Mr. Tingey added that three comments were submitted after the deadline. They were summarized as follows:

Bob Elkington identified himself as a resident of Cottonwood Heights and the President of the Granite Oaks Homeowners Association. He stated that political power and money have combined to make the Gondola B project UDOT's recommended solution to resolve traffic issues in Little Cottonwood Canyon. This massive government-funded and built project is a dreadful idea for many reasons. The plan brings thousands of cars to the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon instead of using parking hubs and bussing alternatives. The plan requires the expansion of SR-210 to the point of the massive parking garage, destroying existing neighborhoods in Cottonwood Heights. The Big Cottonwood Canyon traffic issue is similar and not addressed. He considered the project to be too big and too costly. He suggested there be a phased-in approach an alternative to the destructive UDOT plan. He suggested alternatively that there be effective tolling, required parking reservations, and testing the use of electric buses. He urged the Council to take a stance against Gondola B to preserve the canyon and neighborhoods.

Jennifer Welding commented on the LCC EIS. She realized that the citizens and UDOT are looking at different problems. As a citizen, she felt they were throwing unnecessary funds at a minimal problem.

Jennifer Mijangos commented that a film festival was scheduled and postponed two years in a row due to COVID. Her understanding was that all of the details were arranged and the only outstanding issue was selecting dates. She hoped to see similar projects realized and asked that the Council identify dates so that the public can look forward to enriching community events.

There were no further citizen comments. The Citizen Comment period was closed.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Consideration of Resolution 2022-49 – Approving an Updated Affordable Housing Plan.

MOTION: Council Member Newell moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-49 – approving an Updated Affordable Housing Plan. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Mike Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

5.2 Consideration of Resolution 2022-50 – Designating the National Incident Management System (“NIMS”) as the Basis for All Incident Management in Cottonwood Heights.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-50 – Designating the National Incident Management System (“NIMS”) as the basis for all incident management in Cottonwood Heights. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Mike Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

5.3 Consideration of Resolution 2022-51 – Declaring Certain Property Surplus.

MOTION: Council Member Petersen moved to APPROVE Resolution 2022-51 –Declaring Certain Property Surplus. The motion was seconded by Council Member Birrell. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Mike Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

6.1 Approval of the City Council Work Session and Business Meeting Minutes of September 6, 2022.

MOTION: Council Member Newell moved to APPROVE the City Council Work Session and Business Meeting minutes from September 6, 2022. The motion was seconded by Council Member

Petersen. Vote on motion: Council Member Petersen-Aye, Council Member Bracken-Aye, Council Member Newell-Aye, Council Member Birrell-Aye, Mayor Mike Weichers-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

7.0 ADJOURN CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS MEETING.

MOTION: Council Member Bracken moved to adjourn the City Council Business Meeting. The motion was seconded by Council Member Petersen. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Council.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Cottonwood Heights City Council Work Session and Business Meeting held Tuesday, September 20, 2022.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: October 4, 2022