

MINUTES OF THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2020, IN THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1020 EAST PIONEER ROAD, DRAPER, UTAH

PRESENT: Mayor Troy K. Walker, and Councilmembers Mike Green, Tasha Lowery, Fred Lowry, Cal Roberts, and Marsha Vawdrey

EXCUSED:

STAFF PRESENT: David Dobbins, City Manager; Mike Barker, City Attorney; Laura Oscarson, City Recorder; Scott Cooley, City Engineer; Hazel Dunsmore, Human Resource Director; John Eining, Police Chief; Rhett Ogden, Recreation Director; Christina Oliver, Community Development Director; Clint Smith, Fire Chief; Britnee Johnston, Communications Director; and Bob Wylie, Finance Director

This meeting was held electronically.

This meeting will be an electronic meeting according to Draper City Municipal Code 2-1-040.
Determination 2020-25, pursuant to Utah Code Annotated 52-4-207(4)

I, Mayor Troy K. Walker, do hereby determine conducting an electronic meeting of the Draper City Council with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location and hereby authorize the Draper City Council to conduct electronic meetings without an anchor location.

The foregoing determination is based on the following facts:

- Federal, state, and local leaders, including the Draper City Mayor and City Council, have all recognized a global pandemic caused by the spread of the COVID-19 virus.
- Governor Herbert and the Utah Department of Health have recently issued updated orders in response to record numbers of COVID-19 cases and COVID-19-related hospitalizations. The orders implement statewide what has been termed a “mask mandate” and have severely limited social gatherings in an attempt “to prevent and control the rapidly changing consequences of COVID- 19 throughout the state.”
- It is difficult, if not impossible, to predict the number of attendees at any meeting and to manage issues regarding social distancing in order to comply with applicable health orders.
- COVID-19 poses a continuing and immediate threat to the health, safety, and welfare of Draper City residents and the public in general.
- The City has the technological capability to provide means by which the public may hear, or view and hear, the open portions of the meeting and to participate in public hearings.

To participate, please see the options below:

- Listen through the Draper City website - <https://www.draper.ut.us/95/Agendas- Minutes>
- Email comments to public.comment@draper.ut.us. These will become part of the public record.

- Those wishing to speak during the meeting, send a request and include your name, address, and phone number which you will be calling from, for the Zoom meeting ID to public.comment@draper.ut.us.

Study Session

1.0 **Presentation: Locally Preferred Alternative for the Point of the Mountain** – Patti Garver, Utah Transit Authority

- 1.1 Ms. Patti Garver gave a presentation and an update on the Point of the Mountain Transit Study. She stated that they had begun the project last October, and the project intended to connect both existing and future economic development sites in Utah County, and noted that the project involved many entities and several cities. She said that last year, they had considered five options for transit, including rail, light rail, or a bus and that while the options all functioned similarly for ridership costs, they had gotten input from the Mayor and City staff and had found that transit benefits were also important to consider. They had thus decided to focus on common segments with all of the alternative options that would help with their economic development potential and would also be quicker to implement and more likely to receive funding. For their level two evaluations, they had focused on the Common Ground Segment, which she showed on the map as a green line that extended southeast on an elevated structure down to the Traverse Mountain station. Ms. Garver highlighted areas on a map that they had considered in their level two evaluations and outlined the enhanced amenities that would be offered at the stations. She also explained several technologies that could be used in the construction, as well as stated what infrastructure those technologies would require and what their limitations would be. She also noted that if they went with the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) option, they could use an existing maintenance facility, but they would have to build a new facility for the rail line.
- 1.2 Ms. Garver summarized that the capital costs for the BRT were much lower than the rail option, and the cost to construct and operate the BRT would be lower. There would also be more flexibility with where the BRT could go, and it would be faster to implement than the rail. She stated that there was increased ridership with both the bus and rail options, and both options had land use and economic development benefits. They would need to build a transfer station in Lehi for the rail line, but they would not need to do so if they went with the BRT. Based on their level two evaluations and a tech advisory meeting that they had held last week, she recommended the Common Ground Segment go with the BRT, and they could have a line with up to seven stations and end at the Traverse Mountain Station. They would also have the options for two additional stations south of the Traverse Mountain Station. She added that they had begun public outreach on November 20th and was accessible on their website. They were getting public input on their findings and had promoted their findings on all of their social media platforms to inform people.

- 1.3 Ms. Garver explained what the next steps in the process would be and said that they would make their recommendations to the Steering Committee that upcoming Thursday and hoped that meeting would yield a decision so they could then move into the environmental impact stage, which would begin early next year. She aimed to have the current phase of the project done by the end of the year.
- 1.4 Councilmember Fred Lowry asked about the diesel locomotives and clarified that would extend from Draper Front Runner site and south into Utah County, and that the maintenance facility that would be required for that was included in the cost estimates that Ms. Garver had included in her presentation. Councilmember Fred Lowry also commented that since there was not a site picked out yet for the Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) maintenance facility and pointed out that the cost for the land acquisition was not included in the cost estimates. Councilmember Fred Lowry asked if there was another system that used a DMU, and Ms. Garver said that there was only one other one in the country currently, and she added there was also an option to go with electric. Councilmember F. Lowry confirmed that the light rail option would be traditional with overhead power and asked if that option would also need a maintenance facility. Ms. Garver replied that the light rail would need its own maintenance facility, and the costs for that facility were factored into the cost estimates she had provided. Councilmember Fred Lowry said that BRT could use the existing facilities in Lehi and American Fork, and they could also operate on the existing roadways to connect to the Draper Front Runner.
- 1.5 It was noted that some lanes would be set aside to be exclusively used for the busses. Ms. Garver explained that the gold standard was up to 90% exclusive lanes for the BRT. It was discussed that they could take advantage of the more undeveloped areas to create exclusive bus lanes. Ms. Garver said they would only use the existing roadways near the Draper station, and they could choose to add an exclusive lane there as well.
- 1.6 Claire Woodman discussed the difference in speed of travel time between the BRT and the light rail was three to four minutes, and that figure could be impacted by a variety of factors. She said it was hard to compare the speeds since the busses would be more impacted by the roads and state of traffic, but overall, it was at a similar speed to what the light rail would be able to do.
- 1.7 Councilmember Cal Roberts asked what the arguments in favor of the light rail were, and Ms. Garver replied that the capacity for the light rail would be greater, as well as higher speeds. She said the biggest factor was that light rail was perceived as more aesthetically pleasing than the bus but said that a gold standard BRT functioned just as well if not better. She also discussed the costs of maintenance for light rail and busses.
- 1.8 Councilmember Fred Lowry asked if the implementation of the BRT would do away with using the additional rail right-of-way in Draper on the eastern corridor. Ms. Garver responded that it was listed as a possible future phase or project, but it was not currently being considered.

- 1.9 Mayor Walker commented that they did not have a very safe east-to-west connection for active transportation. Ms. Garver said that they could incorporate the ability to have active transportation back and forth across the corridor, but they had not reached that level of detail yet in the plans. Mayor Walker commented that he would like the Council members and staff to get passes so they could take a trip on Utah Valley Express (UVX) to allow them to see firsthand what they were talking about.
- 1.10 City Manager David Dobbins asked Ms. Garver to go over what the next steps in the process would be. Ms. Garver explained that assuming the Steering Committee recommended Local Preferred Alternative (LPA), they would then take it to their board as an informational item in mid-January, and then Lehi and Draper would adopt the LPA resolution. Next, there would need to be amendments made to some of the associated documents, which would then go back to their board and Advisory Council for approval.
- 1.11 Mayor Walker commented that while light rail was a large draw for many businesses, they could not discount the many advantages that BRT had over the light rail, namely the lower costs associated with it.
- 1.12 Councilmember Cal Roberts asked when they could expect to recoup their losses and break even, and Claire Woodman explained that while they did not have an exact answer at that time, they had several economic experts on the team who would set what fares they could charge for ridership as well as consider other factors that would determine what the economic impact would be.
- 1.13 Mayor Walker added that there would be positive environmental impacts from this project as it would reduce the traffic congestion on the highway and improve air quality. He said that they should not approach this project as if it were a private business, but they should think about what the overall positive long-term benefits of the project would be. There was a brief further discussion about some of the positive impacts of having a public transportation alternative would be.

2.0 Presentation: Logo Survey Results – Britnee Johnston, Communications Director

- 2.1 Ms. Johnston shared the results of a logo survey that had been distributed to City staff and residents for one week in November of that year. Participants had been asked to rank six designs. For the City employee votes, no logo had received 50% or more of the votes, so she applied Ranked Choice Voting (RVC) to determine that City employees liked option A the best. 430 residents had also participated in the survey, and Ms. Johnston broke down the demographics of the residents that had responded to the survey before she listed the results. The residents had voted on option A as well, followed closely by the current logo. She stated that the options based on the results of the survey were to either adopt option A as that had been the most popular, or they could adopt a modified version of option C, which had been the second most popular. Her recommendation was to adopt option A, and she noted that they could also choose to keep their current logo. She showed some variations of the new logo that could be used throughout the City, and mock-ups of what

that logo would look like for different departments. She also showed some options for business cards, street signs, and City vehicles.

- 2.2 Ms. Johnston explained the timeline going forward. She anticipated the logo approval would come in by the end of that month, and the website would be updated, and the brand style guide released in mid-January. The new logo would be added to physical items in February and March, and throughout the summer they could update the street signs.
- 2.3 Councilmember Fred Lowry was concerned that the square logo would not look good in black or white but commented that he liked the colors she had chosen. They discussed their surprise that option A had been the winner of the survey results, and the Councilmembers shared what their favorite designs were.
- 2.4 Councilmember Mike Green asked if there was any negative feedback about option A, and Ms. Johnston reported that some people had thought that it was too busy or looked too much like a poster or stamp. There was discussion about putting the design in option A into a circular shape instead.
- 2.5 Mayor Walker suggested that they tweak the design more since the consensus among the Councilmembers was that option A was not yet perfect and many of them personally preferred option C.
- 2.6 Councilmember Fred Lowry thought they needed to put more work into the color selection of the logos so that the images did not look blurry. Councilmember Mike Green agreed that the mountain design appeared blurry, and they discussed the possibility of combining various elements of the logo options to use the best aspects of each design. Ms. Johnston said they could do a follow-up survey with modified versions of the existing logos.
- 2.7 Councilmember Tasha Lowery thought people liked the colors of option A but preferred the design of option C. There was discussion about what the various designs would look like in grayscale, and how they would appear on different surfaces in black and white.
- 2.8 Ms. Johnston concluded that she could send out a new survey that would just have a modified version of option A and C and eliminate the other options, and she could also include photographs of what the logos would look like on different items.
- 3.0 **Closed Session: By Motion. The Draper City Council may temporarily recess the regular meeting and convene in a closed session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual, pending or reasonably imminent litigation, or the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property, as provided by UCA 52-4-205.**
- 3.1 Councilmember T. Lowery moved to recess to a closed session to discuss litigation. Councilmember F. Lowry seconded the motion.

- 3.2 **A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Green, Lowery, Lowry, Roberts, and Vawdrey, voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.**

4.0 Council/Manager Reports

- 4.1 Community Development Director Christina Oliver said that they had been asked to clarify parking spaces outside a development. A project proposal had come before the Planning Commission, and there had been a question as to if parking stalls could be repurposed to be a fire lane or an egress lane. She asked for guidance as to how they should clarify the code. The Councilmembers decided that they should not allow parking stalls to be used for dual purposes. Ms. Oliver reported that the Fire Marshall had agreed that there should be uninhibited access to a building to ensure the health and safety of those inside the building.

Business Session

1.0 Call to Order: Mayor Troy K. Walker

2.0 Presentation: Police Department Holiday Card Winners

- 2.1 Chief John Eining talked about the Christmas card contest, which was held annually for fifth graders across Draper. They had had three winners, who had all come from John the Baptist Elementary School. He shared pictures of the winning cards and explained that the winning design would be put on the Christmas cards that the Draper Police Department sent out that year.

3.0 Recognition: Rachel Rasmussen – Youth Peer Court Mentor, 5 Years of Service

- 3.1 Chief John Eining offered his congratulations and thanks for Rachel Rasmussen's contributions to her school and presented her with a certificate of recognition that noted her years of service.

4.0 Presentation of the 2020 Popular Annual Financial Report (PAFR)

- 4.1 Assistant Finance Director Jared Zacharias explained that this was the ninth year they had done this report, and he felt it was a helpful tool for the residents and staff. He overviewed some of the highlights of the document and said that overall, he felt that the City was in good financial standing despite some of the difficulties of the year. The PAFR included demographic information and details about property and sales tax. He showed charts that explained how much money the City spent per resident, as well as how much money was spent in Draper. Mr. Zacharias also showed a comparison between the current year and the 2019 report and explained significant differences between the two years. He also summarized the efficiency of the City and included a breakdown of how Draper spent their funding on various departments. He also showed the amounts of money in different funds and explained how the funds sat financially.

4.2 Councilmember Fred Lowry commented on the high amount of volunteer hours that had been logged.

5.0 Public Comments

Mayor Walker invited the audience to give any public comments and asked them to state their name and keep their comments three minutes or less. There was no one in the Zoom meeting to make a public comment, so Mayor Walker closed the public comments.

6.0 Consent Items

a. Approval of November 10, 2020, and the November 17, 2020, City Council Meeting Minutes

b. Approval of the 2021 Annual Meeting Schedule

6.1 Councilmember Green moved to approve the Consent Items. Councilmember Vawdrey seconded the motion.

6.2 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Green, Lowery, Lowry, Roberts, and Vawdrey, voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

7.0 Public Hearing: Provide Local Consent for a Limited-Service Alcohol License for Spark Group Restaurants, LLC dba Paradise Biryani Pointe (Administrative Action)

7.1 Community Development Director Christina Oliver explained they had a local consent item for Spark Group Restaurants to be granted a limited-service alcohol license. She stated that the municipal code did not limit the number of lines that could be distributed by the City and noted that Spark Group Restaurant was in keeping with the City Code.

7.2 Mayor Walker opened the public hearing. No one was on the Zoom meeting for the public hearing, so Mayor Walker closed the public hearing.

7.3 Councilmember Green moved to approve the Local Consent for a Limited-Service Alcohol License for Spark Group Restaurants. Councilmember T. Lowery seconded the motion.

7.4 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Green, Lowery, Lowry, Roberts, and Vawdrey, voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**** Councilmember Green moved to recess back into the closed session. Councilmember Vawdrey seconded the motion.**

A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Green, Lowery, Lowry, Roberts, and Vawdrey, voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

**** The City Council resumed the closed session at 7:28 pm.**

8.0 Adjournment

- 8.1 Councilmember Green moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilmember Roberts seconded the motion. This action was done after the closed session had been adjourned.
- 8.2 A roll call vote was taken with Councilmembers Green, Lowery, Lowry, Roberts, and Vawdrey, voting in favor. The motion passed unanimously.
- 8.3 The meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m.