

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Tuesday, January 2, 2018 7:00 p.m.  
Community Recreation Center  
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Jenney Rees, Mayor, Presiding  
Councilmembers: Denise Andersen, Ben Bailey, Ben Ellsworth, Mike Geddes  
Chandler Goodwin, City Manager  
Charl Louw, Finance Director  
Greg Gordon, Recreation Director  
Jeff Maag, Public Works Director  
Joel Wright, City Attorney  
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder  
Others: Lt. Gregg Ludlow, James Brisk, Craig Clement, Curt Crosby, Craig Hansen, David Kirkpatrick, Robert Morgan, Maurice Navarro, Thomas Reams, Kelly Smith, Steven Thomas, Keith Irwin, David Driggs

1. Call to Order

This meeting of the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Rees. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chandler Goodwin, and the invocation was given by Mayor Rees.

2. Approval of Meeting’s Agenda.

**MOTION: C. Andersen—To approve the agenda.** Seconded by C. Geddes.

Yes - C. Andersen  
C. Bailey  
C. Ellsworth  
C. Geddes Motion passes.

3. Public Comment

There were no comments.

CITY REPORTS AND BUSINESS

4. City Manager

Chandler Goodwin, City Manager, reported that staff was preparing the preliminary budget for the upcoming budget retreat on February 10, 2018. He also spoke to the candidates present, informing them that there were other positions in the City that needed to be filled, including positions on the Planning Commission and the Board of Adjustment.

5. Mayor and Council

The City Councilmembers had nothing to report.

Mayor Rees reported that she had attended a MAG meeting on December 14, 2017, and the Commission had discussed the ¾ cent sales tax. She explained that there was already a tax in

place that allowed the County to collect funds, but those funds could only be used after a project had been approved by MAG. Mayor Rees said that they were now in a situation where the County felt that they could reject an approved project if they didn't agree with it. Commissioner Lee was proposing to repeal the 3% County tax and instead have the individual cities implement the tax. Mayor Rees said that she would keep the City Council informed of any changes in that regard.

## SCHEDULED ITEMS

### 6. Review of City Council Applications

Mayor Rees invited the candidates for City Council to sit in the front row. Each candidate would have two minutes to introduce themselves, and then the City Council would ask questions that each candidate would answer in turn. The City Council would vote for their top three choices and ask more questions of the final three individuals. Afterwards, the City Council would vote on their final choice.

Curt Crosby, 9835 North Meadow Drive, said that he had been a resident of Cedar Hills for ten years. He had 11 children and 20 grandchildren. Mr. Crosby applied for the City Council position because he felt that it was his duty to participate in the community and the American experience.

Steven Thomas, 10152 North Pinion Drive, said he had been a resident for three years and he loved the City. When his family was seeking a home in Utah, this was the only City that felt right. Mr. Thomas expressed his love for the City's parks and open space, and he was glad to see that development was slower here than other cities in the State. Mr. Thomas said there were important decisions coming up for the City, and he wanted to be a part of those decisions. Mr. Thomas went to school for urban planning and had served on the Planning Commission since moving to Cedar Hills.

Craig Clement, 4114 West 9950 North, said his family moved to Cedar Hills 15 years ago, and he had served on the Planning Commission for 11 years. He enjoyed participating in the community and was looking forward to getting to know more residents if chosen for this position.

David Kirkpatrick, 10461 North Sage Vista Lane, was a resident from 1977 to 1983 before moving out of state for work. He was able to transfer to Utah in 2004 and chose to move back to Cedar Hills because it was the best place to raise his family. Mr. Kirkpatrick spoke about his service in the community and how he was able to watch the City grow.

Brian Miller, 10509 North Sage Vista Lane, expressed a hope that the City Councilmembers would consider him for this appointment. Mr. Miller had dedicated countless hours to the City since moving here in 2014, and he felt that he had shown good judgement. He had served on the Citizens Advisory General Plan Committee and the Planning Commission, and he had volunteered to participate in many City events. He had also headed up the educational campaign for the PARC Tax. Mr. Miller worked as a city attorney for another city, so he had experience with land uses and advising Councils.

Kelly Smith, 9037 Silver Lake Drive, had been a resident of Cedar hills for three years. Previously, she had served as the American Fork Council PTA President, the Parks Board, and other committees. Ms. Smith was currently serving as a county delegate. She said that she had a good working relationship with the American Fork City Council and Mayor, and she was an advocate for education.

Craig Hansen, 4049 West Cypress Drive, was a five-year resident of the City. He commented that all the candidates were good options, and they were good people. Mr. Hansen said he loved Cedar Hills and couldn't have picked a better city in which to live. He enjoyed the natural surroundings and open space, and he wanted to make sure that part of the City survived as they went through changes in the next ten years. Mr. Hansen had served on the Board of Adjustment and the Citizens Advisory General Plan Committee.

Maurice Navarro said he had the opportunity to participate in the campaign for the last ten months, and he would not give up. Cedar Hills was a great City with very involved citizens. Mr. Navarro emphasized the need for clear communication with the residents and the need for a better presence on social media.

Thomas Reams, 9614 Aztec Drive, had been a resident for three years. Mr. Reams said that he had worked as an auditor for almost a decade and he had a lot of experience with service districts. He was very comfortable working with governmental entities. Mr. Reams felt that serving on the City Council would be a good opportunity for him to give back to the community.

Robert Morgan, 4555 West Windsor Circle, said he had lived in Cedar Hills since 2002 and he was passionate about the City. Mr. Morgan's background was in the automobile industry, and he had experience with management, leadership and customer service trainings. Mr. Morgan has had the desire to run for office for a long time, and he now had the time. He expressed a concern that the passive majority in the community were being left behind, and minorities were running things.

JD Brisk, 4034 Oak Road North, had lived in Cedar Hills for 26 years. Until now, he had other commitments that kept him from serving. Mr. Brisk believed that he was a good judge of character and he had leadership skills to bring to the table.

Mayor Rees invited the City Council to ask questions of the candidates.

C. Geddes commented that there were many issues in the City that required the attention of the City Council, and one of those was the golf course. He asked if the candidates had read the Golf Committee's report that they had prepared last year, and if they agreed or disagreed with it. He also asked if there was anything the candidates would have chosen to do differently.

Mr. Crosby said that he didn't read the entire report, so he couldn't say that he agreed with everything in the report. However, he believed that the committee had made a good attempt to bring the issues to light. The issue of overwhelming City debt had always been a key concern

for Mr. Crosby, and he wanted to be sure that whatever decision the City went with the golf course that it was in the best interest of the community.

Mr. Thomas admitted that he had not read the report and he therefore had nothing to add.

Mr. Clement said that he had attended most of the committee meetings and a lot of interesting information came out of their study. At this point, the City owns the golf course, so they need to move forward rather than look back. He suggested that they do the best with what they have.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said that he agreed with two of the committee's conclusions in the report. The first was that the City wasn't in any position to sell the golf course at this time. The second was that the City needed to manage the debt wisely. Mr. Kirkpatrick was glad that the City Council jumped on the opportunity to refinance the bond, which would ultimately save the residents a lot of money. He also felt that the golf course was an asset to Cedar Hills.

Mr. Miller agreed with the findings of the report. He has also attended several committee meetings, and he was a member of the group that pushed for the preservation of that land. The report provided the City with true and accurate numbers that they could use, and the committee had put in a lot of hard work to get that information. Mr. Miller supported the golf course and other open spaces in the community.

Ms. Smith had read the report and agreed with the findings. She was glad that the report was thorough and contained a lot of important details. Ms. Smith also felt that the golf course was an asset to the community and the City had an obligation to run it well.

Mr. Hansen said he was a golf course supporter and felt it was an asset to the community. The City's duty now would be to maintain that asset and pay off the debt.

Mr. Navarro read the report and spoke to a lot of people regarding the issue. The golf course was part of the City now, and they needed to make the most of it. Mr. Navarro did not want to see the land broken up or developed.

Mr. Reams felt that the report gave the best information possible. He emphasized the need for the City to consider how the golf course would impact the community, for good or bad.

Mr. Morgan commented that the City had been paying for the golf course for some time already, and it had been a contentious issue among the residents. He believed that the City needed to continue to find solutions to paying off the debt.

Mr. Brisk said that he had read the report and he agreed with the comments made by the other candidates. The golf course was an asset to the community and he supported it.

C. Andersen commented that the City recently acquired the Harvey Property just east of Deerfield Elementary. The intention was to develop a park there, but the City did not have enough money to do that. She asked how the candidates would propose to finance the park.

Mr. Brisk commented that it took a long time for the City to acquire the property. The best approach would be to develop the park with community projects and volunteers.

Mr. Morgan said that it would be beneficial to find out what the registered voters wanted to do. If they wanted to bond, then the City should move forward with that. Mr. Morgan said this decision should be made based on the input of the entire City.

Mr. Reams said this issue was similar to that of the golf course. The City needed to understand what kind of park they wanted, how much it would cost to develop, and the financial impact to the residents. The City should conduct the necessary research and then present it to the residents for public comment and feedback.

Mr. Navarro commented that it would be hard to get feedback from everyone in the community, but it would be worth seeking that input. He recommended phasing the funding and development of the park. Mr. Navarro thought the park was a great project, as long as the City was fiscally responsible.

Mr. Hansen didn't want to throw out an answer to the question without first investigating the issue. He agreed that the City should be fiscally responsible and receive input of the residents.

Ms. Smith said the renderings she saw for the potential park were very nice and she appreciated that they were put together based on the income of the citizens. She agreed that the City needed input from the residents as to how they wanted to fund the project.

Mr. Miller explained that the City would either have to bond now or wait until the golf course was paid off and bond at that time. He was in favor of bonding now because open space drives community. Mr. Miller felt that the benefit would outweigh the cost.

Mr. Kirkpatrick also appreciated that the conceptual drawings were based on citizen surveys. The park could be a good asset to the City, but he wasn't sure he wanted to bond right away. It would be wiser to see what other funding was available.

Mr. Clement was in favor of a phased approach and open communication with the residents. If the residents were open to bonding, then that's the route the City should pursue.

Mr. Thomas would not be in favor of bonding to build a park, because it wouldn't produce revenue for the City and would create more unnecessary debt. He suggested fundraising and pursuing grants before bonding.

Mr. Crosby also did not like the idea of bonding for the park. There was a small park near the Purple Turtle that was built using funds raised by the residents, private donations, grants, and sponsorships. He suggested pursuing all funding options.

C. Bailey asked the candidates what their top priority would be if they were chosen.

Mr. Crosby said that he intended to help the City live within its means and pay off debt.

Mr. Thomas said that he would prioritize parks and open space, as well as update the General Plan. It was important to have a solid plan in place to help the City achieve its vision.

Mr. Clement said that he would concentrate on the commercial district and increasing sales revenue. Second to that was working to resolve the issues with Canyon Road.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said that he would like to work with the surrounding cities to create a recreational district, and the golf course would become part of that district. He also would like to resolve the issues with Canyon Road.

Mr. Miller said the he would concentrate on the commercial zone, because there would be a lot more interest in their commercial area with the completion of the Murdock Connector. That road would make it easier for residents from Highland and Alpine to come to Cedar Hills.

Ms. Smith agreed with the answers that had already been given, particularly commercial development. She was concerned about how the schools would be impacted by increased commercial development.

Mr. Hansen would seek to improve the commercial district and develop the land along the Murdock Connector.

Mr. Navarro said he would also put commercial development as a priority, because sales tax revenue would help to generate more funds to pay off debt. Debt was one of the primary concerns of the residents.

Mr. Reams said he would prioritize commercial development, because that would help resolve some of the City's other issues. He believed that there were unique ways of creating a vibrant commercial tax base in the City.

Mr. Morgan would also focus on commercial development and Canyon Road.

Mr. Brisk said the focus of the City Council was to maintain the quality of life for the residents, and commercial development was key to reaching that objective. They should encourage development that would increase the sales tax base, which would relieve the residents' tax burden.

Mayor Rees thanked the candidates for their responses and asked the City Council to nominate three candidates as finalists.

C. Geddes also thanked the candidates for their interest and participation, and he said there were many other places to serve if they were not selected. He's top three choices were Mr. Clement, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Navarro.

C. Andersen favored Mr. Hansen, Ms. Smith, and Mr. Miller.

C. Bailey favored Mr. Miller, Mr. Navarro, and Mr. Brisk.

C. Ellsworth favored Mr. Miller, Ms. Smith, and Mr. Hansen.

**MOTION: C. Geddes nominated Mr. Miller, Mr. Navarro, Mr. Hansen, and Ms. Smith as finalists.** Seconded by C. Andersen.

Yes - C. Andersen  
C. Bailey  
C. Ellsworth  
C. Geddes Motion passes.

Mayor Rees invited the City Council to ask the finalists more questions.

C. Bailey stated that the City had five precincts within the City and asked if they were in favor of or opposed to dividing the Council spots into precincts.

Ms. Smith said that was an interesting concept. There were a lot of interested citizens in the City, and they had many talents to bring to the table; however, it might be difficult to get someone from each precinct to run for office.

Mr. Miller felt that Cedar Hills was not large enough to separate the Council into precincts. It was not ideal to have the majority of the Council from the same area, but there may be precincts with no candidates. They may be “scraping the barrel” to get anyone to run, which does not provide the best options for voting.

Mr. Hansen felt that there would be an uneven turnout if they separated into precincts. They should allow all good candidates to run who were willing to do so.

Mr. Navarro said that ideally, it would be nice to have that kind of representation, but it wasn’t realistic for Cedar Hills at this time.

C. Ellsworth said that many residents don’t feel that the City Council hears their voice and he asked the candidates how they would help to improve that image.

Mr. Navarro said the City Council needed to understand the needs of the different areas of the community and find the best way to reach out to them. Councilmembers also needed to participate in the community and be an example to the residents.

Mr. Hansen said he would make himself available, and even open himself up to social media. He would also find ways to meet with people outside of meetings.

Mr. Miller said residents appreciate when elected officials make themselves available, and that was easy with modern technology. He suggested consistent resident surveys, community open houses, and other events.

Ms. Smith agreed with the comments that had been made and said that they should try using more than one approach. Regarding resident surveys, Ms. Smith said the residents need to know the results of those surveys and feel that the City was responding to them. She also suggested live streaming the City meetings.

C. Andersen asked the candidates what the role of City government should be, and if they thought Cedar Hills over-stepped or under-stepped its bounds.

Ms. Smith recognized that there was a difference between federal, state, and local government. Local government was responsible for services and quality of life, and it was more tangible than other government entities.

Mr. Miller said the City was the closest government to the people, and people didn't want to live in a place stripped down to bare necessities. The local government should be fun, safe, and fiscally responsible. He felt that Cedar Hills had struck a good balance.

Mr. Hansen said all politics were local, and it didn't get much more local than the City Council. The City regulated parks, zoning, planning, and public safety. Mr. Hansen did not feel like Cedar Hills overstepped its bounds at all.

Mr. Navarro agreed that local government was the closest level to the people. He felt that the City should motivate people to initiate community programs, which meant that the City facilities needed to be available for the residents to use.

C. Bailey asked what committees the candidates had served on.

Mr. Navarro had served on an HOA board for two-and-a-half years; for the past year he had been serving as the board's president. He hoped to be part of more committees and boards in the future.

Mr. Hansen had served on the Citizens Advisory General Plan Committee and the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Miller had served on the Citizens Advisory General Plan Committee, the Planning Commission, the Utah County Board of Adjustments, and was Precinct Chair for the Republican Party in his area.

Ms. Smith was currently serving as a county delegate.

Mayor Rees closed the question period and asked the Council to discuss the finalists.

C. Andersen commented that all the candidates were qualified, and she was quite impressed.

C. Bailey said it would be a difficult decision because they were all excellent choices. He urged the candidates to stay involved in the community and serve in other capacities.

**MOTION - C. Geddes—To appoint Brian Miller as a City Councilmember.** Seconded by C. Andersen.

Yes - C. Andersen  
C. Bailey  
C. Ellsworth  
C. Geddes Motion passes.

7. Appointment and Swearing in of City Councilmember  
City Recorder, Colleen Mulvey, conducted the oath of office and Mr. Miller was sworn in as a Member of the Cedar Hills City Council.

*The City Council took a short recess at 8:20 p.m. They reconvened at 8:30 p.m.*

8. Review/Action on Appointment of Mayor Pro Tempore  
Mr. Goodwin explained that the position of Mayor Pro Tempore was a rotating position, and this year the duty fell on Councilmember Ben Bailey.

**MOTION: C. Andersen—To elect Councilmember Ben Bailey as Mayor Pro Tempore, who shall have all the powers and duties of the mayor during her absence, disability of refusal to act according to State and City Codes.** Seconded by C. Ellsworth.

Yes - C. Andersen  
C. Ellsworth  
C. Geddes  
C. Miller  
Abstain - C. Bailey Motion passes.

9. Review/Action on a Resolution making Assignments to Members of the City Council, Staff and Residents to Certain Boards, Committees and Entities  
Mr. Goodwin said a list of the proposed appointments had been sent to the Councilmembers for review and asked if there were any questions or concerns. He noted that the Council representative for the Beautification Committee and the Recreations, Parks and Trails Committee would be C. Miller.

Regarding the Finance Committee, Mr. Goodwin explained that in the past they had assigned two City Councilmembers to the Committee, but last year they had left the positions open for any Councilmembers to attend. There were some meetings where there were no City Council representatives present. This year, they would be appointing one person as a representative and the other position would rotate among the Councilmembers. C. Ellsworth would be appointed to this position.

Mayor Rees noted that the City would be able to have an alternate on the Lone Peak Public Safety District, and a new assignment to the Legislative Policy Committee.

**MOTION: C. Bailey—To approve Resolution No. 01-02-2018A, a resolution assigning members of the City Council, Staff and Residents of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, to certain Boards, Committees, and Entities.** Seconded by C. Geddes. Vote taken by roll call.

Yes - C. Andersen  
C. Bailey  
C. Ellsworth  
C. Geddes  
C. Miller Motion passes.

10. Discussion on Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 5, Section 38, Relating to Ground Mounted Renewable Energy Systems

Mr. Goodwin explained that this was an item that the Planning Commission had discussed for several months. Some time ago, the City received an application for ground-mounted solar panels that were quite large. Unfortunately, the City did not have any code language in place for ground-mounted solar, so staff treated the panels like an accessory structure. At that point, the City decided to draft and adopt an ordinance addressing these panels to mitigate impact to neighboring residential units. The proposed language only allowed ground-mounted solar panels in two residential zones and limited the height to a maximum of 15 feet. There was also a formula included to determine setback requirements.

C. Andersen was not in favor of allowing ground-mounted solar panels at all. They were visually offensive and went against the General Plan. She also didn't think that there was a setback appropriate to make the panels more palatable to the neighbors. C. Andersen appreciated the Planning Commission's efforts in creating the proposed language, but she still didn't like ground-mounted solar.

Mr. Goodwin noted that the Planning Commission was not unanimous in their recommendation of the proposal. There were some that did not want to allow ground-mounted solar at all.

C. Ellsworth asked how many requests staff had received for ground-mounted solar since the first application. Mr. Goodwin said that they hadn't received any, but they wanted to have the language in place in case a proposal came forward.

C. Bailey said that there wasn't really a big demand for ground-mounted solar because most residences could accommodate rooftop solar. He agreed with C. Andersen's comments.

C. Miller said that he was one of the Planning Commissioners that was not in favor of the proposal. The issue the Planning Commission faced was trying to balance between personal property rights and protecting the rights of other residents. He was in favor of renewable energy sources, but agreed this option was unsightly.

C. Geddes felt that it was "politically correct" to have solar renewable energy out there, but he had yet to see an issue where it was necessary. Rocky Mountain Power wasn't buying back everything that the solar panels were producing at this point. He felt that ground-mounted solar should be banned.

Mr. Goodwin pointed out that the City owned ground-mounted solar panels, including some at the water tanks. He felt that the City should have language in place to allow ground-mounted solar with restrictions rather than banning them outright.

There was a brief discussion regarding allowing them as a conditional use. Mr. Goodwin explained that a conditional use was essentially a permitted use as long as the applicant met the requirements in the code. The proposed language limited the panels to the R1-20 and R1-15,000 zones because the Planning Commission felt it was inappropriate for smaller lots to have them.

Mayor Rees invited Planning Commission Chair David Driggs to expound on their decision.

David Driggs said that they tried to find a balance between the rights of the property owners. They had attempted to mitigate problems by allowing them in certain zones and establishing large setback requirements. Two Planning Commissioners voted against the recommendation at their last meeting for this issue.

Jeff Maag, Public Works Director, commented that some ground-mounted solar was small, like fountain or landscaping lighting. He suggested that they include language regarding size classifications.

Kelly Smith said her neighbor had ground-mounted solar panels and was the person who started this process. She asked that if the panels were banned and her neighbor decided to move the panels away from her property line, would he be discouraged from doing so. Staff was confident that they would be able to work with the owner in the situation Ms. Smith described.

Mayor Rees summarized the discussion and requested that staff create language specifying ground-mounted solar to power a home.

11. Discussion on Amendments to the City Code Title 10, Chapter 5, Section 27:Landscaping, Relating to Artificial Turf

Mr. Goodwin presented the next item, which had also been discussed in depth by the Planning Commission. In an effort to motivate residents to be more water conscious, the City Council requested that staff and the Planning Commission work on an ordinance that would allow artificial turf as landscaping in front yards. Mr. Goodwin explained that the code was broken up into three separate sections: requirements on the general appearance, installation, and maintenance.

Mayor Rees asked for the justification for not allowing artificial turf in the SC-1 Zone. Mr. Goodwin said it was just about general appearance. Mr. Geddes commented that a narrow strip in a commercial center would be the perfect place for artificial turf. However, most owners chose to xeriscape those areas, so it probably didn't matter too much.

Mr. Goodwin said that the City should consider installing turf in their own park strips and set an example to the citizens with water conservation.

Mayor Rees said she had received a comment from a resident with concerns about the blades facing different directions and making the yard look like patchwork. She suggested that the language address this potential issue.

C. Miller noted that the language required the turf to remain in “like new conditions”. Turf would deteriorate slowly, and it may not be something the owner noticed until it had faded quite a bit. The City would then be required to issue a citation.

C. Andersen asked if the property owner would have to obtain a permit for artificial turf so the City knew where all of the turf was located throughout the City. Mr. Goodwin said that they could be required to get a permit showing all the details required in the ordinance, including a landscape plan. C. Geddes commented that the code didn’t specify a landscape plan. Mr. Goodwin said that this was new territory for staff, so there were matters they probably still needed to address.

Mayor Rees suggested that they reach out to Ogden City and ask about their permit process for artificial turf.

12. Review/Action on Amendments to the City Code Title 7, Chapter 2C, Section 2, Relating to Sewer Systems

Mr. Goodwin explained that the proposed amendments would change the City Code to match State Code.

**MOTION: C. Andersen—To approve Ordinance No. 01-02-2018A, an ordinance amending Title 7, Chapter 2C, Section 2 of the City Code of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, amending the requirements related to sewer systems.** Seconded by C. Geddes. Vote taken by roll call.

Yes - C. Andersen  
C. Bailey  
C. Ellsworth  
C. Geddes  
C. Miller

Motion passes.

13. Review/Action on a Resolution in Support of the Murdock Connector Road

Mr. Goodwin stated that the City Council had adopted a similar resolution the previous January, and this was before them now because they believed that the Murdock Connector Road was imperative to future development in Cedar Hills. Mr. Goodwin noted that he had received many calls from business owners in the City asking when the Murdock Connector would be done. Personally, Mr. Goodwin felt that it would be an amenity to the City and a benefit to the residents. The last hurdle of this process was the peoples’ vision of what the road would be. Cedar Hills had always seen this as a larger road, while some of the Highland residents wanted it to be a neighborhood road. However, the County would be the entity that made the ultimate decision.

Mayor Rees added that the proposed resolution went before Mayor Mann of Highland, and would also go before American Fork and Alpine. Mr. Goodwin noted that he had added a few “WHEREAS” clauses to the document which were important to Cedar Hills specifically.

Mayor Rees explained that Representative Kennedy and Senator Hemmert had asked for resolutions from the cities to show their support for the project. They would present those resolutions to the State.

C. Geddes said he whole-heartedly supported the resolution. Although his home would be greatly affected by the traffic generated by the road, he still felt that it was necessary to the growth of Cedar Hills.

C. Bailey asked if the road would be two or three lanes. Mayor Rees said that the State's Developmental Center was pushing for a two-lane road because they were concerned about the road's proximity to the center. She clarified that they wouldn't have pedestrians going to and from the site, but they worried about residents that may accidentally wander into the road. However, the center would also be in close proximity to North County Boulevard, which was a much busier road.

C. Bailey believed that they should encourage the County to make the road as large as possible. He imagined that a smaller road would get bogged down because residents and commuters were sure to use it.

Mr. Goodwin said no matter which way the County decided to go, staff had asked that Cedar Hills be included in the discussions because they believed the road would impact Cedar Hills residents more than Highland residents.

**MOTION: C. Geddes—To approve Resolution No. 01-02-2018B, a resolution of the City Code of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, in support of the Utah State Developmental Center and the Murdock Connector Road.** Seconded by C. Bailey. Vote taken by roll call.

Yes	-	C. Andersen	
		C. Bailey	
		C. Ellsworth	
		C. Geddes	
		C. Miller	Motion passes.

14. Discussion on the Canyon Road Sewer Proposal

Mr. Goodwin explained that that many of the homes in the area of Canyon Road were on septic tanks, but a number of them had failed. The City had petitioned the County to allow the installation of a sewer line in Canyon Road to service these homes. It would be a significant amount of money to install and it would make 16 connections. The current estimate from the County was roughly \$215,000. On Friday, staff received an Interlocal Agreement from the County saying that the City would go out and bid for the project, and staff needed direction from the City Council on how they wanted to move forward.

Mr. Maag said that they had reduced the scope of the project by eliminating everything north of the Monson and Canyon Road intersection, which left approximately 1,700 lineal feet of new sewer to be put in. The area to the south would cost roughly \$50,000 and it would make six laterals. The north end would have 10 laterals, one of those being a Pleasant Grove lot. The property owner had already contacted Cedar Hills regarding a boundary adjustment. Mr. Maag said that one issue they were facing was the Jens Monson property, which had not been improved with sidewalk, curb and gutter.

C. Geddes asked if the proposed depth was to accommodate basements. He said that it would decrease costs to raise the sewer line up. Mr. Maag agreed and said that the homeowner would have the option of putting in an ejector pump if the sewer line did not reach below the basement. C. Geddes said it would be a lot cheaper to install the pump than to dig an 18-foot-deep manhole to the sewer line.

Mr. Goodwin commented that some of the septic systems hadn't failed yet. He asked if the City should wait until they failed to connect them, or should they just put the sewer line in and connect the homes immediately. Mr. Goodwin was of the opinion that they should make the connections if the City was going to expend that amount of money. Another option was to set up a Special Involvement District (SID) in which the neighborhood would pay for the installation.

C. Geddes said that an SID would be the fairest way to do it.

Mayor Rees asked how many homes were coming to the City wanting to know about this possible sewer line. Mr. Goodwin said that there had been three inquiries. Staff's concern was that they would see more owners coming in as more septic systems failed.

Mayor Rees commented that it would make sense to install the sewer line as they worked on Canyon Road. She asked if a SID would still work if only three of the 16 homeowners were interested. Mr. Goodwin said the City could use a forceful hand in this case, or they could choose to pay for it.

Mayor Rees asked if staff was looking for direction on how to proceed with funding the project. Mr. Goodwin said that the purpose of the discussion item was more to get the City Council up to speed on the issue. However, a decision would have to be made at some point. The City would have 14 days to process the bidding if they chose to sign the Interlocal Agreement.

#### ADJOURNMENT

This meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m. on a motion by C. Bailey, seconded by C. Ellsworth and unanimously approved.

Approved by Council:  
March 6, 2018

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC  
City Recorder