COUNCIL WORK MINUTES
FEBRUARY 16, 2022

The City Council held a meeting on Wednesday, February 16, 2022, at 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 10 North Main Street, Cedar City, Utah.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Garth O. Green; Councilmembers: Terri Hartley; Craig Isom; W. Tyler Melling; Scott Phillips; Ronald Riddle.

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager Paul Bittmenn; City Attorney Tyler Romeril; City Recorder Renon Savage; Finance Director Jason Norris; City Engineer Jonathan Stathis; Police Chief Darin Adams; Leisure Services Director Ken Nielson; Human Resources Natasha Hirschi; Airport Manager Nick Holt; Public Works Director Ryan Marshall.


CALL TO ORDER: Reverend Celeste Lasich of Community Presbyterian Church gave the invocation; the pledge was led by Darin Adams.

AGENDA ORDER APPROVAL: Councilmember Phillips moved to approve the agenda order pulling items #4, #5, and #16; second by Councilmember Hartley; vote unanimous.

ADMINISTRATION AGENDA – MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS; STAFF COMMENTS: ■Mayor – this is a reminder of the field trip this Friday, meet at 1400 West and Center at 1:00 p.m. We will also go to Cody Drive and Cross Hollows Road and then Fiddlers Canyon and see what is happening there. The retreat will be Tuesday at 9:00 a.m. There is a 20-minute segment for each council member after I go and then we will have a report on Willow Sticks and then each of you will be able to discuss your dreams to help me develop a budget. I envision you will spend 10 minutes and then we will have a 10-minute discussion on your items. ■Jonathan – introduced Shane Johnson, our new Project Engineer, he is originally from Cedar City and has been in New Mexico, we are excited to have him in the Engineering Department. Shane – I am excited to be here and help the city and serve. ■Phillips – I want to congratulate you and Gabbie for the State of the City address at the Economic Breakfast, you had great visuals there and I suspect Gabbie had a lot to do with that. I want to congratulate Brooke Twitchell on the love where you live campaign, a great thing to celebrate the community where we live. ■Jonathan – I had one request; we are working on the storm drain projects to go to bid. An issue has come up, we are having a difficult time with lead times on concrete pipe, so one option we are looking at is ADS HP polypropylene pipe, this is heavy duty plastic pipe, Jeff Hunter has looked at it and seems pleased with it. We are working on taking standards change through, I am wondering if we can start working toward having this as an alternative. SUU is working on a project to run storm drain down 200 West and they would like this material available in their bid package.
Phillips – what is the lead time on this? Jonathan – about 4 months, concrete can be 6 months. We have had a conversation with concrete pipe people, but we don’t have a good lead time yet. Phillips – what is the cost versus other pipe? And what other communities are using it? Jonathan – I don’t know the other communities; I will try and find out. The cost is similar to the concrete, but the installation is cheaper, it is longer and lighter weight. Riddle – what about strength and longevity? Jonathan – strength is similar, I don’t know longevity. Mayor – this is heavier than N-12? Yes, is it smooth liner? Yes. It is an excellent product, if it is heavier than I know of, they can lay it in an open trench, but they cannot bore. It can go down 600 South and 200 West. Jonathan – it comes in 20-foot lengths. Paul – are there engineering standards that show the strength of the pipe and longevity that you can provide next week? Yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: ■there were no comments.

CONSIDER A SINGLE EVENT ALCOHOL PERMIT FOR A MARDI GRAS BEER GARDEN, FEBRUARY 26TH FROM 1 P.M. TO 6 P.M. AT POLICY KINGS BREWERY, 223 NORTH 100 WEST. POLICY KINGS BREWERY: Sara Ridgell, Policy Kings – we want to have an exciting event to celebrate Black History Month and Mardi Gras tied into that. Phillips – if February 26th, why are we just now hearing? Sara – we did this last minute. We hope to get it through the DABC, if we can’t, we won’t hold the event. Chief Darin Adams – We don’t have any problems with this, we give a positive recommendation.

CONSIDER FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE BLUFF AT SOUTH MOUNTAIN PHASE 1 SUBDIVISION. GO CIVIL/TYLER ROMERIL: Dallas Buckner, this is Phase 1, we brought vicinity through a long time ago, Joel sold to 992 properties. It was approved by City Staff last July. Tyler – they submitted a cash bond; all fees are paid. Phillips – I am trying to find where it is? Dallas – between Eagle Ridge and Talon Point, comes off Talon Point Phase 5. We will have a vicinity for phase 2 in the next few weeks. Consent.

CONSIDER VICINITY PLAN FOR THE DIAMONDI INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 3325 W. SR-56. PLATT & PLATT/DON BOUDREAU: Bob Platt – this is light industrial subdivision. This is south of 56, this is Monte Stratton, he owns the property, and they want to develop for light industrial. The parcels range from 1.5 acres to 2-3 acres. Hartley – Planning Commission indicated some issues with water and power lines not along the road? Jonathan – it was the master planned road Center Street at the south end. Bob – 3325 West Street exists partially with curb and gutter, water and power, all utilities are there. We will tie into the water and continue it through. We will also be into the sewer line on Center Street. Hartley – the master plan changed to bring Center to the north and doesn’t follow the sewer lines. Bob – it is by Lady Bug Nursery. Jonathan – Center was originally further south, that is where the existing sewer line is located. The master plan was changed to move Center to the north and loop and tie in further to the west. They are showing the master planned road at the south boundary of the subdivision. Bob – it will probably be done in more than one phase. Jonathan – they will have to work with the FAA, but industrial uses are allowed in the overlay zone. Consent.
CONSIDERE VICINITY PLAN FOR THE FIDDLERS CANYON HILLS PUD PHASES 1-10 LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1900 N. FIDDLERS CANYON ROAD. BROWN CONSULTING/DON BOUDREAU: this item was pulled.

CONSIDER A VARIANCE REQUEST FOR PERIMETER FENCE IN THE FIDDLERS CANYON HILLS PUD LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1900 N. FIDDLERS CANYON ROAD. BROWN CONSULTING/JONATHAN STATHIS: this item was pulled.

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONE FROM MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (MPD) TO DWELLING SINGLE-UNIT (R-2-1) FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT HIGHWAY 46 7400 WEST. GO CIVIL/TYLER ROMERIL: Dallas Buckner, Go Civil – this is the Iron West project, we have had a number of zone changes. The remaining property is still MPD from early 2000’s. We are wanting to clean it up and zone the MPD to R-2-1 single family for this project. We got positive recommendation from Planning Commission, and it is in conformance of the general plan. This goes up to Thorley Ranch. There is a 33-foot alley on the east boundary of Thorley Ranch and SUU farm is north. There was a small portion of property not previously zoned either.

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

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE CITY’S GENERAL PLAN. RURAL COMMUNITY CONSULTANTS/JONATHAN STATHIS: Melling – we just had ethics training a month ago. We talked about the conflicts of interest and while I don’t have a legal conflict I have an apparent conflict on the general plan map changes, one that negatively impacts the family farm. I have no interest in it nor does my household, but I have family that does. The ethic act goal is the public has confidence, I don’t want people thinking my comments are tied to the family farm, especially in light of an ordinance that goes above and beyond the State ethics act that says in an effort to protect the public process members are encouraged to disclose and recuse themselves from the chambers during the discussion and the vote is taken. I feel I need to leave the Chambers for this item. It is significant enough that I feel I need to leave. Phillips – the land use is such a small portion. Melling – I don’t want anyone to question my input. I made comments early in the stages before this recommendation was made but have not commented further since this change was made. I will recuse myself at this time.

Don Boudreau, City Planner – we are finally at the beginning of the end of the process, it has been a long one. State law requires every city to have a general plan, to have land use, transportation and housing plan, but I think it is more than that, it is not zoning, but a guide and vision, it is where the city wants to go. It is not just a tool for development. Growth is almost inevitable, and people want to be here. With growth comes changes and challenges. How do we deal with this change in a positive way? Mike Hansen of Rural Community Consultants will review the plan.
Mike Hansen – this is an advisory document, a vision, the recusal is a weak concern. It is 117 pages of content; 1 page is the map. See Exhibit “A”.

Phillips – how did you respond to all of the comments given. Mike – there is public clamor that is a political decision. We give you a map on tactical/strategic items. A lot of the comments are I like what we have, let’s not change it. In Fiddlers Canyon, northeast corner, we thought multi-family housing would fit there, they gave us compelling thoughts and so we took that out, it would not fit there. We worked with Economic Development around Port-15. We also did hear people say we just don’t want that, and we weighed those on the merits, these changes we feel good about. Phillips – we see new red additions, we need to recognize we need more commercial centers rather than on the Main Street, Center Street and 200 North. We need to look at what may become a major intersection. Mike – water, housing and transportation are not all the concerns. Property is outpacing wages, so that says we need higher density, so in most cases we did that, but not all. Many of the parcels are commercial or mixed use and medium density residential.

Hartley – on one parcel to the north the intersection where you put commercial, but adjacent you moved from high density to one of the lowest density. Don – the idea was we have a commercial corner. Hartley – what about medium density to RE? Don – it is consistancy between low density areas, I was looking for a pattern. Mike – we thought it would be one the Council should discuss. You would have two islands of rural estate with medium density around it. Phillips – on 3000 North where we identified 3 commercial pockets, how come we identified 3 corners instead of 4? Hartley – that is the Coronado piece that has already been zoned. Phillips – on the other corner there are already homes. Don – that is probably an error. Mike – when doing it with steering committee, it was stars. The City has a precedent to have zoning to a parcel.

Phillips – if we are proposing medium density to RE, why not square it off? Don – we don’t have a good answer. Mayor – is that where 3000 North curves out and goes into 3200? Don – we discussed that piece, and we were looking for a pattern. That will be a busy road and we have the feathering concept in the plan. If it is lower or higher, the zoning ordinance may be able to plan that better.

Phillips – to the south, near Eagle Ridge where there is proposed commercial, there are suggestions that it be left open space or single-family homes. I think there is a need for commercial in that area. Don – the thought is more neighborhood serving stuff. Phillips – that could be good neighborhood commercial. Don – if there is a consensus and direction for us, we can mark the map as we go through it and make changes. Phillips – we need to talk that northern section through.

Mayor Green opened the public hearing.

Wayne Melling – I own over 20 acres on the east side of 2300 West between the two parcels of Flying L Subdivision. This parcel is to move from medium density to RE, my family has farmed this for many years, long before we had any neighbors. I bought this east side from my family about 10 years ago, my cousin still farms this property, we are in the process of a
$40,000 clean up thanks to the Flying L floods last summer. We don’t have plans to develop, we are hoping the salts in the flood water were not high enough that the land ends up barren. Because of the way Flying L was developed 20+ years ago, because we are an island between the two sections of Flying L, development value of our farm decreased quite significantly when the development finally happened. Flying L has their own water system and they have not paid for city upgrades to their infrastructure and their residents don’t pay Cedar City property taxes or vote in your elections. About 15 years ago my parents Joe and Sally Melling had an offer on the farm as long as they could get the zoning changed to quarter acre lots to offset the cost of bringing water lines from Fife Town. This was before the City required annexation so it went to the County Planning Commission. Our neighbors in Flying L signed a petition and protested against the ¼ acre lots resulting in the planning commission denying my parents application and the developers backed out and the family kept the farm and kept growing alfalfa and Flying L benefitted from having a beautiful green field for the last 20 years. For a second time the family farm was devalued by the Flying L Subdivision. The City’s annexation policy has changed since then, the 2012 general plan had us and everyone else around us who had not developed marked as medium density residential because we are right in the airport flight path and the adjacent master planned roads warranted that. If our property is moved to rural estate, we are limited to 25% of the number of units that we would have been able to do so now, ¼ acre lots did not pencil out in 2005 and city subdivisions have increased in cost substantially since then with roads and flood mitigation and so it would be more expensive now. In a letter I sent to the council a few weeks ago I said half-jokingly that if we are going to be singled out please do it in a way that increases the value of my property for a change, for example by making it commercial instead of rural. It is frustrating to see my property as one of the only undeveloped parcels in the proposed plan that is having its value diminish especially because this change was largely from input by people that don’t vote for you, don’t pay your property taxes, and have not paid for your infrastructure system. I live in the Cedar City, I pay your taxes and I even voted for most of you. Please don’t let Flying L devalue my property a third time. When farming is done, I would like to have a viable option other than selling the water and owning 20 acres of dust. Please consider this in your decision and remove this little L from your plan.

Joel Hansen – the frontage by Eagle Ridge, right now the property we have small homes backing up from Talon Point and there is a parcel zoned commercial. The property on the north we sold a long time ago. We changed the piece on I-15 frontage as commercial and I would like it changed that way, not open space. We have it commercial for a reason, when developed we need neighborhood commercial. I may not do gas station, but maybe a dentist office, or business offices. We will probably develop and keep it as neighborhood commercial. I don’t think we would sell for a gas station. We did sell the parcel on the north side. The property goes to the freeway and then up to ½ mile wide and then it goes up to Westview. The funny angle is from the freeway.

Carter Wilkey – I am grateful to have been able to serve on the steering committee. I have a few personal thoughts, one is a minor correction at the intersection of 2400 N. Northfield Road, there are 3 parcels, the bottom parcel has already been zoned R-2-2 the next phase of Sage Springs Subdivision, they are in the process of developing. It should be kept medium density residential. As we went through the process, we talked general plan, there are real
life implications to property owners and to neighbors, we heard from a property owner where it was changed two levels. Take the time to look at the individual red lined changes and pause and look at the real-life implications. It was easy to set with a sharpie, but we don't see individual property lines. We need to look at the individual changes.

Randle Cagle – the same issue with the Coronado property when annexed. The area is County property, the residents have not had an input on the master plan, other than through the paper. It should remain as the County has it zoned until it is annexed. The residents of the area don’t want medium density residential. We heard from a council member that medium density of 2300 is a huge impact. Leave it RE and then come through the process and then award it to them. Mr. Melling said they tried to get ¼ acre lots, another option is single family 10,000 square foot lots. It is not a good idea to have MDR next to acre lots. On 2300 keep it RE and when it annexes go through the process and give everyone an opportunity to comment.

Carter Wilkey – there are existing homes and property in the County, is it best RE because it is already that way. Maybe that piece could stay that way. If an existing subdivision lands in our general plan. I don’t know what we do in the annexation zone. Tyler – if in our annexation zone, yes we put in the general plan what we perceive what we want if it comes in.

Phillips – 2300 West, what is the road projection and also for 3000 North, they will be a major road. Mayor – and 2400 North that will go through Flying L. Jonathan – a 75’ on 3000 North and 2300. Mayor – what going through Flying L – Jonathan 100. Wayne Melling – they can bring their subdivision in the City and it is their water system that is causing my property to cost so much. Flying L wants benefits, but they don’t want to pay a dime for it. They can talk all they want; I don’t know why they are allowed to talk here. They could ask to be annexed and do an SID and my property would be able to afford to be developed low density, but I bet they won’t spend one red cent to do that.

Public hearing closed.

Phillips – Mr. Wilkey spoke well, there are changes that affect people’s lives one way or another, I don’t want to move on this next week, at least two weeks. Hartley – I agree, I want to take more than a week. Riddle – I would like more time, I have looked at it, but not in detail.

Councilmember Melling returned to the Council Chambers at this time.

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE CITY’S TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN. AVENUE CONSULTANTS: Thomas McMurtry, Avenue Consultants – many of you were involved and came to our meetings. Attached Exhibit “B” was reviewed. This included Enoch and the County and was partially funded by UDOT. Your staff was great to work with, Paul, Jonathan and Trevor. As part of this plan we also looked at the Active Transportation Plan, where people are walking and biking. Every time someone pushes a button at a cross walk UDOT collects the data, and we
are able to have access to that. This is regional information, today we have a population of about 40,000-45,000 people in 2050 we are looking at about 65,000, it may be wrong, we got it from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget and the Kem C Gardner Policy Institute. Even roads that stay green, the volume goes up with growth.

Melling – you use level of service, I saw a video the other day a traffic counter in California, and it was what is wrong with Utah, it is they have not figured out what we did 20 years ago, they don’t make adjustments to reduce the need to travel 10 miles to get to where you need to be. There is something to be said, we assume and plan that everyone will want to always get to the south interchange, or in areas leading to that, if you allow a little more pain, maybe it creates demand to put a Costco on the new south interchange or the north interchange. Thomas – the idea of eliminating trips because people live closer to where they work, etc. that concept is being pushed hard along the Wasatch Front, different centers along Salt Lake County, reducing trip length and number of trips. You can do it on a smaller scale, but an area like this you haven’t experienced that much congestion. To have the population or infrastructure, it takes a bigger geography and Cedar City is not there yet. Plan for good roads and preserve space for them. It would benefit you to have additional options for people. Congestion can be a good thing. Congested areas like New York, Las Vegas you get public transportation. People will find different routes, but I think it is a little early to think like that. Melling – the assumption that we will always use the south interchange as the hub, is it factored in? yes. You have more than one commercial model, people continue to go downtown, SUU north interchange. Phillips – the purple map with projected economic growth, that means it is on the south, so they will continue to be on the south. Thomas – the map on the right is employment growth. Phillips – on the projected map, 3900 West, I am trying to understand the logic, how come we don’t project 3900 West going to the south to Westview Drive. Thomas – good arterial placement. Westview is a north/south road, and 3900 south is and it stops at Center Street. You can continue south, but through that area Westview Drive operates as the north/south road. Phillips – 4200 you have that. There is already a lot of congestion on Westview Drive, would that not help alleviate that. Thomas – the likelihood is not; Westview yellow is due to growth south of Westview. When they get on the road. Jonathan – we will have to build another bridge over the channel if we do that. Thomas – it is draft and open to comment. Jonathan and I made several changes.

Isom – the current Predicted Congestion, Minersville Highway, UDOT owns that. If you look at 2050, Westview Drive jumps out as being inadequate and failing, a 75-foot minor arterial is not adequate for the future. Thomas – the 2050 is a no build future, if you go to the roadway improvement in 2050, the interior connections, if Iron Horse has connections out then Westview can exist as a 75’ road.

Phillips – the other area is in South Mountain, what is the thinking coming off the dotted lavender roads? Thomas – that is a future collector, if there is any development it will need to be served by a corridor parallel with I-15. It is dependent on the growth. Phillips – is it a minor collector? Thomas – it is a major collector. Phillips – from one neighborhood to another? yes. This is if development happens you need to preserve a connection. Melling – specifically we have the two-lavender going to the west, there has been a lot of feedback from the existing neighborhood in Cross Hollow Hills, they don’t want traffic, the other one
we have a route going there, to me it gets back to if we always want people to drive to Walmart forever. There are neighborhoods that want to stay. Thomas – look at the existing area of the city, look at the area between Westview Drive and I-15 it is the same size of the city. Look at the grid through the City, connections will be critical, if there are not connections between neighborhoods it will come back to bite you. If all these subdivisions only have access to the outside, it will be painful. We can make Westview and others to work if you have connections, if not you have to really widen the roads. I did a plan in Payson, and they are laid out like Cedar City and they put through a lot of cul-de-sacs and the police and the community hate them and want to get back to the grid. Melling – this is a low-density area. Thomas – there is a lot of flexibility to where the connections are. Residents need to have options on the exits. Individual developments will need to do traffic studies that are not included in the master plan.

Hartley – we already have an RDO in that area without a master planned road. Thomas – Joel and I have talked; we can take this off the map. As you go into the future, this is what you may want to do, especially if the developments come to you, you can have several low traffic that become a lot.

We make recommends looking at Main Street and the corridor, future signal analysis and a full review of cross sections. There is additional work the City should consider. The master plan is a guideline. Phillips – you did a terrific job on the active transportation portion.

Mayor Green opened the public hearing.

Jeff Corry – we have people from 200 and 300 East, south of 400 South and one from 400 South. We spoke about a north/south corridor will that be laid out on one of the items. Mayor – there are no new roads, the roads are 100 feet wide on 200 East and probably 75 on 400 East, there are no changes in any of that across the bridge to the Paiute Tribe, the road is already in. There is a water tank at the end of 300 East. It is not one road, all the roads 100, 200, 300 East around the school, 400 East, they are already there are wide. Jeff – not between Fairway Drive and Paiute Drive. Mayor – 100 East behind the new Forest Service building that piece of road is not in there. Also, where Wedgewood gets to the trailer park and does not go through. Cedar has a lot of problems of traffic on Main Street. We have roads going north and south but they don’t go as far as they should go. 800 West is a great north/south but it stops at Coal Creek and it won’t go through Kayenta Circle, and it should have gone through to the High School, but it doesn’t. 300 West is great, but again it goes from Coal Creek to the KB Oil on Main Street, then you are back on Main Street. They are using the western corridor west of the football field, they are using it to get to the south regularly, and the neighbors are complaining about all the traffic. They are there and they are public roads and that is the place to drive. I said we need to designate this area because we need to preserve it. We don’t need to build many roads or bridges it is already there. 200 East is already a 100-foot road with curb and gutter. I drive that road often to go to my store across from the cemetery, it is easier than Main Street. There are a couple gaps that prevent people from going to Main Street, one by the Ford Dealership, one by the youth center. If you can get off and get where you are going, they are all public streets that we can use. Any citizen has a right to drive down a street. There will be no corridor, I would like to connect a
few pieces. The City owns property on 300 East from the water tank to the dikes, they have walking trails, it would be wonderful to connect them, and people will use those.

Jeff – the north interchange, heading south on Main Street at Love’s traffic light heading south, if you turn left is that where Wedgewood will start? Mayor – there will be several, but Wedgewood will be major north south road. Jeff – Paiute Drive and 100 East by the Library area. Paiute Drive, if the bridge was put in you would have a straight shot up 100 East to 400 South, people could get a straight shot to the dikes. Mayor – 100 East is narrow because of Lin’s. Jeff – on Fairway Drive I pulled a U-turn and got to Heritage Center and made a U-turn and it was easier there than at Fairway Drive. this is another alternative that people would use. Jeff – this proposal, is there a specific date it will be looked at. Mayor – it will be on the agenda next week, but like the general plan this may get postponed, they will decide next week.

Laura Henderson – is part of the general plan update we talked public transportation, it needs to be addressed going forward, we have several fails within 8 years’ time. We were told the population is not big enough for public transportation. We need to rethink that in a short amount of time. By Walmart we can get 700 cars to take another route.

Joel Hansen – a few things about the new road on the master plan. We can put it on the general plan and move it around, as a developer when it goes on the master plan it doesn’t come off and it is built somewhere. If you look at the main part of downtown grid system, that is everything I have tried to avoid, I don’t want a grid system, it would be great if I have 6-8 units per acre. There is already a road, and I can’t imagine emergency access would be much different on this road than South Mountain. I have already put 6 miles of master planned road in my development, and 95% of the value of that road is used for county residents to get to the City and back to the County. One subdivision has caused me a ton of grief because I had to put a master planned road in and all the traffic goes there. My marketing and what I am trying to build, I have a hard time believing it has any value for my project other than a lot of traffic. People love the area where it is a closed loop area, very few will go north over the top to get to Walmart, they will go on the frontage road where they can drive fast. I would like that piece of road removed from the master planned roads. I worked diligently with Kit to get the road in to specifically divert traffic from going through the neighborhood. If that road has to go in it will have a huge economic impact on me. Hartley – there is not one on the current master plan? Joel - no, it is a new road I found out a few weeks ago, it was not planned or on the master plan before. I already have that valley designed for homes to be built, I don’t want to redo it and put a 66’ road in. Melling – we have had a lot of discussion with your neighbors to the north, if we give them a choice between more congestion on Westview Drive or 8 units per acre to the south, what do you think they will respond? Joel – I think more congestion. I think there is another master planned community to the north connecting, there was supposed to be another road that was removed because they didn’t want it, so I have a hard time. I have worked on this project a long time and have put my fair share of infrastructure in that has benefitted a lot of people with sewer and roads. I don’t have a problem with a master planned road system, but I do with that road.
Susan Goodman, I live on 300 East by the water tank. There are already concerns there, it is a 25 MPH and cars go fast on the wide street, there are razors going to the trails. It is a wonderful place to live, it is quiet. Once you have all the cars go through it will change. Is the plan to go through the dike with a road to the south interchange? Mayor – it would mirror the walking path. Susan – would that be rezoned or stay what it is? Mayor – my idea is it would connect 300 east and 75 East to Mountain View Drive, the little pieces that are not connected. Susan – when connected you get more traffic. We went there because it was quiet and now it will change. People do walk the trails a lot. You are creating a lot of congestion there.

Diane Bryant - Take in consideration all the people that go on the trail, there is a lot of congestion.

Susan Goodman – would the speed limit change? Mayor – nothing changes on the city streets. Susan – there is a curve with a 3 way stop and it is a little hazard, that will be an issue also. You have a hard time seeing when traveling on 300 East to the water tank.

Jack Davidson – all these 100-foot-wide streets will there be any painting or stop signs connecting into them? Mayor – they are neighborhood streets. Phillips – they can be stripped. Jack – I moved from California, a lot of things are different, it seems to be strange that there is no indication, on 100 east people are parking diagonally. Mayor – that is allowed on a 100-foot road. Jack – if you use that as major corridor it will have an impact. Melling – if major corridor we want stop lights, if not we want stop signs, it depends on the vision. Stoplights can back up. Jack – on 300 East there is a stop sign at 200 South and 400 South and then 820 South, quite a span. If you look google maps it takes you on Monterey.

Jeff Corry – if the council would consider a bridge on Paiute Drive to 100 East and make a straight shot to 400 East and the jog to 75 East. Hartley - nothing is in front to vote it as a corridor, Mayor Green brought that up. We are not voting on that as part of the printed map, that would come up in the future.

The hearing closed.

Phillips – Avenue Consultants did a great job. We will have to look and decide what we will accept and reject. There are only a few hot spots on the concerns of the congestions. Jonathan – we talked about when we met with Joel, the road running to the southeast we shot 55’ row, we talked increasing it a 66’ so that would be from South Mountain Drive to the Interchange. Phillips – is there anything in progress there? Joel – no. If we did that, we own a big piece of frontage and would be happy to make it a 66’ road. Melling – where it branches to the south is that School District property? Joel – yes, they own the frontage and I have a triangle piece. Phillips – 66’ road would make sense. If you put a round about people take the right lane.

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE TO THE CITY’S ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN. AVENUE CONSULTANTS/ JONATHAN STATHIS: this item was discussed in conjunction with the above item.
Jonathan – the city has a trails master plan; I would suggest overlaying the active transportation with the trails master plan, so we don’t lose any of that. Thomas – we have worked with your staff on that. We made a few corrections; they are in the maps. There is a lady that commented on transit, that is not part of the plan. The Paiute Drive is not on the map. On Joel’s property I want to run the models before we make that change. Jonathan – on Westview Drive, the City has been obtaining right of way, a lot has been acquired, especially on the north end for the 100 foot right of way. Melling – when looking at changing the model, if we further widen going south on South Mountain instead of going north, that will alleviate pressure into Eagle Ridge Subdivision as well.

Jonathan – the future interchange is shown at the fly over, there has been discussion with UDOT to line up with Westview Drive. Hartley – how far along on the north end of Westview, how far south have we gone to get the right of way? Jonathan - to the south end of the new County Subdivision. Hartley – all the way to Hwy-56? Jonathan – there are a few gaps. Melling – is there issues with driveways to the south? Jonathan – yes and one to the north also. The City has not acquired a lot of right of way on the south end, it is in the County. Phillips – there is not much development there. Jonathan – only 4B Ranch. Phillips – the widening has gone on for about 3 years, will staff decide? Paul – you will decide when you adopt the master plan. If you want a 75’ right-of-way we will start refunding money to the County. If you want 100’ then we will keep acquiring right of way. Melling – does the land use account for moving the interchange? Paul – there would be more commercial.

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

CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 38 OF THE CITY’S ORDINANCES REGARDING DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT DESIGN AND INSTALLATION STANDARDS. SUNRISE ENGINEERING/JONATHAN STATHIS:

Jonathan – this was brought before you the past two weeks. I ran some numbers on the different designed storms. The current is A 25 year 24-hour storm and rainfall data was done in 2000 by Bowen Collins, the chart summarizes the land area, attached Exhibit “C”. Changing the rainfall data, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) data is more current information. Going to NOAA would increase the pond area by 25%. The next is the 100-year 24-hour storm, that would double the size of the pond. The initial was 100-year 72-hour storm. Sunrise is recommending 100-year 24-hour storm. Melling – that is 10-acre development in medium density, that is more than low density. A $10,000 to $15,000 increase for 80 units. Jonathan – yes if you could get to the maximum which doesn’t usually happen. Melling – that is $300 per lot, I think that is palatable. Phillips – most are rock and weeds. Melling – you can make it deeper. Paul – we are seeing more and more underground detention areas. Melling – is there a way to look at drainage under the parking? Paul – yes, that is what they are doing. Melling – it is not prohibited? Jonathan – no, we allow parking lots to be used as long as the depth is not too high. Phillips – often the detention ponds are as you go into a development, and they are big. Isom – they can be used for open space, they do that in Gilbert Arizona. Riddle – with a detention pond on a development, 10,963 square feet, a large lot, once that is done and it floods and fills with silt, who cleans it? Paul – we do it if it is public, but if a PUD they clean it. Riddle – most are 3 foot deep? Jonathan – that is average. Riddle – do we ever make them deeper and not as
large, 6’ on 5,000 square feet. Jonathan – it depends on the topography; the outlet has to tie into the infrastructure downstream. Melling – if you do detention, it slows the water down. Does the retention numbers change? Jonathan – it is similar, see Exhibit "C". Riddle – same, once it fills with silt, do we clean that also? Paul – yes if it is public infrastructure. Jonathan – they have to be fenced. Hartley – the underground in Sunset Canyon, what water does that collect? Paul - during the flood it blew the manhole lids and filled the detention pond and out the outlet and flooded some homes in Crescent Hills. Jonathan – it is everything north of Cody Drive and to the east of the ridge. Mayor – that was the failure of Cody Drive.

Carter Wilkey – why can’t you gravel the bottom and make them a mini recharge pit? Paul – the floor of the basin is gravel and then the structure either recharges or drains out within 48 hours.

Tim Watson – a few things, I read quite a bit the past few days. I obtained information from Mr. Romeril and Stathis. From what I read detention is maintained by the public, but detention has to be privately owned. Retention requires a 42” fence but only a 36” depth. The overflow has to be at the elevation of the 100-year storm. The City streets are designed for the 10 year 3 hour storm, however the subdivision has to be designed for the 100-year 24-hour storm. The NOAA information changes from location to location in the City. If I look at Magnolia in Equestrian Point, that versus Shurtz Canyon is different. My detention pond for magnolia is 4.5 acres because I can only go 3 feet deep and no outlet for my storm drain, so I have to do retention. I could get and easement from Mr. Smith and drain some of the water to his property. I have to encumber 4.5 acres of land that will be privately owned because it is retention pond. We could put rock in it, but I still need 3 feet. Melling – what is the rationale of 3 feet? Jonathan – it is a safety issue; retention water will stay longer. Tim - detention Pond can be deeper, drowning doesn’t take 48 hours. Phillips – do you have a suggestion? Tim – deeper with a higher fence around it. I don’t understand if the streets are a 10-year 3-hour event and subdivision 100-year 24-hour event. A Shurtz Canyon is 1.2 inches, for 10 years, but double the water for a 100-year storm. I am not objecting, are we really worried about the high intensity storm, can we stay consistent and can we make the retention and detention work. Jonathan – I would be willing to go deeper on retention if we can keep people out. There may be a little misunderstanding, the rainfall a street or storm drain needs to be a 3-hour 100-year storm, the drainage needs to be taken off the street and conveyed quickly, that is why we are looking at longer duration, the pond can dissipate, store and release the water. Tim – the stormwater should contain a 10-year 3-hour storm. Is there something to make it consistent. Jonathan – the street is a conveyance system. We first look at can the street carry a 100-year 3-hour storm if it can’t the excess has to go into the storm drain system. If we are only designing without the road conveying it then you look at a 10-year 3-hour storm. We use the 100-year 3-hour storm, if the road cannot carry it there needs to be a storm drain to carry the excess. Tim – Shurtz Canyon is 2.31 inches where the 100-year 3-hour storm is 2.99. I understand the excess has to be piped somewhere and that depends on the street grades. Can we go deeper with retention, on commercial they have to pump them out to maintain the cfs. If we get into detention will there be something requiring gravity flow versus pumps. Can we do something similar with retention? Jonathan – NOAA does differ depending on the weather station. I took the data from the Airport Station.
NOAA gives flexibility, you can also look at a specific site. The other was looking at the city as a whole. Melling – I appreciate that they can offset with impact fees. Jonathan – the offset in cost is a savings in the impact fees. One other thing was on the LID, a good compromise to not require the LID at this time, but it is an option for developers. Melling – long term we could require it, if we do we set a date a few years out to make it mandatory. Jonathan – it will become mandatory when we hit the population threshold. Melling – maybe we should be a head of the curve. Paul – we can adopt the standards sooner than required. Jonathan – I agree, it would be nice to take time to work that in.

CONSIDER A NEW HANGAR LEASE AT THE AIRPORT. CHRIS & REBECCS SAUNDERS/NICK HOLT: Nick Holt – this is a lease for Chris and Rebecca Saunders, this is to build a 60 x 60 hangar, a standard lease 20 years with 5 5-year renewals with the standard $0.30 lease. consent

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REVISION TO THE 2021-2022 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET. JASON NORRIS: Jason – we are going to do another budget revision to expedite storm drain projects. We did a few other adjustments with this. We are receiving $4,414,341 of ARPA funding from the State of Utah, there is an exemption where you can claim those funds and don’t have to put them toward specific eligible projects. If that changes, we may treat it different in accounting. In RAP tax we are reallocating RAP tax funding earmarked for childcare facility at the Aquatic Center and put it towards the Pickle Ball project. With RAP tax we have a set amount collected in prior years and when projects are presented the committee wants us to get as much done as possible. A little over $300,00 was for pickle ball, with the design it will be more than allocated. Heritage Center came in and Jason presented costs for electrical, they need an additional $15,000 that will come out of general fund. Street Department, capital outlay called Cody Drive, not all $4,414,341 for Cody Drive. Pickle Ball in parks. Golf Course, I was unaware they were given RAP Tax funding for the driving range surface without being on the natural grass, and the amount was $25,000 because they also had a roof fix. The RAP Tax fund accounts for the transfers. Coal Creek Flood Control, NRCS grant for rip rap and channel $477,566 is the cash portion, Public Works will do in kind work. Melling – I thought that was materials. Paul – it is, but also our people, we will haul the rocks, there won’t be a cash amount other than the fuel and labor. Aquatic Center construction is reducing funds transferred to pickle ball, there is still money for the outdoor ninja warrior amenity. Water fund we want a new item $220,000 to go out and contract a company for water exploration. Mayor – this is the Willow Sticks project; they have given us a scope and what it will cost. You will hear from them at the retreat before your vote on this. This is exploring 6 or 7 areas where they think we should drill wells. Hartley – for clarification, if we approve the budget revision, is that approving that project or moving the money. Mayor – moving the money.

Mayor opened the public hearing. Wendy Green – does that make it so you are over the budget? Jason – we have our annual base budget that captures most of what we do operationally and capital that was approved in July 1st. In November we had existing projects moved into the new year. This is new spending, ARPA is a federal grant and NRCS is also federal funding we have been awarded, the elected body says yes, we want the money and approve spending. RAP tax was existing funds, just changing project. The Golf had been
awarded money through the process; I am moving it from RAP tax to the budget. Paul – that should have happened quite a while ago. Phillips – we have the funds. The hearing closed.

CONSIDER A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE CITY PERSONNEL POLICY.

NATASHA HIRSCHI: Natasha Hirsch, Human Resources - this is a minor policy change, we want to lengthen probation, we send them to academy from 6 to 18 weeks, so we want to change until after Field Training. Phillips – would that be a problem with hiring? No. Hartley – does it change vesting? Natasha – it does not affect retirement; it extends how long we can part ways for any reason. We cannot evaluate their performance when they are at the academy.

CONSIDER AIRPORT GRANT APPLICATION FOR AIP 043. NICK HOLT: Nick Holt, Airport Manager – this will be changed to 045, I was notified today. We took 042 for approval, that was not funded for the FAA they changed the 42 to 43 and pushed the 43 to 45. This is for pavement maintenance, taxiway Charlie, will go in front of the FBO, commercial ramp south ramp and FBO ramp. It won’t cover 50’ in front of the building. It will crack seal this fall and next spring seal coat. Phillips – when will we be notified on the grant? Nick – they are backed up, it will take longer than normal, it may be this fall. Estimated cost is $288,000 it is a 95/5% match, ineligible amount is estimated at $20,000. Hartley – will we have time to complete this year? Nick – we hope the work will start this fall. It depends on how long it takes to get bids back.

CONSIDER AIRPORT GRANT APPLICATION FOR AIP 044. NICK HOLT: Nick Holt, Airport Manager – this is the Airport Master Plan, the airport is growing rapidly and with the business growth that is what is triggering the update. The number came back at $700,000 we negotiated, we have Gabbie as the PIO and that takes it to $615,659. Those will be our entitlement funding if the Airport sees 10,000 enplanements.

Tyler – the AIP agreement the Mayor got today has already been approved by the Council? Nick - Yes, it was approved as AIP 042, but the number has changed, but the scope of the work is the same.

CONSIDER CONTRACT AMOUNTS WITH ENGINEERING FIRMS FOR THE DESIGN OF CITY CAPITAL PROJECTS. JONATHAN STATHIS. This item was pulled.

REVIEW IMPACT FEES. PAUL BITTMENN: Paul - we adopted a impact fee facility plan last January and we adopted new rates. The way the act works, the cities can impose fees up to what is justified in the impact fee analysis and facility plan, but they don’t have to go that high. Cedar City chose to adopt fees, almost across the board, below what the analysis justified. I gave you all the categories, we will focus on single family residential, adopted rates most increased from a year ago, police decreased a little, storm water decreased quite a bit, and Parks & Recreation almost held the same $312 difference. Water went up, wastewater was steady, and transportation was steady. The question council had for staff was we need to review them every year and make sure that the reduction we put in a year ago is still our meeting our needs, we don’t want to get behind and then have to take huge jumps
in the future. The decision paper shows the rates and what was collected over the past FY, the last part of the decision shows the amount of impact fees collected over the last fiscal year. These are numbers that Jason has to track closely and report to the State, he has a spread sheet that shows where the fees came from and who paid them. Water we accumulated over a million last year, in Wastewater over a \(\frac{1}{2}\) million, in Storm Water $300,000, in Transportation \(\frac{1}{2}\) million, Fire about $84,000, Police about $94,000 and Parks about $740,000. We spend the fees different for each operation. Right now, the Fire impact fee is pledged on debt on a large ladder truck. Police fees are for their debt on this building, for the Police Department. Water impact fees are used for a lot of different projects, for tanks, wells, lines and looking for new sources of ground water. Transportation impact fees are spent on road improvements, increasing widths or making a better road for the future. From staffs perspective we are in ok shape, we are not recommending changing. Phillips – even if we have deficits in water and wastewater? Paul - water and wastewater show deficits because we have cash allocated to projects, they are projects that haven’t been completed. So while those projects are setting there not completed, the money budgeted toward them, you are still accumulating funds coming in without funds going out. Even with the money pledged to those projects, I think we are fine. We have more coming in than going out. Isom – the storm water issues we experienced, are we still ok. Paul – storm water we will have to look at that from two perspectives, impact fees cannot fix deficiencies, they go to tomorrow's infrastructure, we are tight there with all the development, but I think we will be ok a little longer. The conversation we need to have now is the existing storm water fees are probably not sufficient given the size of what we think Sunrise is going to come back and recommend in terms of projects to fix existing infrastructure. Once we get the storm water master plan we can come back and look to change storm water fees. Melling – will the master plan give us the basis for making changes? Paul – you use the new adopted storm water master plan and run it through the impact fee analysis, we can micro focus on any area. The recommended fee was $275, that is $400 less than prior, it went down. If we have a new master plan with a larger cross section of infrastructure, we can run that through the analysis and come back with a new storm water. We usually do them all at once, because it is not fun, but you don’t have to.

Melling – builders are not a fan of impact fees, I will fight for them on land issues, but impact fees are one of the only fees that if not assessed constitute a subsides. If there is infrastructure that we need to maintain a level of service on, then we need to charge the full impact fee. Since we have hiked water acquisition a whole lot, I am ok to leave them alone as long as we come back annually. Paul – we will come back next year. Phillips – on police and fire, we adopted on the highest level, since growth is so affecting our ability in public safety, how do we build impact fees to help us build infrastructure for a new facility. Paul – you have to incorporate something that says you need a new police station and 3 new fire stations; you have to justify, or the analysis won’t show you need the revenue. If you incorporate for 3 fire stations, the fee will be really high for fire, and it is hard to build and staff 3 fire station in a short window. If we want to build a new public safety building, we should go back and adjust that impact fee also. Phillips – the Police owes money toward this building, I thought it was paid for. Jason – the Police funds did not generate enough to pay their share of debt service, so the Police owes the general fund. Paul – there are few things
you can buy with Police impact fees; you cannot buy vehicles, guns, etc. facilities are what you can spend them on.

Mayor – the commercial impact fee is one size fits all, 1,000 square feet is the same for a hotel and warehouse, I wish it was different type of impact fees for different types of commercial, some need to be more, some less. Jonathan – it is based on meter size not square footage for water and sewer. Paul – if you only have a connection for a restroom versus a hotel your calculations will be different. Jonathan – the water and wastewater is based on the meter size, so they are different.

Paul – we will hold off for a year, if we run into problems we will come back.

Carter Wilkey – the money for parks impact fee, is there a project already it is earmarked for, tonight we took RAP money from one project for pickle ball. Melling – RAP tax is more restrictive than impact fees, so we spend RAP first. Paul – the daycare was part of the expansion of the facility, we are no longer expanding the facility. Carter – is it earmarked for a project? Jason – no. There are the state reports and internal reports, we have a number of projects budgeted in rec impact fees, most are trails, they are available for what the Mayor and Council decides in the budget process. With RAP we get $600,000 so there will be stuff people want to do this summer. Carter – can you combine RAP project and impact fee in one? Jason, - if it is new. Paul - yes if they qualify.

CLOSED SESSION – PENDING LITIGATION AND PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS:
Councilmember Isom moved to go into closed session at 9:15 p.m.; second by Councilmember Melling; roll call vote as follows:

Terri Hartley - AYE
Craig Isom - AYE
Tyler Melling - AYE
Scott Phillips - AYE
Ronald Riddle - AYE

ADJOURN: Councilmember Isom moved to adjourn at 9:56 p.m.; second by Councilmember Hartley; vote unanimous.

Renon Savage, MMC
Cedar City Recorder
The general plan... is an "advisory document"... not regulatory.

...not zoning.

Role of the General Plan.

...serves as the rationale for any land use ordinance or capital investment a community wants to implement.

...establishes a common understanding of the vision of the community.
Project Timeline

City awarded the project (to RCC) in July, 2020.
Steering Committee meetings (ongoing).
Draft availability in (really-late) Summer, 2021.
PC recommend adoption, February 2022.
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Plan Themes

- Water, traffic, and housing issues are significant.
- The rate of change for many residents is a strain on them. Expectations are high.
- Cedar City is an attractive community, more people will want to live here.
The previous draft recommends an RDO requirement for proposals that exceed "80 acres."

The PC felt like the City's RDO development agreement (and/or the RDO) for large future developments.

f. Consider updating the land use ordinance to require a master development agreement to require a master development agreement.
Changes to PC Draft (2 of 6)

FEATHERING

Consultant Recommendation:

New objective - "03-1.9. Develop a land use code amendment that encourages and defines flexibility of site design in order to encourage density transitions (i.e. "feathering") while maintaining the intent of the gross density."  

Discussion:

The City wants to strengthen its encouragement of "feathering" within and between developments. Currently discussed on p22. Implementation of the concept will be done in the zoning ordinance.
support existing expanded programming.

support additional staff positions for the Heritage Theatre to enhance and

Education + Arts Short Term Opportunity (1-5 yrs) = The City should

reduce recharge potential.

increase the stress on the aquifer. Increasing hardscapes can also

on the City's existing infrastructure. Specifically, a growing population will

Infrastructure Constraint = Continued Growth will put additional pressure

Changes to PC Draft (3 of 6)
Changes to PC Draft (4 of 6)

Healthcare (new objective) = 017-1.4 Ensure opportunities remain available for the expansion of the Cedar City Hospital to provide for continued excellence in services to meet Cedar City's expected growth.
Changes to PC Draft
(5 of 6)

CONSULTANT RECOMMENDATION:
Reassign the street frontage to "civic" use for the USFS office and State Park facilities.
Changes to PC Draft (6 of 6)

CONSULTANT RECOMMENDATION:

Move the future commercial along Lund north to the alignment of the 3000/3200 N. corridor.
Cedar City

Transportation & Active Transportation Plan

City Council Meeting: Feb 16th, 2022
Vision & Goals

Joint Vision & Goals crafted by the project Steering Committee comprised of representatives from Enoch City, Cedar City, Iron County, UDOT, and SW Health Department

Collaborating to Create an Active and Connected Transportation Future

- Improve connectivity within the transportation network
- Enhance safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers
- Expand access to destinations through a multimodal network for all ages and abilities
- Collaborating for a multi-jurisdictional commitment
- Engage and listen to all users
Existing Conditions

An extensive Existing Conditions Chapter highlights the current state of transportation.
Growth

Population and employment in Iron County are expected to grow by 40% over the next 30 years.

Without transportation improvements, congestion and resulting delays will increase significantly.

As a result, Cedar City & Enoch are updating their Transportation and Active Transportation Plans to meet this growing demand!
Growth

Potential developments we've heard about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Horse</td>
<td>3,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer Meadows</td>
<td>1,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Sorel Ranch</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Main Commercial</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B Ranch</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,228</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current & Predicted Congestion

Roadway congestion is measured by means of level of service (LOS) which is the relationship between the traffic volume and the capacity of each roadway. Green roads have little or no traffic congestion corresponding to LOS A, B or C, while orange and red roads have "peak hour" traffic congestion. The current traffic congestion is displayed to the right.

If no improvements are made to the roadway network (No Build Scenario), by 2050 near 12 roadway segments will have LOS D or worse.
Public Involvement

Public Survey

- Assessed travel modes and frequency, transportation priorities, walking and biking, and areas of concern.
- 573 completed surveys – 109 from Enoch
- 1,300+ website views
- Statistically significant survey numbers for the area!

Project Website: www.cedarenochplan.com
Public Survey Results
How important is walking by community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cedar City</th>
<th>Enoch</th>
<th>Iron County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Importance</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

avenue | CONSULTANTS
Public Survey Results

What transportation issues are you most concerned within Cedar City and Enoch?

- Biking/Walking Options: 21% Cedar City, 22% Enoch, 13% Iron County
- Congestion: 35% Cedar City, 37% Enoch, 41% Iron County
- Connectivity: 6% Cedar City, 15% Enoch, 18% Iron County
- Public Transportation: 15% Cedar City, 8% Enoch, 8% Iron County
- Other: 5% Cedar City, 5% Enoch, 8% Iron County
- Safety: 19% Cedar City, 14% Enoch, 11% Iron County

avenue CONSULTANTS
Public Survey Results
Public Comment Map

- 293 comments placed on map;
  - 120 – Safety Concern
  - 84 – Project Idea
  - 68 – Needs Improvement
  - 21 – Keep as is

Access all comments here:
Public Open House

- Held on March 30\textsuperscript{st}, 2021 at Festival Hall
- 65+ attendants
- Support for capacity projects, including enhancements to South Cedar Interchange.
- Support for widespread active transportation projects.
Future Roadway Classification

Streets provide for two distinct functions: mobility and land access.

- **Arterial roads** (shown in red and green) are designed to serve greater mobility with fast flowing traffic. These roads provide the most direct route for cars, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit.

- **Collectors** (shown in purple and yellow) can offer higher comfortability for pedestrians and bikers because of lower vehicle speeds and a variety of access options.

- **Local Roads** - The primary function of local roads is to provide access to land parcels. Through movement is usually discouraged, and they are not intended for long-distance travel.

We recommended adjustments to the roadway cross-sections to be improved.
Roadway Cross-Sections

Roadway cross-sections are essential for understanding the function, capacity, and speed, as well as the look and feel of a road. The roadway cross-section standards for Cedar City are based on the City's engineering standards.
Roadway Cross-Sections

MINOR ARTERIAL

25' RIGHT OF WAY

8' Shoulder / Bike Lane
14' Travel Lane
14' Travel Lane
14' Shoulder / Bike Lane

PRINCIPAL ARTERIAL

100' RIGHT OF WAY

8' Shoulder / Bike Lane
12' Travel Lane
12' Travel Lane
12' Shoulder / Bike Lane
8'
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Roadway Improvements:

The proposed roadway improvements, displayed on the right, would prepare Cedar City roadways for the expected growth and help minimize delays.

We modeled congestion levels based on the Transportation Plan improvements. Notice how congestion lessens (more roads turn green) after the Transportation Plan improvements are implemented compared to the No Build Scenario!
Roadway Improvements

Capital Improvement Projects - Roadway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SR-130</td>
<td>Widening with Sidewalk</td>
<td>3000 North to Midvalley Highway</td>
<td>$12,585,000</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Westview Drive</td>
<td>Widening with Bike Lane</td>
<td>Old 91 to SR 56</td>
<td>$14,724,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coal Creek Road</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>Bulldog Road to Main Street</td>
<td>$1,004,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kitty Hawk Drive</td>
<td>Widening/Realign with Bike Lane</td>
<td>Airport Road to Bulldog Road</td>
<td>$2,164,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2400 North</td>
<td>Widening with Sidewalk</td>
<td>Nichols Canyon Road to SR 130</td>
<td>$2,811,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2400 North</td>
<td>Widening with Bike Lane</td>
<td>Clark Parkway to Nichols Canyon Road</td>
<td>$7,004,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2400 North</td>
<td>New Road with Bike Lane &amp; Shoulder Bikeway</td>
<td>2500 West to Clark Parkway</td>
<td>$5,781,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2400 North</td>
<td>Widening with Shoulder Bikeway</td>
<td>3100 West to 2500 West</td>
<td>$4,256,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1800 South</td>
<td>New Road with Shoulder Bikeway</td>
<td>Cedar Valley Belt Route to Westview Drive</td>
<td>$3,256,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Improvement Projects - Intersection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Main Street / I-15</td>
<td>Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>UDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Airport Road / Kitty Hawk Drive</td>
<td>Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>$867,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fiddlers Canyon Road / Main Street</td>
<td>Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>$498,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>300 West / Main Street</td>
<td>Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>Cedar City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Transportation

An active transportation (AT) network is a key component of a transportation system because it provides mobility options for all residents by means of biking and walking.

While Cedar City does not have an extensive existing AT network, they are in a good position to expand upon existing facilities to provide local and regional options that offer high-comfort for users and desirable accessibility to the origins and destinations within both cities.
Active Transportation

Facilities recommended in this plan include:

- Signed Shared Roadways
- Shoulder Bikeways
- Bike Lanes
- Sidepaths & Multi-use paths
Cross Hollow Interchange

UDOT led a study to look at improvements

Information can be found on UPLAN

https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/e406266ea445477ab8380750d66d9a5f
Cross Hollow Interchange

2021 Existing & 2021 Adjusted Saturday Peak Volumes
South Cedar Interchange Study

2021 Adjusted Saturday Peak Level of Service
South Cedar Interchange Study
Cross Hollow Interchange

2030 No Build Saturday Peak Level of Service
South Cedar Interchange Study

2030 No Build Saturday Peak Average & 95th Percentile Queue Lengths
South Cedar Interchange Study
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Cross Hollow Interchange

Near-term East/West Connection:

- This solution utilizes existing structure from an old I-15 ramp to accommodate east/west traffic
- It will remove some through-traffic from the interchange
- This solution delays DDI operational failure to year 2040 and
- It creates MOT options for future interchange upgrades

Near-term Improvements - $20 million
Cross Hollow Interchange

**Long-term Solution:**

- Upgrades the existing DDI to a Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI)
- This solution incorporates intersection improvements from interim concept
- The year 2050 requires three through lanes in each direction even with east/west connection

Long-term Improvements - $65 million
Cross Hollow Interchange

Near-term Improvements - $20 million

Long-term Improvements - $65 million
Thank you!
### Summary – Detention Pond
(10-acre development site, medium-density)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Storm</th>
<th>Rainfall Data</th>
<th>Pond Area in sq. ft. (assuming 3' depth)</th>
<th>% increase in size</th>
<th>Land &amp; Const. Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Cost Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-year, 24-hour</td>
<td>Bowen Collins report from 2000 (currently used)</td>
<td>5,424</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$12,776</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-year, 24-hour</td>
<td>NOAA Atlas 14</td>
<td>6,787</td>
<td>+25%</td>
<td>$15,986</td>
<td>$3,210 +25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year, 24-hour</td>
<td>NOAA Atlas 14</td>
<td>10,963</td>
<td>+102%</td>
<td>$25,822</td>
<td>$13,046 +102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year, 72-hour</td>
<td>NOAA Atlas 14</td>
<td>10,963</td>
<td>+102%</td>
<td>$25,822</td>
<td>$13,046 +102%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary – Retention Pond
(10-acre development site, medium-density)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Storm</th>
<th>Rainfall Data</th>
<th>Pond Area in sq. ft. (assuming 3' depth)</th>
<th>% increase in size</th>
<th>Land &amp; Const. Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Cost Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-year, 24-hour</td>
<td>Bowen Collins report from 2000 (currently used)</td>
<td>8,172</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$19,248</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-year, 24-hour</td>
<td>NOAA Atlas 14</td>
<td>8,443</td>
<td>+3%</td>
<td>$19,887</td>
<td>$639 +3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year, 24-hour</td>
<td>NOAA Atlas 14</td>
<td>12,619</td>
<td>+54%</td>
<td>$29,723</td>
<td>$10,475 +54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year, 72-hour</td>
<td>NOAA Atlas 14</td>
<td>12,619</td>
<td>+54%</td>
<td>$29,723</td>
<td>$10,475 +54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary – Storm Drain Pipe
(50-acre drainage area, medium-density)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Return Period</th>
<th>Peak flow (cfs)</th>
<th>% increase in peak flow</th>
<th>Pipe diameter (1% slope)</th>
<th>Approx. Cost/foot</th>
<th>% cost increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-year, 24-hour</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30-inch (41 cfs capacity)</td>
<td>$108</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year, 72-hour</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>36-inch (66.7 cfs)</td>
<td>$153</td>
<td>+42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>