

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF THE  
CITY OF CEDAR HILLS  
Tuesday, March 7, 2023 – 6:00 p.m.  
Community Recreation Center  
10640 North Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah**

**Present:** Mayor Denise Andersen, Presiding  
Council Member Laura Ellison  
Council Member Mike Geddes  
Council Member Alexandra McEwen  
Council Member Bob Morgan  
Council Member Kelly Smith

**Staff:** Chandler Goodwin, City Manager  
Charl Louw, Finance Director  
Greg Gordon, Recreation Director  
Kevin Anderson, Public Works Director  
Hyrum Bosserman, City Attorney  
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder  
Lieutenant Josh Christensen

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

**1. Call to Order, Pledge, and Invocation.**

The City Council Meeting of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mayor Andersen.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council Member Morgan.

The Invocation was offered by Mayor Andersen.

**2. Approval of Meeting Agenda.**

**MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to APPROVE the Meeting Agenda. Council Member Morgan seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member McEwen-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

**3. Public Comment.**

There were no public comments.

## **REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS/RECOGNITIONS**

### **4. Open and Public Meetings Act Training.**

City Attorney, Hyrum Bosserman reported that the Open and Public Meetings Act training needs to be done on an annual basis. The spirit of the act was that all meetings, discussions, debates, and decision-making need to be done in the open. Government bodies need to follow the Open and Public Meetings Act. More specifically, any local administrative, advisory, executive, or legislative body that:

- Consists of two or more persons;
- Spends, distributes, or is supported by tax money; and
- Has the authority to make decisions about public business.

Mr. Bosserman reported that a meeting is defined as any convening between a quorum. For example, if there were five Council Members on a City Council, a quorum would be three Council Members. Whenever there are three Council Members meeting to discuss City business or make a decision, that meeting needs to be open to the public and properly noticed in advance. He noted that in a small city, like Cedar Hills, Council Members can run into each other. If three Council Members run into each other and begin to discuss City business, that would be considered a meeting. If there were discussions about non-City business, that would not be considered a meeting. It is acceptable for Council Members to socialize as long as City business is not discussed and decisions are not being made behind closed doors.

Mr. Bosserman discussed text messages. There could be a text message thread with Council Members where notices are shared, such as the start time of a Work Session. However, whenever there is dialogue on the text message thread with three Council Members, that is considered a meeting. For example, if a Council Member texts two other Council Members to discuss a specific agenda item. That kind of communication needs to happen in an open forum. Council Member Geddes wondered if it was appropriate to discuss whether someone can attend a City Council Meeting. Mr. Bosserman explained that the best practice is not to do it. If there is a thread among the Council Members where updates related to meeting times and locations are shared, that is appropriate. Discussion about specific items should be avoided.

Mr. Bosserman reminded the Council that emails discussing City business could be subject to a Government Records and Management Act (“GRAMA”) request. City Manager, Chandler Goodwin noted that some cities try to add their attorney on all emails so those emails would fall under attorney-client privilege. That does not always work. He explained that when the City receives a GRAMA request for emails, those emails become public. He asked that Council Members be mindful of what is written. Mr. Bosserman noted that there could be privilege invoked on those communications. Generally, if anything of substance is discussed regarding litigation or legal matters, it would be done during a Closed Session. That was the appropriate forum. Citizens are entitled to know what their government decides and to observe how the decisions are reached.

In terms of meeting locations, they can be held at the regularly scheduled place. Mr. Bosserman noted that the meeting location could change. Electronic meetings are allowed, and the City can adopt specific rules about how to regulate those types of meetings.

Additional information was shared about a Closed Session or Closed Meeting. Mr. Bosserman explained that everything is supposed to be done in the open but the State Legislature provided specific criteria where the City Council could be together as a quorum and discuss pertinent issues that are privileged or need to be held in a closed manner. The most common reasons included professional competence, physical or mental health, imminent litigation, sale of real property or water rights, security interests, and allegations of criminal misconduct.

Mr. Bosserman shared details about noticing requirements. According to the Open and Public Meetings Act, all meetings must be noticed at least 24 hours in advance. The notice needs to include the agenda, date, time, and location. He reported that an open meeting does not necessarily mean that members of the public are allowed to comment during the meeting. Mr. Goodwin explained that a bill was recently passed that will require public comment. Mr. Bosserman confirmed this. In Cedar Hills, there is always a public comment period at the start of the City Council Meeting. Mayor Andersen pointed out that the Council can limit the amount of time allowed for public comment. In addition, they can limit comments if there is a lot of repetition. Council Member Geddes pointed out that the Council does not have to respond to comments. Mr. Bosserman confirmed that there does not need to be a back-and-forth between the Council and residents.

Mr. Bosserman shared information about Meeting Minutes and recordings. He reported that all meetings need to be recorded and Minutes prepared after each meeting. This ensures that there is a record of what was discussed, and a record of the votes cast. Mr. Bosserman reviewed the policies regarding emergency meetings. He explained that the City Council can meet quickly if there is an emergency. The statute requires that reasonable notice be provided. There also needs to be an attempt to notify all members of the body beforehand. As for violations of the Open and Public Meetings Act, if a violation is intentional, it could be deemed a Class B Misdemeanor. Action taken in a meeting is voidable if the body is found to violate the Act.

Mayor Andersen noted that there are normally two City Council Meetings per month but legally, the City Council is only required to hold one. Mayor Andersen thanked Mr. Bosserman for the training.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **5. Approval of the Minutes from the February 7, 2023, City Council Meeting and the February 21, 2023, Work Session and City Council Meeting.**

**MOTION: Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda. Council Member Geddes seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member McEwen-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **CITY REPORTS AND BUSINESS**

### **6. City Manager.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that the Legislative Session ended on Friday. City Staff had been monitoring several bills as a record number were introduced in the House. Many passed. Some Code changes may be needed in the future, but everything would be addressed to ensure that the City is compliant. Mr. Goodwin added that the Timpanogos Special Service District (“TSSD”) is going through a bond process. There were some plant upgrades and line extensions planned to address future growth. As a result of the bond process, there could be some changes in the coming years. Mr. Goodwin also noted that there had been a lot of snow this season. There was some concern about a warm snap that could create a difficult runoff season, so sandbags and sand had been obtained. If residents were in need, those materials would be available to protect properties and homes. Those interested were invited to reach out to the City.

### **7. Mayor and Council.**

Council Member Ellison reported that the Easter Egg Hunt coordinated by the Youth City Council will take place on April 8, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.

Council Member Morgan reported that he attended the American Fork Chamber of Commerce Meeting at the hospital. Utah County Sherriff, Mike Smith, spoke and asked citizens to remember how difficult the job is. Council Member Morgan stated that it is important to express gratitude for their hard work.

Mayor Andersen reported that the City needed to bond for a portion of the Pressurized Irrigation (“PI”) meter installation. The bond closed on March 2, 2023. Additionally, the Mountainland Association of Governments (“MAG”) appointed a New Executive Director last month, Michelle Carroll. Ms. Carroll served previously as the Assistant Executive Director and was doing an excellent job. MAG also provided a list of bills that passed.

Council Member Smith reported that she serves on the Utah League of Cities and Towns (“ULCT”) Legislative Policy Committee. The last Session was challenging as there were a record number of bills. There were a few wins and a few severe losses for cities and towns as far as policies on local control and taxes. She thanked the ULCT for their work. The ULCT advocates for cities and towns. Without their assistance, the result would have been much worse.

### **8. City Staff.**

Police Lieutenant, Josh Christensen introduced his son who is in the 7<sup>th</sup> Grade. He was job shadowing that day and attended various meetings. Lieutenant Christensen reported that everything is going well at the Police Department. The department was preparing to begin another round of Citizens Police Academy. A few Council Members have not attended and was something to consider. The Citizens Police Academy would start on April 13, 2023. It would run from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. and would take place each Thursday night for 10 weeks.

Recreation Director, Greg Gordon reported that Jr. Jazz will wrap up this week. Summer camps, bowling, coach pitch, and T-ball were all open for registration. Mr. Gordon informed the Council that a quarterly newsletter related to recreation had been distributed. Anyone who registered with Cedar Hills Recreation was sent the newsletter. It contained a review of all upcoming recreation-related events.

Public Works Director, Kevin Anderson reported that the Public Works Department has been busy addressing water main breaks caused by UTOPIA hitting the water mains. The department was also trying to prepare for possible flooding. It was important to identify the problem areas. He noted that Cedar Hills Drive is not in good shape due to several potholes. The Public Works Department has been out daily to fill them. He asked that motorists drive slowly on Cedar Hills Drive to protect their vehicles and remain safe.

Finance Director, Charl Louw reported that the Finance Department is focused on the budget. Additional information was to be shared later in the meeting.

### **SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **9. Review/Action and Public Hearing on an Ordinance Amending City Code Title 10-6a-4 Related to Parking Requirements in the SC-1 Commercial Zone.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that there were discussions about potential amendments to the City Code at the last City Council Meeting. That discussion pertained to the Parking Code for office structures in the SC-1 Commercial Zone. The current Code requires six parking stalls per 1,000 square feet of office space. After reviewing the Codes from surrounding cities, it was determined that the requirement was abnormally high. Some developers who were looking to develop office structures in the community were asking the City Council to consider a reduction.

Mr. Goodwin shared a conceptual idea for Cedar Canyon on the corner of 4700 West and Cedar Hills Drive where an office building is proposed. The developers want to comply with the Code requirements but certain parts of the office structure do not generate traffic such as elevators and lobbies. The developer believed that the square footage requirement should be based on the portion of the building that generates traffic. As a result, the last meeting focused on net versus gross. For the proposed development, the assumption was that a 14,000-square-foot building 15% to 20% of the office space was made up of common areas. Common areas could include restrooms, hallways, janitorial closets, HVAC rooms, elevator corridors, and stairwells. Mr. Goodwin believed it was best to remove break rooms from common area consideration as building uses change over time.

With an assumed 14,000-square-foot building, a 3/1,000 gross floor area calculation totaled 42 parking stalls. On the other hand, a 3/1,000 net floor area calculation totaled 36 parking stalls. The difference between net and gross was only a few stalls. There would not be a significant difference in the parking requirements. Previously, the Planning Commission recommended that the calculation be based on the gross floor area calculation. At the last City Council Meeting, the Council Members believed there was merit to the net floor area argument. The issue was that when a developer comes in with building plans, Staff needs to determine the portions that are and are not considered common areas. Choosing net instead of gross means that there is a certain

amount of ambiguity. However, the Council suggested an assumed reduction for office structures. That was where the question of the percentage came in. For example, whether the reduction should assume 15%, 20%, or fall somewhere in the middle.

Mr. Goodwin stated what the City wanted to avoid was utilizing large portions of the commercial zone for parking. He looked at aerial images of different office structures. One example was Lexington Heights. There is a lot of parking along the fence that borders Cedar Ridge Elementary School and the middle portion is empty. He assumed the employees park against the fence and the rest of the parking area is not used. He noted that a lot of commercial land is dedicated to parking, but not all of that parking is used.

Language was drafted for 10-6a-4 (Parking Requirements in the SC-1 Commercial Zone). Mr. Goodwin noted that language was included in the packet but additional changes had been made. He shared the newly proposed language with the Council as follows:

- For office uses, a minimum of three parking spaces shall be provided for each 1,000 square feet of net floor area. The final number of parking spaces shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number when calculating the number of required parking spaces. Net square footage excludes restrooms, janitorial closets, elevator corridors, and common areas used for major pedestrian movement, such as public lobby areas. Net floor area shall be calculated by multiplying the gross floor area by \_\_\_%.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the above language was his recommendation. The percentage amount could be whatever the City Council is comfortable with. Council Member Geddes asked about handicapped parking stall requirements. Mr. Goodwin reported that there are Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) parking requirements that need to be complied with. He shared an image of the property on the corner of 4700 West and Cedar Hills Drive. It is a difficult piece because there are utility lines on the southern portion. In another corner, there needs to be a clear vision area. Additionally, as part of future development, there may be a roundabout nearby to mitigate traffic. All of those issues reduce the buildable space. The parking lot needs to be shielded from the major street corridors as well. Mr. Goodwin pointed out that on-street parking will not count toward the parking requirements but would be possible for visitors of the building to use. It is a wide street that accommodates on-street parking.

Mayor Andersen asked if Mr. Goodwin was looking for a percentage to add to the proposed language. This was confirmed. Council Member McEwen pointed out that the Planning Commission recommended gross floor area. She wondered what their thoughts were on the newly proposed language. Mr. Goodwin reported that their concern was that the net floor area would cause City Staff to determine what is common area and what is not. That being said, some of the Commissioners understood the idea of there being a general reduction.

Council Member Smith believed what was discussed was a good compromise. During the last City Council Meeting, the developer mentioned 20% for net. She felt that made sense and noted that Cedar Hills is small. There is not a lot of space, so it is important to make sure that development makes sense for developers. Mr. Goodwin believed the current Code is too

demanding and leads to large amounts of unused parking. It was important to address the issue in some way. It was a matter of tailoring the Code to meet the needs of the City.

Mayor Andersen wondered how the Council felt about the 20% suggestion. Council Members Geddes and Ellison expressed support for that percentage. The Council discussed the calculation for the net square footage. Council Member Geddes agreed that the site in question is difficult. He wanted to make sure the language proposed is reasonable.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

**MOTION: Council Member Geddes moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 03-07-2023A, an Ordinance amending Cedar Hills City Code 10-6a-4 related to parking requirements in the SC-1 Commercial Zone, subject to the following condition:**

- 1. Section G(6) to read: For office uses, a minimum of three (3) parking spaces shall be provided for each one thousand (1,000) square feet of net floor area. The final number of parking spaces shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number when calculating the number of required parking spaces. Net square footage excludes restrooms, janitorial closets, elevator corridors, and common areas used for major pedestrian movement, such as public lobby areas. Net floor area shall be calculated by reducing the gross floor area by 20%.**

**Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member McEwen-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

**10. Review/Action and Public Hearing on an Ordinance Amending City Code Title 10-6a-4 Related to Lighting in the SC-1 Commercial Zone.**

Mr. Goodwin reported on a recent incident where a vehicle slid into one of the streetlights in the Commercial Zone on a snowy day. The City has worked with the insurance company to replace that streetlight. However, because of the style and the unique design, streetlights are difficult to obtain. It is a style that was 15 to 20 years old and needed to be custom-made. The cost was approximately \$8,000 for the light and \$7,000 for the labor. One light is \$15,000. It was a high cost and takes six to eight months to receive. During that time, there would be no streetlight. This creates a lot of problems because lighting some of the areas becomes extremely expensive. Although there was a desire to maintain the town and country style, it was suggested that a different model be permitted. There could be the same look in the commercial zone but it would be more fiscally responsible.

While looking into the streetlights, Staff also looked into the lighting requirements in the SC-1 Commercial Zone. Amendments were suggested. For instance, in 10-6a-4(D) – Street Lighting, some additions had been made. The proposed language was as follows:

- Street lighting should provide efficient and practical lighting for residents and businesses in Cedar Hills while maintaining the City’s rural character...

In Section 1, the responsibility was given to the subdivider and developer. It was their responsibility to pay for and install the lights. Mr. Goodwin reported that there are certain standards as far as lighting requirements, distance, and the direction of the light. Section 2 reiterated that there needs to be adherence to City standards. Section 3 contained requirements for parking lot lighting. Certain types of lighting throughout the Commercial Zone would be explicitly prohibited. For instance, searchlights, laser source lights, strobe lights, and flashing lights. Those lights would not be permitted to protect the residential boundary. The language also stated that there are some exceptions, which relate to public safety, seasonal decorations, and special events. Some definitions would also be added to the Code.

Council Member Geddes noted that there are a lot of dark sky initiatives. Mr. Goodwin explained that there was a desire to move toward LED lights that are directed downward. The light should cease at the property lines. He noted that switching to LED lights promotes dark sky initiatives, but also saves the City a significant amount of money. There was discussion regarding cost. Mr. Goodwin further discussed the streetlights and the town and country look. Referencing that more generically would allow there to be some natural progression over time. A standard would come back to the Council in the future but some areas in the Code could be addressed currently.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

**MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 03-07-2023B, an Ordinance amending Cedar Hills City Code 10-6a-4 related to lighting requirements in the SC-1 Commercial Zone. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member McEwen-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

**11. Review/Action and Public Hearing on an Ordinance Amending City Code Title 10-5-32 Related to Accessory Dwelling Units Certificates of Completion.**

Mr. Goodwin reported that when the Building Official retired at the end of the last calendar year, the City became reliant on Sunrise Engineering to conduct building inspections and for granting the final Certificates of Occupancy. The Accessory Dwelling Unit Code required there be a Certificate of Occupancy to ensure that someone inspected the unit and meets the Building Code. However, the Building Department has had issues. Sometimes, the home itself has a Certificate of Occupancy but the basement does not. In those instances, Sunrise Engineering is reluctant to issue a New Certificate of Occupancy. They would prefer to issue a Certificate of Completion for the basement portion. The amendment would recognize that a Certificate of Completion rather than a Certificate of Occupancy would be acceptable in those instances. He explained that the proposed amendment is fairly straightforward.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

**MOTION: Council Member Ellison moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 03-07-2023C, an Ordinance amending Cedar Hills City Code 10-5-32 related to Accessory Dwelling Units Certificates of Completion. Council Member Morgan seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member McEwen-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **12. Discussion on Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Items.**

Mr. Louw shared the financial approach and how the budget process begins each year. There needs to be consistent financial support for basic and essential services. Some of those are driven by what residents consider to be essential and others are based on what the State has determined is essential. One of the requirements from the State is that there be a balanced budget. This means that operational expenditures need to be offset by operational revenues. In Cedar Hills, the more volatile revenues are budgeted more conservatively. Mr. Louw explained that property tax is a stable revenue, but most other revenue types are more volatile.

Fees need to be based on the associated cost of the service. One example was contracting with Waste Management for garbage and recycling. There are times when the City needed to adjust those fees because Waste Management adjusted them. Mr. Louw discussed capital improvements and explained that every effort is made to pay for those with grants and money that is a set-aside, which is a pay-as-you-go funding approach. Reserves were also set aside for potential emergencies and planned improvements. It is very important to have reserves to cover unexpected costs. However, additional debt may be needed at times to fund a project where unexpected improvements were needed through State or Federal unfunded mandate.

Mr. Louw explained that when all of the planned maintenance and capital improvements are met, the reserves can be used to pay down debt. In the last 10 years, the debt had been cut in half from approximately \$15 million to \$7 million. He noted that it was important to be transparent with reporting so all reports are based on best practices. This included the budget document and audit. It was noted that Cedar Hills does more than the minimum required.

Regional challenges were described. Mr. Louw reported that permanent job openings have not been pursued by a large number of qualified local applicants. Recently qualified applicants largely come from out of state. That means that the process takes longer. Nationwide, unemployment is at 3.4%, but in Utah and Utah County, unemployment is at 2.2%. Another challenge is that the State mandate for a Commercial Driver's License ("CDL") Training Class A or B is needed for vac trucks, large plows, and dump trucks. It used to cost less than \$200 to get CDL certified, but now when there is a new hire, it costs \$3,800 to train on a truck if the truck is provided or \$4,800 if the truck is not provided. In addition, there is a \$2,000 cost related to labor and benefits for the time needed to obtain the CDL. Training costs can be significantly higher than in prior years. Retention of current CDL holders may also be more challenging due to driver shortages.

Mr. Louw shared information related to inflation and reported that the latest statistics indicate that grocery prices increased by 11.3% in the last year. Electrical costs increased by 11.9% and the cost of shelter increased by 7.9%. There is also a shortage of affordable homes that range between 35,000 and 45,000 units. Between February 2021 and January 2022, inflation costs in Utah households totaled approximately \$511 per month. Although the numbers were slightly less in the current year, there was still a lot of inflation. Mr. Louw reported that the Utah Consumer Sentiment Index in February 2023 was 70.4 whereas it was 78.8 the previous year.

Mr. Goodwin shared information about prior and future City surveys and reported that it was time for another City-wide survey. This was last done in 2021. He explained that the survey allowed the City to gauge success. Rather than waiting until the summer or fall to do the survey, he wanted to launch it by the end of the month. Similar questions were raised each year to benchmark the changes. There would also be questions that were specific to the discussions happening at a City Council level.

Mr. Goodwin shared data from the last survey. One of the questions had to do with ways to improve Cedar Hills. The highest-ranked answers were to maintain the unique small-town feel and beautification/open space. The Council discussed what a unique small-town feel means to them. Some felt that it meant no significant changes to the character and others felt it meant there should be a separation between residential and commercial. Council Member Ellison believed the small-town feel had to do with the community events and traditions. Council Member Morgan believed it meant living in a place where you know your neighbors. Mr. Goodwin noted that the unique small-town feel means different things to different people. As for beautification and open space, that was a priority for residents. It was the reason they live in the community.

Another previous survey question related to the recreation facilities that should have amenities added or renewed. There were three standout answers at that time which included bicycle/walking paths, trails, and shade structures. It is important to consider what can be done to address those community desires. Mr. Goodwin noted that a lot of time and money was spent refurbishing the parks. He felt now was the time to shift the attention from parks to the trails.

As part of the next City survey, it was important to determine where the City should focus its attention moving forward. Mr. Goodwin explained that there could be an Open Space/Beautification Survey where future improvements would be ranked. Options included:

- Repair and widen existing Forest Creek Trail;
- Add additional paved trail on the east bench/Bonneville Shoreline Trail;
- Grade a winter sledding hill and parking lot at City's spring cleanup site by the golf course;
- Drought-resistant landscaping in unusable space (medians/roundabouts/park strips);
- Sunset Park renewal (all abilities playground and surfacing);
- Timpanogos Cove Park (move swings closer to the playground or resurface Timpanogos Basketball court);
- Move backstop from Heiselt's Hollow Park to Harvey Park multipurpose south fields, and convert baseball at Heiselt's to another purpose (fenced Skate Park and Dog Park);
- Multipurpose indoor facilities for pickleball courts, basketball, volleyball, and track at Heiselt's or Mesquite Park;

- Mesquite Park (northeast side improvements courts, trees, and walking path);
- Additional trees and shade structures at Harvey Park and Heritage Park;
- Cemetery above Canyon Heights or Timpanogos Cove;
- Frisbee golf course on the east bench; and
- No open space improvements.

Council Member Smith did not want to see all of the trails paved. She felt there needed to be a balance for different types of users. Mr. Goodwin agreed but noted that some residents want trail areas to be paved so they are more accessible. Mr. Louw shared additional information about the future improvements list that had been shared. A lot of times, the surveys were vague. He wanted respondents to be able to visualize more specific suggestions. Mr. Goodwin explained that in the last survey, residents were asked if a Dog Park was desired and desired near their homes. There were very different results. He liked the idea of including more specific suggestions that the City could receive feedback on.

Council Member Smith suggested that instead of one specific option, several different options be presented in the survey. For example, if the baseball area was moved, various options could be added for consideration. Mr. Louw confirmed that this would be possible. Mr. Goodwin reported that there was interest in a Dog Park and a Skate Park within the community. However, he noted that there was no majority of community support. Approximately 23% of the community was interested in those types of amenities.

Mr. Goodwin was looking for some feedback from the Council. City Staff would work on preparing the survey. He hoped to have something ready to review at the next City Council Meeting. He felt that ranking 13 items were too many and asked that the Council share some suggestions that could be removed from consideration. He did not believe there should be more than 10 items to choose from, but six to eight would be ideal. Council Member Geddes suggested removing drought-resistant landscaping from the list because that kind of question had been asked before. Additionally, the cemetery question had been asked before.

Council Members discussed the different options. Council Member Smith explained that she wanted to see the costs included in the survey. That made it easier to make a decision. Mr. Goodwin explained that the costs would be addressed in a follow-up. Another survey could be done later in the year once there is more specific data. If during the first survey, there is a lot of interest in one suggestion, that item could be prioritized.

Council Member McEwen believed it was important to focus on trails. There was a lot of interest in that from residents. She felt that the trails and the Dog Park-related suggestions should be on the survey. Council Member Geddes agreed that a lot of time had been dedicated to parks over the last several years. It was likely time to look elsewhere and trails might be the best option. Mr. Goodwin pointed out that there were some major and minor expenditures listed on the Open Space/Beautification Survey future improvements suggestion list. He next reviewed the Trail Refinements Survey trail improvements suggestion list, which was as follows:

- Widening existing trails to 10 feet wide for safety, if possible;
- Mill and repave damaged pavement;

- Add signage (mile markers, distance to other trails, maps);
- Shaded bench seating near the trail;
- Exercise area option along the trail;
- Drinking option along the trail;
- Year-round heated restrooms at Heritage Park and Harvey Park in the winter;
- Trees; and
- Provide better sight lines where brush encroaches near the trail.

Mr. Goodwin reported that trail widening would be ideal for safety purposes. It would make it easier to plow the trail as six feet is pretty narrow. In addition, if there is a brush fire, a 10-foot-wide trail would allow a brush truck to have access. There would need to be a lot of evaluation from City Staff to determine where it is possible to have a 10-foot trail.

The suggestion about year-round heated restrooms was referenced. Mr. Goodwin reported that he received a report related to Utah County trail usage along the Murdock Canal Trail. Approximately 250,000 visitors come through there in one year. It is a heavily used trail. Council Member Smith noted that Cedar Hills is small and providing year-round restrooms for a lot of visitors is a significant burden. There might be approaches that allow the burden to be shared with other cities. Mr. Goodwin provided additional information about heated restrooms. It is much more difficult to heat the Harvey Park restroom than the Heritage Park restroom. The Council discussed other trails, such as Forest Creek Trail, and potential opportunities to improve connection. Mr. Goodwin offered to look into the details and return with additional information for consideration.

Mr. Goodwin shared a list of preliminary future projects for Cedar Hills. The list included:

- Lower Cedar Hills Drive up to Oak Road/Redwood Drive repaving project 2023 (Class C Fund reserves);
- Water main upsizing Cedar Hills Drive east of Oak Road and repaving in 2023 or 2024, depending on engineering plans availability (Class C Fund reserves and Water Fund reserves);
- Pressure zone improvements (Water Fund reserves)
- Chlorination improvements (Water Fund reserves);
- Harvey Boulevard widening with Pleasant Grove and Mountainland Association of Governments funding (Impact Fees);
- Trail updates, such as repaving and widening Forest Creek Trail (likely Capital Project Fund reserves or possibly State Outdoor Recreation Grant);
- Heritage Park Amphitheater Shell (Capital Project Fund reserves);
- Events center improvements, such as additional tournament space, permanent City Council improvements, and improved landscaping (Golf Fund and Capital Project Fund reserves);
- Continue golf course bunker and tee box repairs throughout the course (Golf Fund and Capital Project Fund reserves);
- Golf pumps, irrigation updates, and equipment replacement (Golf Fund);
- Public Safety Building repairs, such as paint, flooring, and restroom updates;
- Cedar Hills additional roundabout (Class C Roads or General Fund contributions);
- Speed bump updates (Class C Roads); and

- Other: park improvements, skate park, dog park, cemetery depending on survey follow-up (Capital Project reserves).

Mr. Goodwin explained that most of the items listed are projects that are on the City's radar. There was a desire to fund and move those items forward. Mr. Louw next shared a spreadsheet related to Fund Balance Projections which showed 2023 Projects/One-Time Expenses. All of those line items were one-time items that were being funded in the current year. Several of the items shown were either completed or in progress. He noted that a lot is happening in the City and \$6,642,168 was budgeted for the projects listed. Mr. Louw explained that some of the funds have grants. The spreadsheet also showed what would be left at the end of the year and some possible one-time projects for 2024. The remaining balance for each funding source was also shown.

The City Council took a break from 8:00 p.m. to 8:10 p.m.

Mr. Goodwin shared information related to Building Improvements – Landscaping. There had been previous discussions about landscaping improvements and the City contracted with a company for landscape designs. However, the designs were larger than what Cedar Hills was looking for. There was a desire to scale those back so there could be a return on investment. Though the City wanted to facilitate outdoor weddings, there was a need to recoup the costs. The biggest priority was the path that went from the patio out to the pergola. He believed the path needed to be done, the location of the pavilion selected, and the grade made level to accommodate outdoor weddings. As for the landscaping, there had been discussions about dividing areas. He loved the idea but stated that it was not as important. He liked the idea of redoing the landscaping so it would frame the view rather than detract from it.

Mr. Goodwin shared information about a proposed golf deck. There are issues when special events and golf tournaments take place in the building at the same time. It is not possible to accommodate both. As a result, a golf deck was discussed. It would allow golf tournaments to host their luncheons on the deck area. At the same time, a wedding could be hosted in the Vista Room. That way, the City does not need to choose between an event or a tournament. Mr. Goodwin noted that there had also been discussions about Council Chambers as there was a desire to establish permanent Council Chambers. He shared images of the old conference room. Due to the size limitations, he did not consider that to be a great option. Another option that was discussed was the bay, which offers a lot of space but would cost a lot to renovate. He also noted that long-term, that was an asset for the City. If the building ever needs to be reused as a Public Safety Building and the bay had been turned into a Council Chamber, there would no longer be a bay for fire apparatus or an ambulance. Mr. Goodwin explained that the current room is an option as well but there were challenges in the space. It was difficult for everyone to see the screen and it was also difficult in terms of accessibility.

As part of the deck discussions, there was a suggestion to enclose a room instead. Two different layouts were shared. That room could function as the permanent Council Chambers but could also be utilized for golf tournaments. Examples of different setups were shown. One was for a City Council Meeting and another with a golf deck. Council Member Geddes asked about hosting more than one event at a time. Mr. Louw wanted to encourage that. The original idea was to minimize the stress between events and golf tournaments, however, to maximize the return, holding two

events at one time made the most sense. Mr. Goodwin added that parking may need to be expanded. He shared the current layout. If there is a tournament, the golf parking lot will be full. Since tournaments and weddings do not normally overlap in their demand period for parking, that worked out well. However, if two events are happening at the same time, the current parking layout would not work. He also pointed out that there would be some challenges if the event staff is managing two events.

Mr. Goodwin noted that events and golf did a good job of working together even through the COVID-19 pandemic. He believed the proposed room would be able to pay for itself. It would also allow people to set up early, which was currently not possible if there is another event scheduled. Mr. Goodwin liked the idea because it was the highest and best use for the community. One of the reasons people want to rent the Vista Room is because of the view.

Council Member Geddes explained that there had been a lot of discussions about the need for permanent Council Chambers. In other cities, the Council Chambers sat unused when there were no City Council Meetings. He liked the idea that the room could be rented out and used in different ways. Mr. Goodwin noted that between City Council and Planning Commission Meetings, there are approximately 30 meetings held each year. It made sense to use the room in other ways the rest of the time.

Mr. Goodwin informed those present that converting the bay into Council Chambers would be almost as expensive as the deck proposal. For a room that will only be used 30 times a year, that did not necessarily make the most sense. Council Member Smith liked the idea of there being a dual-use room. Mr. Goodwin explained that to move the idea from a concept to preliminary to construction, there were budget concerns. He wanted to hear more from the Council about the preferences moving forward. City Staff had thought a lot about where Council Meetings could be held and felt the current suggestion was the best long-term investment for the City.

There was discussion regarding the design elements desired by the Council. It seemed that something modern, complementary, but inexpensive was ideal. Mr. Goodwin wanted to hear additional feedback from the Council. The comments could be summarized and shared at a future City Council Meeting. He pointed out that different projects use different funding sources. Focusing on the Council Chambers did not mean a water project or road project would not be done.

**13. Motion to Go into Closed Session Pursuant to Utah State Code Section 52-4-205(1)(c) to Discuss Pending or Reasonably Imminent Litigation.**

**MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to go into CLOSED SESSION pursuant to Utah State Code §52-4-205(1)(c) to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation. Council Member Geddes seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member McEwen-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

The City Council was in Closed Session from 8:50 p.m. to 9:06 p.m.

**14. Motion to Adjourn Closed Session and Reconvene Closed Meeting.**

**MOTION: Council Member Morgan moved to ADJOURN the Closed Session and Reconvene the Cedar Hills City Council Meeting. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member McEwen-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**15. Adjourn.**

**MOTION: Council Member Geddes moved to ADJOURN the City Council Meeting. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member McEwen-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Approved by Council:  
March 21, 2023

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC  
City Recorder