

WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
6:30 pm

Minutes of the Woods Cross City Council Meeting held April 6, 2021 by ZOOM conference.

CONDUCTING:

Rick Earnshaw, Mayor

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rick Earnshaw, Mayor
Julie Checketts
Tamra Dayley

Wally Larrabee
Matt Terry
Ryan Westergard

STAFF PRESET:

Gary Uresk, City Administrator
Sims, Assistant City Administrator
Tim Stephens, Community Development Director
Sam Christiansen, Public Works Director

Annette Hanson, City Recorder
Jessica Chad Soffe, Police Chief

VISITORS:

Don Schrader
Aleah Dayley
Vjay Kornala

Robbie Johnson
Clayton Cherone
Marley Ferrin

Greg Seegmiller
Rachel Dart
Terry Findling

INVOCATION:

Rick Earnshaw

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Gary Uresk

The Mayor welcomed those attending remotely and invited all in attendance to participate in the meeting if they would like to do so.

CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE MINUTES

The Mayor called for the review of the minutes of the March 16, 2021 City Council meeting.

Following the review of the minutes by the City Council, Council Member Terry made a motion to approve the minutes as written with Council Member Westergard seconding the motion and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

RATIFICATION OF CASH DISBURSEMENTS

The Mayor gave the floor to the City Recorder who went over the cash disbursements with the Council for the time period of March 13, 2021-March 31, 2021. Following the review of the cash disbursements by the City Council, Council Member Westergard made a motion to approve the cash disbursements as presented. Council Member Larrabee seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

OPEN SESSION (BRIEF ITEMS)

The Mayor then opened the meeting to anyone who would like to address the City Council.

Susan Phillips addressed the Council and said she had emailed a letter to the City Council members expressing her concerns with the new proposed parking lot a Mills Park. She said she was concerned about a proposed 20 stall parking lot going in behind her house at the corner of 1200 West and 1900 South and the possibility of another streetlight shining in her backyard as she has a streetlight that shines in her front yard and her side yard.

OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 2

The Public Works Director addressed the matter and said since he had recently spoken with her. He had taken her concerns back to the Public Works Department for further review. The intended light will be one designed for parking areas and is not as bright as a streetlight. As the current parking lots are in failure and need to be replaced, adding the additional parking will help alleviate parking congestion at Mills Park during large sports events. His department had explored several options and found the south parking lot was the best option for cost as well as for design. He said they are now planning to shift the parking lot a little further north. The Public Works Director shared that this is a very preliminary plan and that he is happy to look at other options.

Council Member Dayley said she would like to see other options explored for the additional parking lot. Council Member Checketts asked if the city had looked into purchasing any of the property that is for sale northwest of Mills park and if any of that property could be purchased using RAP Tax funds to possibly add a parking lot. The City Administrator said he had looked at purchasing that property once before, but he could investigate purchasing the property again. The City Administrator and Public Works Director said they would work on the other options and look into the property that is for sale. The Public Works Director said he would keep the Council and Ms. Phillips updated on options as they move forward.

The Mayor asked if the Public Works Director had received the email regarding the lights on the basketball court at Mills Park. The Public Works Director said he did get the email and his staff had reset the timer on the lights so they would turn off no later than 11:00 P.M.

Chief Soffe said he had received a request from Robbie Johnson, a city resident, to see if the 2-way stop near the Odyssey Elementary School could be turned into a 4-way stop at 1950 W 1950 S. Council Member Checketts said she had a few residents reach out to her about intersections in Shamrock and Valentine Estates they felt like needed to be addressed. Council Member Checketts said she had a few residents reach out to her about intersections in Shamrock and Valentine Estates which they felt need to be addressed.

Ms. Johnson addressed the Council and said that intersection is a problematic now, but when the rest of the new homes that will be built in the area, the congestion at the intersection will become even a bigger issue. She said there are drivers who travel fast in the area and there are very large trucks associated with the construction of new homes coming into her neighborhood. She said she is concerned about the children being safe.

Mr. Greg Seegmiller, the city engineer, addressed the Council and said JUB Engineering had conducted a traffic study at this intersection about a year a half ago. He said it could be studied again to ascertain the traffic counts. Council Member Checketts said she would like to see a 4-way stop put in at this intersection. Council Member Dayley agreed that a 4-way stop should be installed but she is concerned about the cost of an additional traffic study.

Mr. Seegmiller noted that the reason traffic studies are conducted is to make sure stop signs are put in under the guidelines that are required from AASHTO (American Association of State of Highway Transportation) so if there is an accident at an intersection, the city can show that all guidelines have been followed in putting in the signs. He said there is a lot of science that goes into why the signs go in where they do, and the city staff has tried to be judicious in the past in putting in the signs. He said there are several warrants that must be met for adding additional stop signs at an

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 3**

intersection. Mr. Seegmiller said a study could yield important information such as what direction the cars are going, how the traffic affects the safe route to the school, and what changes could help increase safety in this area.

Council Member Terry said he thought extra consideration need be taken regarding this intersection because it is in the vicinity of the school. For this reason, he said he is also in favor of putting in a 4-way stop. He would like to see if there is a way to consider additional traffic that will come as the new homes are built near this intersection.

The Mayor said he would like to see the City Engineer do a traffic count to protect the city and the warrants the City Engineer spoke about are met and to make sure there is good traffic flow as well. He said he wants to make sure all the bases are covered so there are no issues in the future. The Mayor asked Mr. Seegmiller how long that would take, and Mr. Seegmiller said it would not take too much time or too much money to get these counts taken. Council Member Terry said to make sure the counts are taken during school hours, so there is an accurate count. Mr. Seegmiller said he would move forward with getting that done.

YOUTH CITY COUNCIL REPORT

The Mayor gave the floor to Youth Mayor Rachel Dart who reported on the activities of the Youth City Council. She said the Youth City Council would be sponsoring an Appreciation Dinner on April 17th at 6:00 P.M. at the city shops. She said that Hungry Hawaiian would be catering the event and she invited the City Council to attend. She reported that the Easter Parade was very successful and the children in the city enjoyed seeing the Easter Bunny.

PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO PERMIT SIX-FOOT FENCING WITHIN THE FRONT YARD SETBACK (CODE REFERENCE 12-21-109) WITHIN THE SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS

The Mayor gave the floor to the Community Development Director who explained:

“Mr. Cherone has proposed a text amendment to our fencing regulations. I spent the last several months discussing fencing with Mr. Cherone and his situation. Mr. Cherone has a home on a corner lot on 1850 South. The front door of the home faces 800 West. He desires to fence this area in with a six-foot fence. However, it was explained to him that fences in the front yard can only be erected to four feet (non-obscuring) or three feet (sight obscuring). Eventually, he made a case that the front door of his house faces 1850 South. The portion of the front yard that faces 800 West would then be considered a side yard and could have a six-foot fence constructed. However, Mr. Cherone has insisted that the six-foot fence should extend all the way to the street corner enclosing part of the new designated front yard along 1850 South. Again, I explained to him that area is now part of the front yard along 1850 South and would need to meet the 3 or 4 foot fence regulation. He has responded by filing a zoning text amendment request which you have been given a copy of along with his proposed fencing language which he can review with you.

“Fencing regulations, particularly in the front yard, usually have two purposes: one is aesthetics, and the other is safety and clear vision. I have asked our City Engineer of JUB Engineering to review this text amendment with one of their traffic and transportation engineers. Given to the Council is the JUB memo which evaluates this request and finds it to be contrary to public safety.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 4**

The Planning Commission has recommended that the proposed text amendment be denied for safety and aesthetic reasons.”

Following the review by Mr. Stephens Council Member Larrabee asked why the property owner wants to put up a six foot-fence on his property. Mr. Stephens said he might have a dog he wants to keep in and also had concerns about foot traffic that cuts that corner on his property.

The Mayor then opened the public hearing.

Ms. Aleaha Delaney addressed the City Council and said she is sensitive to Mr. Cherone’s reasons in wanting a six-foot fence, but she felt this change would affect the whole city and she would not like to see six-foot fences in front yards in her neighborhood or around the community.

There were no further public comments, and the Mayor closed the public hearing.

Mr. Stephens noted there were several representatives from JUB engineering that were present at tonight’s meeting to answer any questions the Council might have for them.

Mr. Seegmiller addressed the City Council and introduced the traffic engineer Vjay Kornala, with JUB to the Council. Mr. Seegmiller said there are two issues with item, one is the change to the ordinance, and one is for the change for this individual and his individual residence. Mr. Seegmiller said they went over the AASHTO recommendations as far as being able to see oncoming traffic on a corner. He said most residential streets, when using the math show that it is 30 feet X 30 feet to see oncoming traffic at the corner. He said there are other specific regulations with trees as well, but he said JUB engineering would recommend leaving the ordinance as it is written because it conforms to the MUTCD and the AASHTO regulations. He said corners that have a four-foot fence allows site for oncoming cars and still keep a dog inside the yard.

Council Member Checketts asked if there is a conditional use for this on a case by case basis. The Mayor said the ordinance would not permit this as it would set a precedent and open up the city to making allowances for endless changes. Mr. Stephens agreed.

Council Member Terry said the city could be liable if there was a fence put up on a corner and weeds grew on the fence and there were to be an accident because of it. He said he was strongly against making any changes.

Council Member Westergard said he had looked at all the documents Mr. Cherone had sent to the City Council and he said he understands why Mr. Cherone is making this request because of the way his house is situated, but he has a hard time wanting to make any changes to the ordinance because of the reasons that have been stated concerning aesthetics and safety. He said he would be opposed to making changes.

Council Member Checketts asked if there could be a portion of the property fenced at six-feet and it was noted that yes there could be a portion of fencing that is six-feet and then it could reduce to a four-foot fence as it approaches the corner of the property.

Council Member Larrabee and Dayley expressed that the change should not be granted because it creates a safety concern.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 5**

Mr. Clayton Cherone addressed the Council and asked to show a couple of examples of a six-foot fence that had been put in in other areas and other communities. Mr. Cherone asked about why retaining walls had been allowed in some instances. Mr. Cherone showed a few examples of six-foot fences and some retaining walls. Mr. Cherone said his point is that some resident had been allowed to do so. Mr. Cherone showed another property in Bountiful that has a retaining wall around its corner. He said there are current examples throughout the state of Utah of site obscuring walls and fences and his would be non-site obscuring.

Mr. Cherone said there is much more that goes into this proposal and there are certain circumstances that a six-foot fence could be allowed and done safely. He said he thought there should be some sort of compromise that could be reached for this situation.

The Mayor said he appreciated Mr. Cherone's comments and examples. He also said that Mr. Cherone's images had confirmed the fact that a higher walled fence, especially at a corner, does not allow vehicle drivers to a secure line of vision. He said in some of the situations shown the older farmhouses in Woods Cross were built before other streets were put into the area requiring a need to take traffic into consideration. The Mayor said in his mind this is a safety issue.

Mr. Cherone said that the proposed change would allow owners of older homes to fully use their lots. He said he felt like there could at least be some sort of compromise because there are other people throughout the state that have this type of fencing and he felt they have done it safely.

Council Member Checketts asked if there was any consideration for older homes in our ordinance and Mr. Stephens said he did not know of any. He said he was not sure what could be drafted to allow older homes to have exceptions opposed to newer homes.

Mr. Cherone asked if this matter could go to the Board of Adjustments. Mr. Stephens said there is a Hearing Officer that could hear this matter. He noted that the parameters that the Hearing Officer must look at to grant a variance are prescribed in state law and are rather narrow. He said anyone has the right to make an appeal, but they would have to present evidence that would meet the required criteria for the Hearing Officer to grant a variance.

Mr. Cherone asked the City Engineer about the retaining walls and fencing that he had shown examples of and what their opinion was in respect to the corner lot and fencing. Mr. Seegmiller said with a tall wall on a corner lot as shown in the example, it would be a very dangerous situation. He said he could not speak to the situation specifically because it was in Bountiful and he did not know the history. He noted that the other example that Mr. Cherone had shown to the Council was an older home and some of those fences would be grandfathered. Any new fence put in would need to be a four-foot fence because of the criteria used for safety.

The City Administrator said there is concern about people not stopping at a stop sign and if there is a wall or tall fence you will not see people that may inadvertently run a stop sign.

Council Member Westergard said that while the outcome of the discussion may not be the solution Mr. Cherone was hoping for, the Council decision must be for what is best for city as a whole and they do not want to set a precedence to allow six-foot fencing in front yards throughout the city.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 6**

CONSIDERATION TO AMEND SECTION 12-21-19 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO ALLOW SIX-FOOT FENCING IN THE FRONT YARD SETBACK

Following the above discussion, Council Member Larrabee made a motion to deny the petition to amend section 12-21-19 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow six-foot fencing in the front yard setback. Council Member Westergard seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion to deny through a roll call vote.

PUBLIC HEARING: REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1486 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD FROM R-1-8 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO I-1-LIGHT INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS PARK

The Community Development Director continued with the floor and explained the following:

“This applicant owns several acres adjacent to the former Woods Cross City Public Works Shop on 1500 South and Redwood Road. The body of his property lies adjacent and directly west of the former Woods Cross City Shops. However, there are two parcels adjacent to the north side of the shops that are used to access this property from Redwood Road. The westerly strip is also owned by Mr. Glines and is part of the rezone request. The easterly strip that connects directly to Redwood Road is owned by an adjacent owner on which Mr. Glines has a right-of-way to access his property from Redwood Road.

“Prior to the development of the Mountain View Estates Subdivision, the two properties were landlocked and only accessible by the right-of-way connecting them to Redwood Road. With the development of Mountain View Estates, 1500 South was extended from Redwood Road westward and adjacent to the subject property. However, the property owner has never utilized 1500 South to access the property and continues to use the granted right-of-way to access these parcels from Redwood Road. Presently, there is a small storage building or shop building on the property with some associated vehicles or trailers stored on the property which are assumed to be for the personal use of the Glines family.

“The subject property is presently zoned R-1-8 Single Family Residential matching the adjoining Mount View Subdivision zoning. The city property adjacent and east of the subject property was recently rezoned to CRT Commercial/Residential Transition. Presently, the city has leased the former public works shops to a business that performs RV trailer repairs and services. The city has chosen to retain this property for possible future city use. Furthermore, our present general plan identifies Mr. Glines’ property as being utilized a multi-family residential zone to match the adjacent townhome development within the Mountain View Subdivision. In fact, private roadways within the existing townhome development of Mountain View Estates are stubbed to the Glines property.

“Mr. Glines has requested that the subject property be rezoned to I-1 Light Industrial/Business Park. He does point out that there is a natural gas pipeline that runs diagonally through the property in addition to his desire to place a business use on the property that would be similar to the trailer repair business on the city’s adjacent property.

“The tool that the Planning Commission and City Councils use to guide them with zoning and rezoning issues is the community’s general plan. It is noted above that our general plan designates

OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 7

the subject property for future multi-family residential zoning and development. Furthermore, the city's property and other properties to the east, lying along Redwood Road, are designated in the general plan as Commercial/Residential Transition-CRT Zone. Preserving a small patch of industrial zoning for a use that is dissimilar to the existing residential and dissimilar to the zoning of the adjoining properties to the west may not make sense. Based on the general plan designation of future multi-family residential use of this property, the Planning Commission had recommended to the City Council that the request to rezone from R-1-8 Single Family Residential to I-1 Light Industrial/Business Park be denied."

Following the information given by the Community Development Director, the Mayor opened the public hearing.

Ms. Aleaha Delany, a neighbor of the subject property, addressed the Council. She said she would like the zoning to remain the unchanged until it is determined what will happen with the city owned property in the future. She said if the proposal was approved, then the nearby property was later turned into a multi-family or single-family residential property would leave one business in the middle of all the residential area, which would take away from the aesthetics the neighborhood is trying to maintain. She said she is hoping the City Council will follow the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the request for the rezoning of this property.

Mr. Terry Findling, who lives directly across the street from the property that is in question then addressed the City Council. He said he has no problem presently with the RV business located on the city property, but he said there is no idea what will be located on that property in the future. He said he has concerns regarding aesthetics and home values. He expressed that at putting a business in the middle of the area without understanding the full future plan could create a problem. He said that he and his wife both agreed with the denial of the rezone the Planning Commission.

There were no further comments from the public and the Mayor closed the public hearing.

The Mayor then called for discussion from the City Council.

Council Member Terry said the Planning Commission and City Council had just finished working on rezoning in the city and said the Planning Commission was quite firm that they do not recommend make any zoning changes in this area.

Council Member Checketts said she had listened in on the Planning Commission meeting regarding this matter and she said her concerns and questions had been answered listening in on that discussion.

Council Member Larrabee said he felt it was nice to be able to rely on the General Plan for the guidance in settling these kinds of matters. He said he agreed with the recommendation of the Planning Commission to deny the rezone in this area.

Mr. Stephens said he had one more thing to add. He said he was looking at the attendees at tonight's meeting and he did not see Mr. Glines in attendance. Mr. Stephens said he emailed a reminder of the meeting and the Zoom link to Mr. Glines, but he was not in attendance at this meeting. It was noted that Mr. Glines was in attendance at the Planning Commission meeting and did hear their recommendation for denial of the rezone at that time.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 8**

CONSIDERATION TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1486 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD FROM R-1-8 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO I-1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS PARK

There was no further discussion. Council Member Dayley made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission to deny the rezone of property located at 1486 South Redwood Road from R-1-8 Single Family Residential to I-1 Light Industrial/Business Park. Council Member Terry seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

CONSIDERATION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 2021-730, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF WOODS CROSS, UTAH, APPOINTING A BOARD OF EQUALIZATION FOR THE 1960 SOUTH STREET ASSESSMENT AREA; SETTING THE DATES FOR THE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION TO HEAR AND CONSIDER OBJECTIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO ANY PROPOSED ASSESSMENTS; AUTHORIZING THE CITY RECORDER TO PUBLISH AND MAIL A NOTICE OF ASSESSMENT AND BOARD OF EQUALIZATION HEARINGS; AND RELATED MATTERS

The Mayor gave the floor to the City Administrator who noted the following for the City Council:

“Given to the Council is the proposed resolution. As part of this resolution, 3 members of the City Council need to be appointed to the Board. The Council also needs to set the hearing dates which must be at least 1 hour for 3 consecutive days between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 9:00 P.M. Because of advertising timing requirements, the earliest we can hold the hearings will be May 12, 13 and 14, however, since this limits the days of the week, we can look at the week of May 17-21 as well. The members of the Council appointed to the Board will need to commit to meeting for the 3 days for 1 hour. I am recommending the hearings be held in person at the Public Works Facility.”

The Mayor said he agreed with what the City Administrator was recommending for the Board of Equalization. The Mayor said he had asked Council Members Westergard, Checketts and Dayley to serve on this Board. He said he would like to propose their names to be appointed to this Board.

It was discussed that the best nights to hold the meetings would be on May 17, 18 and 19 from 5:30-6:30 P.M. in person at the public works building. The Board said they would also only like to include an in person audience as well.

Following the discussion, Council Member Westergard made a motion to adopt resolution 2021-730, a resolution of the City Council of Woods Cross, Utah, Appointing a Board of Equalization for the 1960 South Street Assessment Area; Setting the Dates for the Board of Equalization to hear and consider objections and corrections to any proposed assessments; authorizing the City Recorder to publish and mail a Notice of Assessment and Board of Equalization Hearings; and related matters. Council Member Dayley seconded the motion, and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 9**

CONSIDERATION TO ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 2021-731 AMENDING THE CONSOLIDATED FEE SCHEDULE BY ADDING A NEW GARBAGE CAN DELIVERY FEE ASSESSED AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT ISSUANCE AND INCREASING THE GREEN CAN MONTHLY COLLECTION FEE FROM \$6.00 TO \$6.50

The City Administrator continued with the floor and noted the following for the City Council:

“Given to the Council is the Consolidated Fee Schedule with the proposed changes.

“During the last meeting I addressed the decrease in cash reserves in the Garbage Fund. The main reason for the decrease in cash is we have had to purchase a considerable number of garbage cans this year. We will spend about \$30,000 for cans this year where normally we spend about \$10,000. Part of the reason for this increase is due to the homes being built in Shamrock and the new cans delivered when the homes are completed. We are also experiencing an increase in cans that need to be replaced. Our older cans that were purchased when the City implemented automated garbage collection around 30 years ago are approaching the end of their life. They were expected to last around 20 years, so they have exceeded their life expectancy. Also, we are finding the new cans are not built as rugged as the older generation of cans, so we are having to replace them more frequently than the older cans. We have checked with our neighboring cities to see how our can replacement is in relationship with them and we found that we are all in the same range.

“The first change in the Consolidated Fee Schedule assesses a \$65.00 charge at building permit issuance to cover the cost of delivering a new can to the home when it is completed. This will take some pressure off of the need to finance the upfront cost of the cans required for new homes.

“In assessing the impact of the \$.50 decrease in our collection costs from Waste Management, this decrease will save us approximately \$18,000 annually. This coupled with paying for the new cans for newly constructed homes should cover the cost of can replacement. It will not be necessary to increase the black can garbage rate at this time.

“While making the detailed analysis of the Garbage Fund I found we are paying Waste Management \$4.37 to collect and Wasatch Integrated a \$2.00 tipping fee for our green waste cans. We are paying a total of \$6.37 for each green waste can but only collecting \$6.00. We need to increase the green waste fee to cover our costs. The second change in the Consolidated Fee Schedule increases the green waste can charge from \$6.00 to \$6.50. This fee has fallen behind as we haven’t updated it to reflect cost-of-living adjustments in the Waste Management contract.”

Following the review by the City Administrator, Council Member Checketts asked why the city is paying a \$2.00 tipping fee to Wasatch Integrated Waste Management when the green waste is helping to keep garbage collection cleaner and they are able to recycle more. She said she felt like the city is being penalized and is helping to cover costs for the new recycling plant. The City Administrator said that was the fee was set when the green cans were instituted some years ago. He also said there is a cost to mulch the green waste in order to be able to resell it and he did not know if the tipping fee were to help cover that cost. He said he would be happy to talk to the director to see if anything could be done to reduce the fee for the green can.

Council Member Larrabee asked if the fee was being charged by Waste Management or Wasatch Integrated Waste. The City Administrator said it was charged by Wasatch Integrated Waste

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 10**

Management as a monthly charge on the city's bill. He said they charge \$7.00 on a black can and \$2.00 on the green can. Council Member Larrabee also asked about fees from November to March when the residents use the green can as a black can. The City Administrator said he would have to look into that matter further. The Mayor said he thought the green can stayed at a \$2.00 fee year round. The Mayor said he was on the board at Wasatch Integrated when the green can program was instituted, and he recalled the \$2.00 fee was just for the handling of the green waste when it got to the waste facility.

Council Member Larrabee noted there are two locations that the green cans are being dumped, depending on the time of year. When the can is being used as a black garbage can it goes to one and when it is being used for green waste it goes to the other. He then asked if a green can was mandatory for city residents to use and it was noted that the green can is an optional choice. He also asked if a resident determines they no longer needed the green can if they could opt out of that choice. The City Administrator said yes, they could opt out of having a green can if they chose to do so at a later time.

Council Member Terry said he would like to see something structured so people would be encouraged to use the green waste can more. He said after going to see the new recycling facility at the waste district and how effective it could be without having all of the grass clippings mixed in with the waste that is being sorted, it would be utilized better.

The City Administrator said he could have some discussion on that matter with the Waste District. Council Member Larrabee said he could also speak with Nathan at the Wasatch Integrated Waste Management about what had been discussed at tonight's meeting regarding the green waste can as he meets with Nathan on a monthly basis as Council Member Larrabee serves as the secretary on the Board of Directors at Waste Management. The Council said they would like to have Council Member Larrabee do so and have him report back to the Council on what he finds out.

Council Member Terry then made a motion to adopt resolution 2021-731 amending the consolidated fee schedule by adding a new garbage can delivery fee assessed at the time of building permit issuance but hold off on increasing the fee of the green can at this time pending further discussion regarding different options. Council Member Checketts seconded the motion, and all voted in favor through a roll call vote.

PUBLIC WORKS REPORT

The Mayor gave the floor to the Public Works Director who noted the following for the City Council:

WATER/STORM

After Hours Callouts-7
Blue Stakes Tickets-97
Storm Water Site Inspections-14
GIS points
Water Leaks repaired April-4
 3 Meter Setters
 1 Lateral

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 11**

STREETS

- March Snowplow Mobilizations-0
- Concrete replacement-trip hazards, water leak repairs
- Asphalt Patches-6
- Prep shop for Cleanup
- Potholes

PARKS

- Soft Fall in Playgrounds
- 2 Seasonal Employees started
- Hogan Park playground repair
 - Climber replaced
 - Volcano parts ordered
- Wildcat Park
 - Water line installed
 - Concrete almost Complete
 - Prepping for Bowery and Irrigation
 - On track for May 15th substantial completion
 - Ribbon Cutting Ceremony

2200 S 1425 W

- Cars ignore pedestrians and cross traffic
- Does not meet warrants for a Stop Sign under MUTCD
- School bus stop just east of intersection
- Recommended Yield sign as trial for similar intersections

The Council and Public Works Director discussed options for addressing problem intersections such as installation of yield signs and possibly a public safety campaign to educate residents who use the intersection on safe practices.

WEBER BASIN 2021 WATER FORECAST

- Governor Cox Executive Order for Water Conservation
- Record breaking Hot and Dry Summer of 2020
- Lackluster Snowfall this winter. 75% of Normal
- Low Soil Moisture in Runoff areas

2021 WEBER BASIN WATER RESTRICTIONS

- Irrigation Season ends October 1st
- Irrigation Water Allotment Contracts and retail use reduced by 20%
- No Indoor use restrictions
- Additional restrictions may happen based on Spring/Summer rainfall and temperature
- Recommended that cities advertise Irrigation Water Conservation
- Woods Cross's Water System is not designed to handle residents switching to culinary to water their yards

The Council and the Public Works Director discussed possible ways to help conserve water as this summer due to the drought conditions the whole state is experiencing.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 12**

ADMINISTRATIVE PROJECTS

FY 22 Budget Planning
2020 Water Report Booklet
Davis County Pre-Disaster mitigation plan update
Windstorm Insurance Claim
Garbage Cans

Safety Training—Roadway Safety

Elements Implementation

GIS/IT integration started
Work Orders available in June/July
Online Portal for Building in September

SEPTEMBER 2020 WINDSTORM UPDATE:

Working with FEMA and Insurance for damages reimbursement
Tree planting organizing for Arbor Day
Trees Ordered
Vouchers/Verification

OPEN SESSION

Council Member Larrabee asked if there had been any discussion on having a Memorial Day Celebration this year. The Mayor said they have decided not to hold it since there is usually a large crowd and there is no way to social distance at the event. He said they are hoping to start holding community events in July or August.

Council Member Dayley said she would like someone to check on the RV Repair shop on Redwood Road. Staff said they would check into it.

It was mentioned there had been a death at In-Town suites. Chief Soffe confirmed there had been someone who had passed away at that location, but he did not know the cause of death at this time.

Council Member Terry said he had a streetlight that was out near his home, and the Public Works Director said he would take care of it.

SOUTH DAVIS SEWER DISTRICT REPORT

Council Member Westergard reported that the district is having to replace the compressor on the gas scrubber unit. He said they are currently upgrading several items at the plant. He said they are still working on the nutrient removal project and getting in line with the nutrient discharge concerns on the notice of violation.

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT

Council Member Terry reported on the Planning Commission meeting held April 13, 2021. Please see the minutes of that meeting for the details of that report.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 13**

MAYOR'S REPORT

The Mayor reported that Carol Haacke, who worked for the police department for 17 years, had passed away. He expressed appreciation to the police department for helping with the funeral.

The Mayor also reported he had received a letter from the County ending the State's mask mandate on April 10th, 2021. The County has decided to continue retain the mask requirement for all county buildings and offices, and masks will still be required to be worn in their facilities. He encouraged continued mask wearing by Woods Cross staff, noting that many businesses around are still requiring patrons to continue to wear masks. He said he does not want to see COVID cases go up again as in other states who have done away with their mask mandates and seeing their cases rise. He said he does not want to undo what has been done so far to keep COVID cases down.

The City Administrator said the staff had discussed the policy of masks and were planning to continue to require masks for employees and visitors to city offices.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

The Mayor gave the floor the City Administrator who reported the following to the City Council:

1. **UTOPIA Agreement.** "We will be meeting with UTOPIA in the next couple of weeks as well as other providers. I plan on reporting back our findings at the May 6th City Council Meeting.
2. **Redwood Road.** "Sam and I met with Rob Wight, UDOT Region 1 Director, and he agreed to look at facilitating striping on Redwood Road to help minimize the confusion motorist are having with the changing lanes. They will also look at changing the light timings to minimize traffic backups. We also discussed future plans for finishing the widening of Redwood Road. The widening of Redwood Road is further into the future (2030). However, with the change of truck traffic on Legacy Parkway, we may be able to move this up because we are seeing more movement of trucks from Redwood Road to Legacy. We will keep in touch with Rob on Redwood Road regarding the traffic on Redwood Road.
3. **Strategic Planning Goals.** "We have not received the finalized goals from Jeff. I plan to have this on the April 20th Agenda.
4. **Budget Schedule.** "Attached is the budget schedule for the adoption of the FY 2022 Budget. If you would like to make any changes, we can discuss them.
5. **City Hall Opening.** "We plan on starting a phased opening of City Hall after the April 10th COVID mask end date established by the Legislature. I will be meeting with my staff on April 8th to outline exactly how we plan on proceeding with the opening. I anticipate in either June or July depending on how the case count goes we should be fully opened.
6. **ULCT Spring Conference.** "Currently I have the Mayor, Wally, Julie, and Ryan scheduled for the Conference. If anyone else wants to attend let me know.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
WOODS CROSS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 6, 2021
PAGE 14**

7. **Action Item List.** The City Administrator reviewed and reported on items previously identified for action.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the City Council, Council Member Dayley made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 P.M. with Council Member Westergard seconding the motion and all voted in favor of the motion through a roll call vote.

Rick Earnshaw, Mayor

Annette Hanson, City Recorder