



ALPINE CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

NOTICE is hereby given that the **CITY COUNCIL** of Alpine City, Utah will hold a Public Meeting on **Tuesday, June 27, 2017 at 7:00 pm** at Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, Utah as follows:

- I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER** ***Council Members may participate electronically by phone.**
 - A. Roll Call:** Mayor Wimmer
 - B. Prayer:** Troy Stout
 - C. Pledge of Allegiance:** By invitation
- II. PUBLIC COMMENT**
- III. CONSENT CALENDAR**
 - A. Minutes of June 13, 2017 City Council Meeting**
 - B. Bond Release – Three Falls Ranch Phase 2**
 - C. Ken Garff For Truck Purchase, Fiscal Year Budget 2017-18**
 - D. Surplus 2000 GMC Pickup Truck**
 - E. Payment to Smithco for well house air conditioning**
- IV. REPORTS and PRESENTATIONS**
 - A. Swearing-in of the Alpine Youth Council – Judge Schaeffer-Bullock**
 - B. Presentation to Brad Freeman**
- V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - A. PUBLIC HEARING – Amending Budget FY 2016-17:** The City Council will receive public comment on the amending the budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17.
 - B. Ordinance No. 2017-14, Amending Budget FY 2016-17:** The Council will consider amend the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17.
 - C. Sweeper Lease:** The Council will consider approving a lease agreement for a sweeper vehicle lease for the Public Works Department.
 - D. Ordinance No. 2017-12 Amending the Development Code, Article 4.7, Private Streets:** The Council will consider approving an amendment that will provide consistency in the Code regarding private streets.
 - E. Ordinance No. 2017-13 Amending the Development Code, Section 3.21.6:** The Council will consider approving an amendment that would allow open style fences on top of a retaining wall.
- VI. STAFF REPORTS**
- VII. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION**
- VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Discuss litigation, property acquisition or the professional character, conduct or competency of personnel.

ADJOURN

Mayor Sheldon Wimmer
June 23, 2017

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN ALL CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS. If you need a special accommodation to participate, please call the City Recorder's Office at (801) 756-6241.
CERTIFICATE OF POSTING. The undersigned duly appointed recorder does hereby certify that the above agenda notice was on the bulletin board located inside City Hall at 20 North Main and sent by e-mail to The Daily Herald located in Provo, UT, a local newspaper circulated in Alpine, UT. This agenda is also available on our web site at www.alpinecity.org and on the Utah Public Meeting Notices website at www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html

PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING ETIQUETTE

Please remember all public meetings and public hearings are now recorded.

- All comments **must** be recognized by the Chairperson and addressed through the microphone.
- When speaking to the Planning Commission, please stand, speak slowly and clearly into the microphone, and state your name and address for the recorded record.
- Be respectful to others and refrain from disruptions during the meeting. Please refrain from conversation with others in the audience as the microphones are very sensitive and can pick up whispers in the back of the room.
- Keep comments constructive and not disruptive.
- Avoid verbal approval or dissatisfaction of the ongoing discussion (i.e., booing or applauding).
- Exhibits (photos, petitions, etc.) given to the City become the property of the City.
- Please silence all cellular phones, beepers, pagers or other noise making devices.
- Be considerate of others who wish to speak by limiting your comments to a reasonable length, and avoiding repetition of what has already been said. Individuals may be limited to two minutes and group representatives may be limited to five minutes.
- Refrain from congregating near the doors or in the lobby area outside the council room to talk as it can be very noisy and disruptive. If you must carry on conversation in this area, please be as quiet as possible. (The doors must remain open during a public meeting/hearing.)

Public Hearing vs. Public Meeting

If the meeting is a **public hearing**, the public may participate during that time and may present opinions and evidence for the issue for which the hearing is being held. In a public hearing there may be some restrictions on participation such as time limits.

Anyone can observe a **public meeting**, but there is no right to speak or be heard there - the public participates in presenting opinions and evidence at the pleasure of the body conducting the meeting.

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Alpine City Hall, 20 N. Main, Alpine, UT
June 13, 2017

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Mayor Sheldon Wimmer.

A. Roll Call: The following were present and constituted a quorum:

Mayor Sheldon Wimmer

Council Members: Ramon Beck, Lon Lott, Troy Stout (participated by phone), Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant

Staff: Shane Sorensen, David Church, Jason Bond

Others: Carson Pennie, Cooper Pennie, Jams Da Christensen, Judi Pickell, Rob Schoen, Melanie Ewing, Sylvia Christiansen, Mike Russon, Will Jones, Gale Rudolph, Jessica Smuin, Linda McGee, Rose Fjeldsted, Tiffinee Smart, Shawn Smart, Vickie Callister, Emily Callister, Richard Callister, Brenda Webb, Cynthia Bates, Brian Bates, Carla Merrill, Blair Buswell, Julie Buswell, Scott Hacking, Megan Hacking, Dan Egan, Kristen Egan, Bryce Huff, Chrissy Hannemann

B. Prayer: Lon Lott

C. Pledge of Allegiance: Scouts

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Will Jones asked the Council to continue the prohibition of parking along the public roads in Three Falls. They had built a parking lot with amenities where people could park if they wanted to hike in the open space. Last week he had three groups they had to talk to about building fire pits under the trees in the Three Falls open space. If people had to hike in, it reduced those offenses.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of May 23, 2017 City Council meeting

B. White Pine Estates Bond Release - \$369,377.32

C. Alpine West Meadow Bond Release - \$342,530.10

D. Payment to Carlton, Inc – North Pointe waterline - \$75,126.67

E. Resolution No. R2017-14 Adopting the Mountainland Pre-Disaster Hazard Mitigation Plan

MOTION: Roger Bennett moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Ramon Beck seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Lon Lott, Kimberly Bryant, Roger Bennett, Ramon Beck, Troy Stout voted aye. Motion passed.

IV. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

A. Announcement of Candidates for Mayor and two City Council seats: Shane Sorensen said there were four candidates for the mayor seat. They were Rob Schoem, Sheldon Wimmer, Troy Stout, and Melanie Ewing. A primary election would be required for the mayor seat. There were four candidates for two seats on the City Council. They were Carla Merrill, Judi Pickell, Steve Cospers, Paul Kroff.

B. Report on the Utah County Resource Management Plan – County Commissioner Lee: The County was required to present the Resource Management Plan to all the cities in Utah County prior to adopting it into their Master Plan on August 1st. A copy of the draft plan had been emailed out to all the members of the City Council and the Mayor, and was included in the electronic packet. Commissioner Lee reviewed the basics of the plan, and said he would love to have comments from the cities and citizens, especially those whose land such as Alpine was adjacent to the county land.

Lon Lott said he had read much of the plan and found it interesting. He asked about the county interest in land that was uninhabited. Commissioner Lee said they supported the highest and best use of those lands. They would like to collaborate with the property owners and cities to promote annexation into the cities. There were also a lot of

1 disjointed slivers of federal lands that were surrounded by cities or counties. Lon Lott expressed appreciation for the
2 work of the County.

3
4 Troy Stout asked the County's philosophy about land that came to the county for rezoning then was handed off to
5 the city. He asked if they thought the landowner should go to the city first. Commissioner Lee said his preference
6 was to see a clear path where the landowner came to the city for rezoning. He wasn't in favor of rezoning a piece of
7 land just to make it more appealing.

8
9 Troy Stout said that if a property was not slated for immediate annexation, would the county be inclined to zone that
10 property to closely match the zoning in adjoining city property. Commissioner Lee said that would probably need to
11 be done on a case by case basis. The County was not really equipped to serve the development spread out around the
12 county and they would prefer to see them annexed into the adjacent cities wherever possible.

13
14 There were some difficulties with Councilman Stout's phone connection, who was participating in the meeting
15 electronically, so Commission Lee asked Mr. Stout to contact on his cell phone if he had further questions and gave
16 him his cell number.

17
18 Mayor Wimmer thanked Commissioner Lee for taking the time to come over and meet with them.

19 20 **V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

21
22 **A. PUBLIC HEARING – Amending Municipal Code 3-818, Compensation and Salaries:** Mayor
23 Sheldon Wimmer opened the meeting to public comment on the proposed amendment which would increase the
24 monthly compensation for the positions of mayor from \$800/month to \$1000/month, councilmember from
25 \$400/month to \$500/month. The extra compensation for extra meetings would be eliminated. The planning
26 commission members would go from \$35/month to \$50/month. The mayor and councilmembers would also receive
27 a per diem allowance of \$500 per term for the purchase of a tablet, computer, etc. for communication.

28
29 Will Jones said that as a past councilman, he felt that what the council received was fair compensation. It worked
30 out to about \$200 a meeting. He said they needed to remember it was public service. If the reward became the issue,
31 they lost the meaning of public service.

32
33 Roman Frazier said he seconded what Will Jones had said. He was there as a scoutmaster and that service was not
34 compensated \$100 a week.

35
36 Jessica Smuin said she felt the council deserved a little more because they did a lot and Alpine was underpaid
37 compared with other communities.

38
39 Troy Stout said he was unable to hear the public comments so Lon Lott summarized them for him.

40
41 There was no other discussion and Mayor Wimmer closed the public hearing.

42
43 **B. Ordinance No. 2017-09, Amending the Municipal Code 3-818, Compensation and Salaries:**
44 Sheldon Wimmer said this was on the agenda at the request of councilmembers Troy Stout and Kimberly Bryant.

45
46 Troy Stout said that the Alpine City Council and Mayor were paid less than any city in the county. He felt it was a
47 healthy thing to review the salaries. Some people were happy to donate what they made to the city but there were
48 others who did not have that kind of income. They needed to ask if that was fair to citizens who wanted to run for
49 office. All the previous councils had done a great job at keeping down the city's expenses. He said he felt they were
50 long overdue for an increase.

51
52 Kimberly Bryant said Will Jones had worked really hard as a councilmember and she appreciated that. The pay
53 worked out to about \$200 a meeting but the time she spent at Council meetings took the least amount of time. She
54 spent a lot of time attending other meetings and talking to citizens about City-related issues. The Alpine City
55 Council was one of the lowest paid councils in the county. She said serving on the Council was not a job she did for
56 the money, but she felt strongly about trying to get other people to run. There were some who would like to run for

1 office but it wasn't worth it in relation to the time commitment and what they were paid. She said she would like to
2 see an increase in salary to entice good people to run for office.

3
4 Lon Lott said he was 55 years old before he realized that people who served in city government made money. When
5 he put his name in the hat to run for office, he ran on the assumption that it was totally voluntary. But he could see
6 what Kimberly Bryant was saying because he did spend a lot of time on city business. Some of it was very
7 unpleasant and some of it was very rewarding.

8
9 Roger Bennett said what he received was extra that he used for trips, etc. He didn't need a raise and didn't want a
10 raise as a city councilman. He would be okay if the mayor received extra compensation.

11
12 Ramon Beck said there were other expenses involved in the job such as car trips. He personally did not need the
13 money but he could see that there were others who would need the compensation for the time and expense. He could
14 be the swing vote. He said that for the time that went into the being on the Council and the unpaid expenses, the
15 \$400 a month really didn't cover it. He could go either way.

16
17 Kimberly Bryant said she thought it was great that some people didn't need the money. Don Watkins had turned his
18 check back to the city for to pay for the bell tower. But there were some who needed the money and the sitting
19 council members were not the only people that would ever be on the council. They needed to look to the future
20 when there were others who wanted to serve. She said another issue was that she didn't think it was fair to increase
21 the compensation for the mayor but not for the council because they all put in a lot of time. She said the proposed
22 salary increase for councilmembers was not really an increase. It would be either be a wash or a decrease because it
23 would take about the \$50 allowance for extra meetings attended during the month.

24
25 Regarding travel expenses, Troy Stout said he worked in Salt Lake and sometimes had to run back and forth to
26 attend Council meetings. He was not compensated for travel expenses. Sheldon Wimmer said that they could be
27 reimbursed for travel expenses according to code.

28
29 Troy Stout also noted that the proposed ordinance stated that they would not be paid if they missed more than two
30 meetings a year without an excused absence.

31
32 **MOTION:** Troy Stout moved to reject Ordinance No. 2017-11 amending the Municipal Code 3-818, Compensation
33 and Salaries for city council and mayor. Kimberly Bryant seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Troy Stout, Ramon Beck,
34 Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott voted aye. Motion passed.

35
36 **C. PUBLIC HEARING – Final Budget Fiscal Year 2017-18:** Shane Sorensen said the Tentative Budget
37 was presented a month ago and there were some changes based on that discussion. Line item 45 would need to be
38 adjusted. He said that most of the adjustments from the Tentative Budget were minor and in most cases the budget
39 for the department was less than the budget for the previous year. There was an increase in professional service fees
40 due to litigation costs. There was an increase of \$10,000 in the election budget in anticipation of a primary election.
41 Minor adjustments were made on the budgets for police and fire. The police budget was actually lower than the
42 tentative budget. Sheldon Wimmer said the figures from the PSD were based on the budgets adopted by those
43 departments. There was an increase in the budget for streets for City participation in improving Grove Drive, and
44 some rollover projects from the current budget year. Funds for automated metering for culinary and PI water were
45 on hold pending the latest technology and a grant the City had applied for. Waterline replacement funds had been
46 increased from \$100,000 to \$200,000.

47
48 Mr. Sorensen said this was the last year for the one-dollar per year increase on culinary rates. Trash collection rates
49 would increase on the second trash can to stay current with ACE contract. The finance director position had not been
50 filled but funds were in reserve to fill it if needed. Currently, the City had contracted with a part-time person to help
51 with finances. The budget anticipated an increase in the salaries for mayor and council, which didn't pass. Kimberly
52 Bryant suggested that be used for Youth Council. Finally, the proposed budget changed how they budgeted for
53 Alpine Days.

54
55 Mayor Wimmer opened the public hearing on the budget.
56

1 Jessica Smuin on Moyle Drive asked about the increase in the Alpine Days budget. It went from \$40,000 to
 2 \$134,000. Shane Sorensen explained that in the past, the City would budget about \$40,000 and the chairman would
 3 attempt to raise funds to pay for Alpine Days events. If insufficient funds were raised, the City would pick up the
 4 shortfall. The Council decided to just budget for the actual cost of Alpine Days so they wouldn't have to go in and
 5 adjust it according to revenue. If donations and revenue from ticket sales came in, the City would end up spending
 6 less than the \$134,000. They were hoping the City would end up spending between \$40,000 to \$60,000.

7
 8 Some unidentified person asked what the Alpine City contribution was to the Lone Peak Police Department. Shane
 9 Sorensen said it was one million ninety thousand dollars. The cost of police service was shared with Highland City.
 10 Each city's share of the budget was based on population so Highland (17,000 residents) paid more than Alpine
 11 (10,000 residents) since they had a larger population.

12
 13 Will Jones asked what the unappropriated fund balance was. Shane Sorensen said it was the savings for that fund.

14
 15 Mayor Wimmer closed the public hearing and opened it up to the Council.

16
 17 **D. Ordinance No. 2017-11 Adopting the Final Budget FY 2017-18.**

18
 19 Troy Stout asked if the majority of the capital improvement budget was for the new public works building. Shane
 20 Sorensen said it was. The rest was for the remodel of the fire station and improvements in Moyle Park. He referred
 21 Mr. Stout to the Capital Outlay Detail Sheet included in the packet, which listed the details of expenses.

22
 23 Troy Stout asked about the Canyon Crest Road project. Shane Sorensen said they anticipated it being under
 24 construction the first of July.

25
 26 Lon Lott asked the reduction of utility costs if they contracted with UCMC, and if the budget would need to be
 27 adjusted in a budget opening. Shane Sorensen said they had budgeted for the usual amount for the upcoming budget
 28 year, but the expense would be less. They would watch for changes for the next year's budget.

29
 30 Roger Bennett said he objected to the amount budgeted for Alpine Days. It showed 33% of the Park Budget going to
 31 Alpine Days. Even if they got the revenue and reduced the City's cost to \$40,000, it would still be 23% of the Park
 32 Budget. He would be voting against it.

33
 34 The proposed budget would not require a tax increase.

35
 36 **MOTION:** Lon Lott moved to approve the Final Budget FY 2017-18 with the correction on line 45 as noted by
 37 Shane Sorensen. Troy Stout seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 1. Troy Stout, Ramon Beck, Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott voted
 38 aye. Roger Bennett voted nay. Motion passed.

39
 40 **E. Request to Lower PI impact fee – Fred and Heather Dawson – 247 N. Sunrise Drive:** Shane
 41 Sorensen said the Dawsons owned a large two-acre lot with a detention basin; they did not anticipate landscaping
 42 the entire two acres. The PI impact fees was based on the square footage of the lot. If the reduction was approved,
 43 there would be an Agreement recorded to run with the land requiring payment of the additional impact fee if
 44 additional land was landscaped in the future.

45
 46 **MOTION:** Troy Stout moved to approve the request for a reduced PI impact fee for the property at 247 N. Sunrise
 47 Drive. Ramon Beck seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Troy Stout, Ramon Beck, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Lon
 48 Lott voted aye. Motion passed.

49
 50 Roger Bennett said he would like to see penalty goes to 1.5 percent of the impact fee if the applicant watered
 51 without paying the additional Fee. David Church said they couldn't vary the rate because impact fees were based on
 52 a study and anyone had a right to an individualized calculation if they felt the formula didn't apply to them.

53
 54 **F. Interlocal Agreement with Utah County for Bookmobile Service:** Sheldon Wimmer said the cost for
 55 bookmobile service was \$13,200 a year. It came twice a month and made three stops which were the River Meadow
 56 Senior Living Center, Creekside Park, and the LDS Chapel on 100 North.

1
2 Roger Bennett said he may have a conflict of interest because he used the bookmobile. Kimberly Bryant and Ramon
3 Beck said they used it also.
4

5 **MOTION:** Lon Lott moved to approve the Interlocal Agreement with Utah County for Bookmobile service for
6 2017-2018. Kimberly Bryant seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Troy Stout, Ramon Beck, Roger Bennett, Kimberly
7 Bryant, Lon Lott voted aye. Motion passed.
8

9 **G. Discussion on Delineating Lambert Park:** Sheldon Wimmer said he felt delineating the park
10 boundaries was crucial so people knew what was public open space and what was private land. He felt they should
11 fence the entire park. They had previously discussed using buck and pole fencing at the entrances. He had talked to
12 Roger Bennett earlier in the week about a using a three-strand fence in other areas.
13

14 Troy Stout said he had long stressed the importance of understanding where private land ended and the park began
15 with a visual boundary, especially if development occurred. He would like to create an official entrance to the park
16 with a buck and pole fence. He described where it would be and Jason Bond showed it on the projection.
17

18 Sheldon Wimmer felt they needed to define some uses, especially around the Bowery. They also need to address
19 parking areas by the LDS church building and the rodeo grounds.
20

21 Troy Stout said he wanted to establish three main entrances to the park. One was by the rodeo grounds, one was on
22 the south end, and the third would be at the end of Moyle Drive.
23

24 Sheldon Wimmer said the poppies by the old Lambert Homestead needed protection with signage or something
25 because people were picking the poppies. The road also needed some improvement so people could drive up there.
26

27 Roger Bennett said he definitely felt there needed to be a fence around Lambert Park and other public open space so
28 people knew where to go in and out. Sheldon Wimmer agreed saying that someone had dumped a bunch of branches
29 up by the poppies, and trash had been dumped in other areas.
30

31 Troy Stout asked if they could use the \$120,000 and move forward with the fencing. Shane Sorensen said they
32 could. There was a line item in the report for that purpose.
33

34 **H. Corridor Trail/Open Space Property Exchange:** Jason Bond said it was proposed that the City
35 exchange property with an adjacent property in the Twin River subdivision to provide access to the proposed
36 corridor trail. A public hearing had been held by the Planning Commission who recommended the exchange.
37

38 Ramon Bond said there needed to be a lien-free trade if this was approved. David Church said he would prepare an
39 appropriate agreement.
40

41 **MOTION:** Ramon Beck moved to approve the proposed property exchange for the Corridor Trail as presented and
42 recommended by the Planning Commission. Kimberly Bryant seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Troy Stout, Ramon Beck,
43 Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott voted aye. Motion passed.
44

45 **I. Resolution No. R2017-12, Corridor Trail/Open Space Master Plan:** Jason Bond presented the
46 proposed Master Plan for the trail and public open space along Dry Creek. Years ago when the Twin River
47 subdivision was approved, the area along Dry Creek was dedicated to the City as public open space in exchange for
48 half-acre lots in the one-acre zone and a density bonus. Since then it had been largely unused.
49

50 Jason Bond said the plan proposed a paved trail with wildflowers to beautify and enhance the area. There was no
51 parking by the Old Mill building entrance to the corridor, but the trail connected to Burgess Park on the north where
52 there was parking. The vision was to eventually connect the trail to every major park and every school in Alpine,
53 which would create a great amenity for the citizens of Alpine. Since it was right in the heart of the city, it would be
54 conducive to foot traffic to the business commercial area. He suggested there be conduit placed for future lighting, a
55 pavilion or gazebo in the open area, and a natural playground. As the trail became more well-used there could be
56 resting places like benches along the way.

1
2 He said the Planning Commission had reviewed the proposed master plan and made some changes. They
3 recommended that the trail not be paved and the conduit for power and the “natural playground” be removed. They
4 also wanted to address stream erosion, and reroute and grade the trail as necessary.
5

6 Mayor Wimmer said there were a number of residents present with an interest in the Corridor Trail/Open Space, and
7 invited them to comment. He requested that they limit their comments to three minutes and refrain from repeating
8 something that had already been said.
9

10 Brenda Webb said she lived on Twin River Loop. She and several neighbors met and came up with a proposed
11 revision to Jason Bond’s master plan. She said she thought she spoke for everyone in their area. There was a feeling
12 that it was the residents against the City but she thought they could all work together. If the residents had been
13 included in the plan in the first place, it would have saved time. She said calling it the Corridor Master Plan was not
14 appropriate because it was not a corridor. It was natural open space. When it was deeded to the City, it was meant to
15 be natural open space, and the City’s Park Master Plan designated it as natural open space. The eight to ten-foot trail
16 proposed on the plan disrupted the open space, and the trail did not merit paving. There were paved trails in Burgess
17 Park that needed to be maintained. They would prefer a two to three-foot gravel trail. The trail did need to be re-
18 graveled and the erosion needed to be addressed. They didn’t want wider or additional trails. They didn’t think there
19 should be trailhead parking because it would encourage nighttime activity. They didn’t support conduit for lighting
20 or building a bridge because it would disrupt the flora and fauna. They should maintain the bridges that were already
21 there. They were opposed to the proposed pavilion or gazebo, which would be harmful to the natural open space.
22 Regarding the proposal that it be a venue for community events, she said that those amenities were already available
23 in Burgess Park. One of the greatest assets of Alpine was the natural open space and they felt it should be preserved.
24 On recent surveys of the citizens, preservation of open space was the highest priority. She stated that leaving it as
25 natural open space would be the most beneficial to all the residents of Alpine. She gave a copy of their proposal to
26 Jason Bond.
27

28 Blair Buswell lived on Twin River Loop. He said the new path shown was in between them and the Webbs. He said
29 he felt this had all been done backwards and he didn’t understand the urgency. They found out about it as the
30 backhoes were tearing up the ground behind their property. They came to the Planning Commission meeting and
31 voiced their opinions. They wanted to keep it natural. The reason a lot of people moved to Alpine was to get away
32 from the city and feel like they lived in a natural area. When the state proposed tearing down the prison and building
33 homeless shelters, they involved the community before they started tearing down houses. He said that when he left
34 for work the day before, there was a man with a backhoe on a trailer. When he came back, the was road being built
35 between their houses that was wide enough for a car. He said the great thing about the area was that you could be in
36 the middle of town and feel like you were in the mountains. The City needed to take care of what they had and
37 include the residents in the decisions.
38

39 Julie Buswell lived on Twin River Loop. She said the proposal to pave the trail and put in a playground and pavilion
40 and exercise areas was redundant because they already had all those things at Burgess Park which was less than a
41 tenth of a mile away, and those amenities at Burgess Park were not very well maintained.
42

43 Chrissy Hannemann lived on Twin River Loop. She said that at the Planning Commission she learned a lot about the
44 plans for Lambert Park and other parks. She felt that they already had parks in Alpine with different recreational
45 purposes. If the goal was to preserve some natural open space, she didn’t think they would want to develop right up
46 to the edge of the river. She said that since the Council didn’t want to hear the same thing from everyone, she
47 suggested the residents stand and show their support for those who had already spoken.
48

49 Someone said they wanted to comment on Lambert Park. Sheldon Wimmer said they had already moved on in the
50 agenda, and he hadn’t realized someone wanted to comment on Lambert Park. It would on the agenda regularly as
51 they discussed a master plan for the park. The man indicated he was very concerned about the increased motorized
52 traffic in Lambert Park.
53

54 Linda Wilkinson said the corridor trail wasn’t in her backyard but she frequently walked there. There were three
55 things she thought about when she was walking. One was that it was a hidden gem that was under-utilized. She felt
56 it was a shame that she was the only one down there. She said that most of the time she took her dog and there were

1 places that weren't wide enough for both her and her dog. She was also tripping on some of the growth on the trail.
2 There were times where she would like to jog but the trail was not very joggable in its current condition. She was
3 glad the City planned to make improvements. She wasn't sure an eight-foot wide trail would be the right thing but
4 there could be some kind of compromise. There were trails in other small communities which connected to other
5 areas of open space and she supported that. She also supported the proposal for providing a place for people to park
6 who wanted to use the trail. Make the trail wide enough to be walkable and have a place for people to park without
7 having to park in the neighborhoods. She said she would prefer a dirt trail because it was easier on your knees. She
8 said one of the big problems would be maintenance for people with dogs. Some parks had dog bags for waste.
9 Places that didn't have bags became a problem. She said another problem was that while she was walking the trail,
10 she was looking into people's backyards. They probably didn't like to see her and she didn't like to see them. She
11 suggested some kind of foliage buffer between the trail and the homes.

12
13 Kimberly Bryant suggested they table the issue and take more discussion at a later meeting. There seemed to be a lot
14 of people on both sides who wanted to comment.

15
16 Natalie Johnson lived on Twin River Loop. She said she fully supported those who had already spoken. She wanted
17 to talk about the parking issue. She said she lived next to Burgess Park and if they made an entrance to the trail by
18 Buswell's, there would be even more congestion. People who used Burgess Park already parked on their street
19 instead of parking in the lots at the church and school. Adding an entrance to the trail would make the congestion
20 even worse.

21
22 Tiffinee Smart on River Circle asked what the proposed budget would be for the trail. How were they going to
23 maintain it when they couldn't even maintain the asphalt trail they had in Burgess Park? As property owners, they
24 were told the area would be all natural.

25
26 Sheldon Wimmer said it was in the budget to resurface the asphalt trail in Burgess Park. Improvements occurred
27 over a period of time.

28
29 Will Jones said that the property under discussion was owned by the city and belonged to all the residents in the city.
30 Every time they decided to develop something on City property, they got all the neighbors who lived next to it
31 object to the City using City property. He said he was giving over 500 acres of natural open space and trails to the
32 City in the Three Falls subdivision, which would only enhance it. He said they were not trying to take away the
33 natural open space. It would be incredible when it was built. They were trying to enhance it for everyone. It was not
34 private property. The reason it hadn't been maintained was because they couldn't get into it to maintain it. They
35 were putting in a road so they could take care of the erosion.

36
37 Kimberly Bryant agreed that it was not private open space. It was public open space owned by all the citizens of
38 Alpine.

39
40 Lon Lott said he appreciated the comments that had been made. After three years of sitting on the Council, he said
41 this was typically what happened. The City got to the point of deciding on something and then the residents were
42 informed. He said it would be good to work with the citizens on their concerns. He noted that 30 years ago when he
43 moved to Alpine, his children had played in the areas where their homes were built. One of the concerns they had
44 with all the open space in Alpine was the encroachment from people who lived next to it. They needed some kind of
45 demarcation as to what was city property and what was private. People needed to know they didn't have the right to
46 come into people's yards while using the open space. The City would like the same respect from homeowners
47 adjacent to open space. Aerial maps frequently showed people landscaping into the open space.

48
49 Troy Stout said the Corridor Park was natural open space. He could see the logic of paving the trail for an inner-city
50 park. The value of paving would be that people could take strollers down and enjoy the space. Other parks in town
51 were groomed. Lambert Park was wild natural open space. This would be natural open space with a paved trail. It
52 was their intent to make it an asset.

53
54 Kimberly said she would like to table it because it was an issue that warranted more discussion.
55

1 Jason Bond said the intent of the lighting was not to light the open space but to light the trail. There had been a lot of
2 graffiti at the pumphouse. The conduit was for the future if it was heavily used.

3
4 Roger Bennett suggested they send it back to the Planning Commission. Jason Bond said there was no reason to
5 send it back to the Planning Commission because they had already sided with the neighbors.

6
7 Lon Lott said he would like the opportunity to study it more and listen to other comments, and then address it with
8 more information, and not throw it back to the Planning Commission.

9
10 Steve Cospier said they had pretty good input at the public hearing. He took notes of about twenty comments and
11 those were included in the recommendation.

12
13 **MOTION:** Kimberly Bryant moved to table the Corridor Master Plan. Troy Stout seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0.
14 Troy Stout, Ramon Beck, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott voted aye. Motion passed.

15
16 **J. Ordinance No. 2017-10 Amendment to the Appeal Authority Ordinance (Article 2.3):** David
17 Church said state law required cities to have a provision for an inhouse appeal process for disagreements on
18 interpretations of the law. Recently the State Legislature had passed legislation that affected the appeal process. The
19 proposed amendment would reflect current legislation plus provide an opportunity to clarify the existing ordinance.
20 There were two ways to process an appeal. One was to have the planning commission or city council make a
21 decision, and if someone disagreed, they could appeal the decision based on the record. No new evidence would be
22 submitted. The other approach was to have the appeal authority hear the appeal de novo which was not based on the
23 previous record, and new information would be submitted. The amendment would clarify that it was an appeal
24 process, not a de novo hearing, which would result in cheaper, shorter hearings.

25
26 **MOTION:** Ramon Beck moved to approve Ordinance No. 2017-10, amendment to the Appeal Authority
27 Ordinance. Troy Stout seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Troy Stout, Ramon Beck, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant,
28 Lon Lott voted aye. Motion passed.

29
30 **K. UCMC Utility Audit:** Shane Sorensen said he had more information from UCMC, which was
31 included in the packet. He had also contacted other cities which used the service. They had nothing but good things
32 to say about the utility audit.

33
34 Bryce Huff represented UCMC and answered questions the Council had. Lon Lott asked what the net savings would
35 be over five years. Mr. Huff said it would be about \$62,000.

36
37 **MOTION:** Kimberly Bryant moved to contract with UCMC for a utility audit. Ramon Beck seconded. Ayes: 4
38 Nays: 0. Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott, Roger Bennett, Ramon Beck voted aye. Troy Stout was no longer on the
39 phone. Motion passed.

40
41 **L. Ordinance No. 2017-08, Amendment to the Site Plan to Comply Ordinance (Article 4.14):** Sheldon
42 Wimmer said site plans had been going to the Planning Commission for approval. The amendment would allow
43 simpler plans to be reviewed and approved by staff which would save time for the applicant. The amendment would
44 not apply to commercial site plans or to site plans of a more complicated nature which required roads or other
45 improvements. They would need to go to the Planning Commission for review. The Planning Commission had
46 recommended against approval because they wanted to be involved in the process.

47
48 **MOTION:** Lon Lott moved to approve Ordinance No. 2017-08 Amending the Site Plan Ordinance. Ayes: 3 Nays:
49 1. Lon Lott, Roger Bennett, Ramon Beck voted aye. Kimberly Bryant voted nay. Troy Stout was not present.
50 Motion passed.

51 52 VI. STAFF REPORTS

53
54 Jason Bond said he would be accepting the Community Development Director for Santaquin City so June 30th
55 would be his last day. He said he appreciated his time working for Alpine City and couldn't think of a better place to
56 start his career.

1
2 Shane Sorensen thanked Jason Bond for everything he had done for the City over the years.
3

4 Shane Sorensen reported on the following.
5

- 6 • He said they were making progress on the Fort Canyon Road. There were always issues but they were
7 moving forward. They anticipated paving the road at the end of August or first of September.
- 8 • City Hall landscaping was complete and looked great.
- 9 • Dave Sanderson was working out well as the financial consultant. He was very knowledgeable and was
10 helping clean up some items that needed to be done.
- 11 • Some fire hydrants were flushed by the fire department over the weekend which may have raised some
12 questions from citizens.

13 14 **VII. CITY COUNCIL**

15
16 Kimberly Bryant said there were issues with the soccer parking at Smooth Canyon Park. They needed to
17 communicate better because there just wasn't enough parking. She had received complaints about the soccer kids
18 using the restrooms in the Healey church on Saturday after it had been cleaned. They were tracking dirt and grass
19 clippings on the floor. She said there was also a complaint that City Employees had been using the church dumpster
20 for empty paint cans after striping the streets. Shane Sorensen said it wouldn't be the City because they only striped
21 once a year and used large cans. Someone said they'd seen the people who painted lines on the soccer field dumping
22 the cans.
23

24 Sheldon Wimmer said he met with Draper City earlier that day and talked to them about the watershed protection
25 plan and Draper was interested in joining with them on that. He had also talked to the forest service who were
26 interested in participating.
27

28 Mayor Wimmer said he met with the Draper City Manager and Councilwoman Michelle Weeks about the rumor of
29 a road across the Hartvigsen property to the Blue Bison property in Draper. Apparently, there was no application for
30 such a road. He said he also talked to Hartvigsen about the possibility of a long culdesac into his property provided
31 the City Council and Fire Department approved it. It would enable him to develop a few lots on his property without
32 selling to the Blue Bison. Draper City said they would not approve more than 150 lots in the Hog Hollow area
33 without an access road into Alpine. Alpine City had traditionally avoided those connecting roads into Highland and
34 Draper. But if Hartvigsen had a road into Draper, it would create a solution for his landlocked property. Draper City
35 said that homes built in the Hog Hollow area would be required to be sprinkled and built with fire resistant
36 materials. A two-million-dollar road would be required along with the installation of utilities. Misinformation had
37 spread that Alpine City had granted a right-of-way across the Hartvigsen property to the Blue Bison property. He
38 and Lon Lott attended a Draper City Council meeting and explained that had not been done. He said Rich
39 Hartvigsen was willing to work out something with Alpine City that would provide him some building lots on his
40 property. Mayor Wimmer said he didn't know how others felt about it but he did not want to see a public road from
41 Draper into Alpine. Residential flow from 150 homes draining into Alpine would have quite an impact.
42

43 Mayor Wimmer also reported that Commissioner Lee had handed him a letter from the County when he left the
44 meeting regarding the annexation of Alpine Cove but he hadn't had a chance to review it. He would make a copy of
45 it for the Council.
46

47 **VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION:** None held 48

49 **MOTION:** Kimberly Bryant moved to adjourn. Ramon Beck seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Kimberly Bryant, Lon
50 Lott, Roger Bennett, Ramon Beck voted aye. Motion passed.
51

52 The meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.
53

**ALPINE CITY
ESCROW BOND RELEASE FORM**

Release No. 3

Thru Period Ending: June 21, 2017

Three Falls Phases 2 and 3
Location: Three Falls Drive
Original Bond

BOND HOLDER



Description	Quantity	Units	Unit Price	Total Cost	% Completed This Period**	% Completed To Date**	Total
PHASE 2 - EARTH WORK							
Grubbing, Cut, Fill	1	L.S.	@ \$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00		95.0%	\$ -
PHASE 2 - SEWER							
8" PVC sewer (~9' deep)	1437	L.F.	@ \$ 25.00	\$ 35,925.00	5.0%	0.0%	\$ 1,800.00
8" PVC sewer (~9'-15' deep)	76	L.F.	@ \$ 35.00	\$ 2,660.00		0.0%	\$ -
8" PVC sewer (~15'-25' deep)	380	L.F.	@ \$ 45.00	\$ 17,100.00		0.0%	\$ -
8" HDPE sewer (~9 deep)	250	L.F.	@ \$ 30.00	\$ 7,500.00		0.0%	\$ -
4' Dia. Manhole	16	EA	@ \$ 2,800.00	\$ 44,800.00		0.0%	\$ -
5' Dia. Manhole	3	EA	@ \$ 4,519.80	\$ 13,559.40	33.3%	0.0%	\$ 4,519.80
Trench bedding (3/4")	2479	TONS	@ \$ 17.00	\$ 42,151.00		0.0%	\$ -
4" Sewer lateral	1	EA	@ \$ 1,328.00	\$ 1,328.00		0.0%	\$ -
6" Sewer lateral	5	EA	@ \$ 1,672.00	\$ 8,360.00		0.0%	\$ -
Sewer Air & Deflect Testing per section	25	Each	@ \$ 250.00	\$ 6,250.00		0.0%	\$ -
Cleaning and Video	4100	L.F.	@ \$ 3.00	\$ 12,300.00		0.0%	\$ -
PHASE 2 - CULINARY WATER							
1" culinary water service	10	EACH	@ \$ 1,581.16	\$ 15,811.60		0.0%	\$ -
24" Casing, 40' long (4 total)	160	LF	@ \$ 56.60	\$ 9,056.00		0.0%	\$ -
24"x12" Spacers	36	EACH	@ \$ 88.42	\$ 3,183.12		91.3%	\$ -
24"x8" Spacers	36	EACH	@ \$ 94.69	\$ 3,408.84		28.2%	\$ -
6" DIP Water Line	300	LF	@ \$ 25.60	\$ 7,680.00		0.0%	\$ -
8" DIP Water Line	2660	LF	@ \$ 29.95	\$ 79,667.00		0.0%	\$ -
12" DIP Water Line	3800	LF	@ \$ 39.52	\$ 150,176.00		20.0%	\$ -
Bedding Material	3294	TON	@ \$ 18.60	\$ 61,268.40		26.2%	\$ -
5' Bury Fire Hydrant Complete	4	EACH	@ \$ 3,415.00	\$ 13,660.00		0.0%	\$ -
6' Bury Fire Hydrant Complete	4	EACH	@ \$ 3,690.00	\$ 14,760.00		0.0%	\$ -
7' Bury Fire Hydrant Complete	1	EACH	@ \$ 3,910.00	\$ 3,910.00		91.3%	\$ -
Valve Box	36	EACH	@ \$ 90.00	\$ 3,240.00		28.2%	\$ -
8" 90 DIP Bend	1	EACH	@ \$ 332.00	\$ 332.00		0.0%	\$ -
12" 90 DIP Bend	1	EACH	@ \$ 887.40	\$ 887.40		91.3%	\$ -
8" 11.25 MJ Bend	20	EACH	@ \$ 282.60	\$ 5,652.00		0.0%	\$ -
8" 22 MJ Bend	3	EACH	@ \$ 294.56	\$ 883.68		0.0%	\$ -
12" 11.25 MJ Bend	27	EACH	@ \$ 438.60	\$ 11,842.20		18.8%	\$ -
12" 22 MJ Bend	5	EACH	@ \$ 461.75	\$ 2,308.75		60.8%	\$ -
12"x6" MJ Tee	5	EACH	@ \$ 653.79	\$ 3,268.95		60.8%	\$ -
12"x8" MJ Reducer	1	EACH	@ \$ 717.82	\$ 717.82		91.3%	\$ -
12" Flg Tee	1	EACH	@ \$ 1,684.60	\$ 1,684.60		91.3%	\$ -
12"x8" Flg Tee	2	EACH	@ \$ 1,221.10	\$ 2,442.20		50.7%	\$ -
8"x2" Blow Off	4	EACH	@ \$ 600.00	\$ 2,400.00		0.0%	\$ -
12"x2" Blow Off	3	EACH	@ \$ 750.00	\$ 2,250.00		67.6%	\$ -
8"x6" Tee	3	EACH	@ \$ 419.40	\$ 1,258.20		0.0%	\$ -
8" Flg x MJ Gate Valve	4	EACH	@ \$ 1,201.06	\$ 4,804.24		0.0%	\$ -
8" MJ Gate Valve	3	EACH	@ \$ 1,230.00	\$ 3,690.00		0.0%	\$ -
12" Flg x MJ Butterfly Valve	6	EACH	@ \$ 1,636.44	\$ 9,818.64		16.9%	\$ -
12" MJ Butterfly Valve	5	EACH	@ \$ 1,668.00	\$ 8,340.00		20.3%	\$ -
Thrust Blocks	108	EACH	@ \$ 185.00	\$ 19,980.00		9.4%	\$ -
8" Flg Packs	6	EACH	@ \$ 17.25	\$ 103.50		0.0%	\$ -
6" MJ Packs	14	EACH	@ \$ 45.90	\$ 642.60		0.0%	\$ -
8" MJ Packs	80	EACH	@ \$ 58.60	\$ 4,688.00		0.0%	\$ -
12" MJ Packs	101	EACH	@ \$ 110.86	\$ 11,196.86		31.1%	\$ -
12" Flg Packs	6	EACH	@ \$ 27.10	\$ 162.60		67.6%	\$ -
6" Flg Packs	12	EACH	@ \$ 15.00	\$ 180.00		0.0%	\$ -
End Seals	8	EACH	@ \$ 74.37	\$ 594.96		0.0%	\$ -
Water Line Flushing & Testing	1	LS	@ \$ 8,000.00	\$ 8,000.00		0.0%	\$ -
Locate Tape & Wire	6740	LF	@ \$ 0.50	\$ 3,370.00		10.8%	\$ -
PHASE 2 - STORM DRAIN							
4' Storm drain manhole	32	Each	@ \$ 2,500.00	\$ 80,000.00	25.0%	0.0%	\$ 20,000.00
Curb Inlet Box Installed (2x3x4)	20	Each	@ \$ 2,500.00	\$ 50,000.00	25.0%	0.0%	\$ 12,500.00
Curb Inlet Box Installed (3x3x4)	2	Each	@ \$ 3,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	50.0%	0.0%	\$ 3,000.00
Snout	2	Each	@ \$ 600.00	\$ 1,200.00		0.0%	\$ -
Area Drain Box (3x3x3)	3	Each	@ \$ 1,650.00	\$ 4,950.00		0.0%	\$ -
12" RCP pipe	88	LF	@ \$ 25.10	\$ 2,208.80		0.0%	\$ -
15" RCP pipe	4616	LF	@ \$ 27.65	\$ 127,632.40	26.9%	2.6%	\$ 34,286.00
16" HDPE Storm Drain Main	320	LF	@ \$ 40.00	\$ 12,800.00		0.0%	\$ -
42" RCP Storm Drain Main	136	LF	@ \$ 102.70	\$ 13,967.20		100.0%	\$ -
15" FES	5	Each	@ \$ 493.00	\$ 2,465.00	20.0%	0.0%	\$ 493.00
Manhole collars	138	Each	@ \$ 65.00	\$ 8,970.00	19.6%	0.0%	\$ 1,755.00

Pond 2	1	LS	@	\$	29,463.00	\$	29,463.00	33.9%	0.0%	\$	10,000.00
Pond 3	1	LS	@	\$	56,700.00	\$	56,700.00		0.0%	\$	-
Concrete Retaining Wall 42"x15" (Sheet C4.4)	1	LS	@	\$	15,000.00	\$	15,000.00		0.0%	\$	-
Rip Rap Retaining Wall (Sheet C4.4)	75	TON	@	\$	25.00	\$	1,875.00		0.0%	\$	-
Rip Rap Fort Creek Crossing	200	TON	@	\$	50.00	\$	10,000.00		0.0%	\$	-
Hillside Drainage Ditch	600	LF	@	\$	24.50	\$	14,700.00		0.0%	\$	-
French Drain	1000	LF	@	\$	54.50	\$	54,500.00		0.0%	\$	-
Area Drain Manhole (#3, #2 MH's)	2	Each	@	\$	3,000.00	\$	6,000.00	50.0%	0.0%	\$	3,000.00
8" HDPE	40	LF	@	\$	30.00	\$	1,200.00		0.0%	\$	-
Hillside Drainage Ditch	691,837	LF	@	\$	24.50	\$	16,950.01		0.0%	\$	-
French Drain	1000	LF	@	\$	54.50	\$	54,500.00		0.0%	\$	-
Bedding Material	4050	TON	@	\$	18.00	\$	72,900.00	14.8%	0.0%	\$	10,800.00

PHASE 2 - ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

3" Asphalt	129240	S.F.	@	\$	1.12	\$	144,748.80		0.0%	\$	-
8" Roadbase	129240	S.F.	@	\$	0.80	\$	103,392.00		0.0%	\$	-
12" Subbase	156600	S.F.	@	\$	0.80	\$	125,280.00		0.0%	\$	-
Manhole Concrete Collars	61	Each	@	\$	550.00	\$	33,550.00		0.0%	\$	-
Valve Concrete Collars	25	Each	@	\$	350.00	\$	8,750.00		0.0%	\$	-
Parking Lot - 3" Asphalt	3750	S.F.	@	\$	2.20	\$	8,250.00		0.0%	\$	-
Parking Lot - 8" Roadbase	3750	S.F.	@	\$	0.90	\$	3,375.00		0.0%	\$	-
Parking Lot - 12" Subbase	4500	S.F.	@	\$	0.90	\$	4,050.00		0.0%	\$	-
Parking Lot Striping	1	L.S.	@	\$	450.00	\$	450.00		0.0%	\$	-

PHASE 2 - SLIDING ROCK CULVERT

8'x6' Culvert	56	L.F.	@	\$	691.37	\$	38,716.96		100.0%	\$	-
Crane	1	L.S.	@	\$	10,000.00	\$	10,000.00		100.0%	\$	-
Gravel 1.5"	278	TON	@	\$	18.00	\$	5,000.00		100.0%	\$	-
Labor	1	L.S.	@	\$	30,000.00	\$	30,000.00		100.0%	\$	-
Headwalls	1	L.S.	@	\$	15,000.00	\$	15,000.00		100.0%	\$	-
Pumps	1	L.S.	@	\$	20,000.00	\$	20,000.00		100.0%	\$	-

PHASE 2 - CONCRETE

24" Curb and Gutter	8250	L.F.	@	\$	15.00	\$	123,750.00		0.0%	\$	-
4' Sidewalk	1028	S.F.	@	\$	4.20	\$	4,317.60		0.0%	\$	-
24" Spill Curb (Parking Lot)	170	L.F.	@	\$	17.00	\$	2,890.00		0.0%	\$	-
Handicap Ramps (Curb Cut)	14	Each	@	\$	200.00	\$	2,800.00		0.0%	\$	-
Cross Gutter	100	L.F.	@	\$	30.00	\$	3,000.00		0.0%	\$	-
24" Curb and Gutter (Parking Lot)	180	L.F.	@	\$	17.00	\$	3,060.00		0.0%	\$	-
5' Sidewalk (Parking Lot)	250	L.F.	@	\$	4.20	\$	1,050.00		0.0%	\$	-
Traffic Barriers	520	L.F.	@	\$	50.00	\$	26,000.00		0.0%	\$	-
Curb Inlet Tie-ins	26	Each	@	\$	450.00	\$	11,700.00		0.0%	\$	-
Mobilization	1	L.S.	@	\$	1,000.00	\$	1,000.00		0.0%	\$	-

PHASE 2 - SWPPP

Stabilized Construction Entrance/Washout Area	1	L.S.	@	\$	4,000.00	\$	4,000.00		0.0%	\$	-
Inlet Protection	22	Each	@	\$	50.00	\$	1,100.00		0.0%	\$	-
Erosion Control - Silt Fence	4100	L.F.	@	\$	3.00	\$	12,300.00		0.0%	\$	-
Concrete Washout	1	L.S.	@	\$	750.00	\$	750.00		0.0%	\$	-
SWPPP Sign Install	1	L.S.	@	\$	500.00	\$	500.00		0.0%	\$	-
Toilet Rental Per Month	18	Each	@	\$	150.00	\$	2,700.00		0.0%	\$	-
Toilet Pad Install	2	Each	@	\$	500.00	\$	1,000.00		0.0%	\$	-

PHASE 2 - CONDUIT

Conduit - Dry Utilities	1	L.S.	@	\$	77,318.00	\$	77,318.00		0.0%	\$	-
-------------------------	---	------	---	----	-----------	----	-----------	--	------	----	---

PHASE 3 - SWPPP

Silt Fence	1700	LF	@	\$	3.00	\$	5,100.00		0.0%	\$	-
Inlet Protection	10	EACH	@	\$	60.00	\$	600.00		0.0%	\$	-
Toilet Rental	8	EACH	@	\$	100.00	\$	800.00		0.0%	\$	-
Toilet Pad Install	1	EACH	@	\$	250.00	\$	250.00		0.0%	\$	-
Concrete Washout	1	EACH	@	\$	500.00	\$	500.00		0.0%	\$	-
Trackout Pad	1	LS	@	\$	3,000.00	\$	3,000.00		0.0%	\$	-

PHASE 3 - DIRT WORK

Grubbing, Cut, Fill	1	LS	@	\$	44,105.30	\$	44,105.30		81.1%	\$	-
---------------------	---	----	---	----	-----------	----	-----------	--	-------	----	---

PHASE 3 - SEWER

8" Sewer Main	960	LF	@	\$	28.00	\$	26,880.00		0.0%	\$	-
8" HDPE Sewer Main	140	LF	@	\$	38.00	\$	5,320.00		0.0%	\$	-
6" Sewer Lateral	3	EACH	@	\$	1,700.00	\$	5,100.00		0.0%	\$	-
4" Sewer Lateral	3	EACH	@	\$	1,350.00	\$	4,050.00		0.0%	\$	-
48" Dia Sewer Manhole	10	EACH	@	\$	2,900.00	\$	29,000.00		0.0%	\$	-
60" Dia Sewer Manhole	1	EACH	@	\$	3,860.00	\$	3,860.00		0.0%	\$	-
Bedding	1600	TON	@	\$	14.00	\$	22,400.00		0.0%	\$	-
Air & Deflection Testing	10	EACH	@	\$	300.00	\$	3,000.00		0.0%	\$	-
Video & Flush	1100	LF	@	\$	2.50	\$	2,750.00		0.0%	\$	-

PHASE 3 - CULINARY WATER

12" DIP Main	2865	LF	@	\$	39.52	\$	113,224.80		0.0%	\$	-
8" DIP Main	340	LF	@	\$	29.95	\$	10,183.00		0.0%	\$	-
Locate Wire	3400	LF	@	\$	0.50	\$	1,700.00		0.0%	\$	-

12"x8" MJ Reducer	3	EACH	@	\$	717.82	\$	2,153.46	0.0%	\$	-
8"x6" MJ Tee	1	EACH	@	\$	419.40	\$	419.40	0.0%	\$	-
8" MH 11.25 Bend	1	EACH	@	\$	282.60	\$	282.60	0.0%	\$	-
7' Bury Depth	1	LS	@	\$	3,910.00	\$	3,910.00	0.0%	\$	-
6' Bury Depth	3	LS	@	\$	3,690.00	\$	11,070.00	0.0%	\$	-
8" MJ Gate Valve	2	EACH	@	\$	1,261.14	\$	2,522.28	0.0%	\$	-
Valve Boxes	9	EACH	@	\$	90.00	\$	810.00	0.0%	\$	-
Testing & Flushing	1	LS	@	\$	5,000.00	\$	5,000.00	0.0%	\$	-
12" MJ Butterfly Valve	2	EACH	@	\$	1,636.44	\$	3,272.88	0.0%	\$	-
12" 11.25 MJ Bend	23	EACH	@	\$	438.60	\$	10,087.80	0.0%	\$	-
12" 22.5 MJ Bend	10	EACH	@	\$	461.75	\$	4,617.50	0.0%	\$	-
1" Services	6	EACH	@	\$	1,581.16	\$	9,486.96	0.0%	\$	-
Thrust Blocks	60	EACH	@	\$	185.00	\$	11,100.00	0.0%	\$	-
Bedding	4250	TON	@	\$	15.00	\$	63,750.00	0.0%	\$	-
12" Mega Lugs	80	EACH	@	\$	110.86	\$	8,868.80	0.0%	\$	-
8" Mega Lugs	6	EACH	@	\$	58.60	\$	351.60	0.0%	\$	-
6" Mega Lugs	2	EACH	@	\$	45.90	\$	91.80	0.0%	\$	-
6" Flg Packs	2	EACH	@	\$	15.00	\$	30.00	0.0%	\$	-
12"x6" MJ Tees	2	EACH	@	\$	653.79	\$	1,307.58	0.0%	\$	-
12" MJ 45 Bend	4	EACH	@	\$	521.43	\$	2,085.72	0.0%	\$	-
12" Flg 45 Bend	8	EACH	@	\$	807.93	\$	6,463.44	0.0%	\$	-
12"x12 Spools Bottom	3	EACH	@	\$	1,556.41	\$	4,669.23	0.0%	\$	-
12"x10 Spools 45 Angle	6	EACH	@	\$	1,366.83	\$	8,200.98	0.0%	\$	-
12"x18 Spool & PE Pipe	6	EACH	@	\$	1,856.33	\$	11,137.98	0.0%	\$	-
12" MJ Sleeves	6	EACH	@	\$	450.00	\$	2,700.00	0.0%	\$	-
12" Mega Lugs	12	EACH	@	\$	110.86	\$	1,330.32	0.0%	\$	-
Thrust Blocks Large	10	EACH	@	\$	225.00	\$	2,250.00	0.0%	\$	-
12" Flg 22.5 Bend	3	EACH	@	\$	851.81	\$	2,555.43	0.0%	\$	-

PHASE 3 - STORM DRAIN

15" RCP Storm Drain	1080	LF	@	\$	27.65	\$	29,862.00	0.0%	\$	-
16" HDPE Storm Drain	780	LF	@	\$	40.00	\$	31,200.00	0.0%	\$	-
48" SD Manhole	8	EACH	@	\$	2,500.00	\$	20,000.00	0.0%	\$	-
2x3x4 Curb Inlet Boxes	10	EACH	@	\$	2,500.00	\$	25,000.00	0.0%	\$	-
Pipe Collars	44	EACH	@	\$	65.00	\$	2,860.00	0.0%	\$	-
Bedding	1560	TON	@	\$	18.00	\$	28,080.00	0.0%	\$	-
42" RCP Storm Drain	136	LF	@	\$	102.70	\$	13,967.20	0.0%	\$	-
Headwalls	170	LF	@	\$	100.00	\$	17,000.00	0.0%	\$	-
Rip Rap	640	SF	@	\$	5.00	\$	3,200.00	0.0%	\$	-
FES 15"	2	EACH	@	\$	493.00	\$	986.00	0.0%	\$	-

PHASE 3 - CONCRETE

24" Curb and Gutter	3960	LF	@	\$	15.50	\$	61,380.00	0.0%	\$	-
Manhole Collars	21	EACH	@	\$	550.00	\$	11,550.00	0.0%	\$	-
Water Valve Collars	8	EACH	@	\$	350.00	\$	2,800.00	0.0%	\$	-
Mobilization	2	EACH	@	\$	500.00	\$	1,000.00	0.0%	\$	-
Curb Tie-ins	10	LS	@	\$	450.00	\$	4,500.00	0.0%	\$	-
Curb Cut	65	LF	@	\$	7.00	\$	455.00	0.0%	\$	-
Headwalls	170	LF	@	\$	100.00	\$	17,000.00	0.0%	\$	-

PHASE 3 - ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS

3" Asphalt - Main Roadways	59200	SF	@	\$	1.25	\$	74,000.00	0.0%	\$	-
8" Roadbase - Main Roadways	59200	SF	@	\$	0.80	\$	47,360.00	0.0%	\$	-
12" Subbase - Main Roadways	72000	SF	@	\$	0.80	\$	57,600.00	0.0%	\$	-
3" Asphalt - Secondary Access	16100	SF	@	\$	1.43	\$	23,023.00	0.0%	\$	-
8" Roadbase - Secondary Access	16100	SF	@	\$	0.90	\$	14,490.00	0.0%	\$	-

PHASE 3 - CONDUIT

Conduit - Dry Utilities	1	L.S.	@	\$	27,748.00	\$	27,748.00	0.0%	\$	-
-------------------------	---	------	---	----	-----------	----	-----------	------	----	---

BASE BID TOTAL				\$		\$	3,135,443.39	Previously Released:	\$	261,002.16
10% Warranty Amount				\$		\$	313,544.34			
TOTAL BOND AMOUNT				\$		\$	3,448,987.73	This Release:	\$	102,153.80
<i>Total Released to Date</i>				\$		\$	363,155.96			
TOTAL BOND REMAINING				\$		\$	3,085,831.77			

At the discretion of the city, up to 95% of the Base Bid Total may be released as partial payments and 100% of the Base Bid Total will be released at final inspection. The 10% Warranty Amount will be held for the one year warranty period.

Will Jones
Developer

Date

Sheldon Wimmer
Mayor

Date



Jed Muhlestein, P.E.
City Engineer

6-21-17

Date

City Council
(by Charmayne Warnock - City Recorder)

Date

SELLER/DEALER:

MOTOR VEHICLE CONTRACT OF SALE

06/22/2017

DATE OF SALE:

KEN GARFF FORD
597 E. 1000 S
AMERICAN FORK UT 84003
(801)763-6800

ALPINE CITY

PURCHASER'S NAME

20 N MAIN ST

STREET ADDRESS

ALPINE UTAH COUNTY UT 840041416

CITY COUNTY STATE ZIP CODE

(801)756-6347

RES. PHONE

BUS. PHONE

CUSTOMER #: 308978
DEAL #: 98104

Purchaser and Co-Purchaser(s), if any, (hereinafter referred to as "Purchaser") hereby agree to purchase the following vehicle from Seller/Dealer (hereafter referred to as "Seller"), subject to all terms, conditions, warranties and agreements contained herein, including those printed on the reverse side hereof.

Table with columns: NEW, USED, DEMO, YEAR, MAKE, SERIES, BODY TYPE, CYL, COLOR. Includes VIN: 1FTMF1E89HKD95848, ODOMETER: 5, STOCK NO.: 1FS8372, DEL. DATE: 06/22/2017, SALES PERSON: LEROY G PAGE.

PURCHASE PRICE AND OTHER SUMS DUE table with rows 1-9: CASH PRICE OF VEHICLE (24660.00), ACCESSORIES/OPTIONS (N/A), TOTAL CASH PRICE (24660.00), MFR. REBATE (N/A), PORTION/REBATE APPLIED TO PURCHASE (N/A), SUBTOTAL (24660.00).

THIS SECTION FOR SELLER'S USE ONLY PERTAINING TO TRADE-IN. Includes checkboxes for Title, REGISTRATION, POWER OF ATTORNEY, ODOMETER STATEMENT, TRADE-IN APPRAISAL, AUTHORIZATION FOR PAYOFF, MANUFACTURED OUT OF COUNTRY.

NOTICE ONLY TO BUYERS OF USED VEHICLES. The information you see on the window form (Buyer's Guide) for this vehicle is part of this contract. I HAVE RECEIVED A COPY OF THE FTC BUYERS GUIDE.

TRADE-IN AND/OR OTHER CREDITS table with columns: YEAR/MAKE, ODOMETER, SERIES, BODY TYPE. Includes fields for BALANCE OWED ON TRADE-IN, PAYOFF VERIFIED BY, DATE OF VERIFICATION.

FINANCING DISCLOSURE. INSTRUCTION: One of the two following disclosures, either "A" or "B", must be acknowledged, if Purchaser agrees to be responsible for financing...

PURCHASER AGREES TO ARRANGE FINANCING. "A" THE PURCHASER OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE DESCRIBED IN THIS CONTRACT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT THE SELLER OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE HAS MADE NO PROMISES, WARRANTIES, OR REPRESENTATIONS REGARDING SELLER'S ABILITY TO OBTAIN FINANCING...

WARRANTY AS TO BALANCE OWED ON TRADED-IN VEHICLE. Table with rows 10-31: TRADE-IN ALLOWANCE, NET ALLOWANCE ON TRADE-IN, DEPOSIT/CASH DOWN PAYMENT, TOTAL CREDITS, SUBTOTAL FROM LINE 9, SERVICE CONTRACT, DEALER DOCUMENTARY SERVICE FEE, SUBTOTAL-TAXABLE ITEMS, TRADE ALLOWANCE, NET TAXABLE AMOUNT, UTAH SALES/USE TAX, UTAH LICENSE AND REGISTRATION FEES, UTAH AGE BASED PROPERTY ASSESSMENT FEES, UTAH INSPECTION/EMISSIONS TEST FEE, UTAH WASTE TIRE RECYCLING FEE, TOTAL OF ALL ITEMS ABOVE, TOTAL CREDITS, BALANCE DUE.

SELLER AGREES TO SEEK ARRANGEMENTS FOR FINANCING. "B" (1) THE PURCHASER OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE DESCRIBED IN THIS CONTRACT HAS EXECUTED THE CONTRACT IN RELIANCE UPON THE SELLER'S REPRESENTATION THAT SELLER CAN PROVIDE FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE MOTOR VEHICLE...

OTHER TERMS AGREED TO: NONE [X] AS FOLLOWS []

Purchaser has arranged insurance on vehicle through insurance company. Policy #. SELLER MAKES NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, WITH RESPECT TO THE MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR PARTICULAR PURPOSE, OR OTHERWISE CONCERNING THE VEHICLE, PARTS OR ACCESSORIES DESCRIBED HEREIN. SIGNATURE OF PURCHASER, DATE 06/22/17, ALPINE CITY, SIGNATURE OF SELLER, DATE 06/22/17.

ORDINANCE NO. 2017-14

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING AND ADMINISTERING THE ALPINE CITY FISCAL
YEAR 2016-17 ANNUAL BUDGET**

WHEREAS, it is deemed desirable and in the best interest of the City of Alpine, Utah to adopt the annual budget for the operations, debt amortization, and capital outlay of the City.

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALPINE
DO ADOPT AND ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:**

**ARTICLE 1
DEFINITIONS**

SECTION 1. "BUDGET YEAR" means the 2016 - 2017 fiscal year for which this budget is made.

SECTION 2. "FISCAL YEAR" means that year which begins on the first day of July, 2016, and ends on the last day of June, 2017.

**ARTICLE II
BUDGET ESTABLISHES APPROPRIATIONS**

SECTION 1. APPROPRIATIONS.

From the effective date of the budget as outlined in the attached Exhibit "A", the several amounts stated therein as proposed expenditures, shall address the several objects and purposes therein named.

SECTION 2. ANTICIPATED REVENUES.

The amended anticipated revenues shall include revenue from all sources, including grants and loans and shall be classified in accordance with the chart of accounts of the municipality.

SECTION 3. FUND BALANCE.

The fund balance shall be available for emergency appropriation by the City Council.

**SECTION 4. ANTICIPATED SURPLUS FROM MUNICIPAL UTILITY OR
ENTERPRISE FUNDS.**

The anticipated revenue and proposed expenditures of each utility or other public service enterprise owned or operated by the city is stated in a separate section of the budget (See attached Exhibit A); and as to each such utility, an anticipated surplus, if legally available for general purposes and to the extent such surplus is to be used to support budget operation, is stated as an item of revenue in the budget.

**ARTICLE III
ADMINISTRATION OF BUDGET, FINANCIAL CONTROL**

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURES.

The City Administrator shall be the Finances Director and have charge of the administration of the financial affairs of the city and to that end shall supervise and be responsible for the disbursement of all monies and have control over all expenditures to insure that appropriations are not exceeded. He shall exercise financial budgetary control over each office, department and agency and shall cause separate accounts to be kept for the items of appropriation contained in the budget.

**ARTICLE IV
SEVERABILITY**

If any provision of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity shall not affect other provisions or application of the ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provision or applications; and to this end the provisions of the ordinance are severable.

**ARTICLE V
ADOPTION & EFFECTIVE DATE**

This Ordinance is hereby adopted the 27th day of June 2017 and shall be effective for the Fiscal Year 2016 -2017.

Sheldon Wimmer, Mayor

ATTEST:

Charmayne G. Warnock
City Recorder

Alpine City
Budget Adjustments (End of Year)
6/30/2017

<u>Court Department</u>		<u>Debit</u>	<u>Credit</u>
10-42-31	Professional Services	10,000	
10-39-10	General Fund Surplus		10,000

Professional services costs have exceeded the original budget projection.

<u>Planning & Zoning</u>			
10-59-31	Professional Services	20,000	
10-39-10	General Fund Surplus		20,000

Professional services costs have exceeded the original budget projection.

<u>Streets</u>			
10-60-26	Street supplies	10,000	
10-39-10	General Fund Surplus		10,000

Street maintenance supplies have exceeded the original budget projection

<u>Parks & Recreation</u>			
10-70-65	Alpine Days	100,000	
10-38-17	Alpine Days (Revenue)		100,000

Alpine days exceed their budget projection but raised revenue in excess of the original budget projection.



TYMCO, Inc.
MUNICIPAL LEASE/PURCHASE PROGRAM
FINANCE REQUEST

DEALER INFORMATION

Dealer #: 601100
 Name: Intermountain Sweeper Co.
 Address: 6972 S. Airport Rd.
 City: West Jordan
 Contact: Andrew Winegar

Phone No.: 801-955-6280
 Fax No.:
 State: UT
 Zip Code: 84084

LESSEE INFORMATION

Name: City of Alpine
 Address: 20 N. Main St.
 City: Alpine
 Contact:

Phone No.:
 Fax No.:
 State: UT
 Zip Code: 84004

Fiscal Year Ending:

BID REQUEST INFORMATION

Request for Proposal: Yes
 Bid Closing Date:

Estimated Award Date:
 State Sales Tax (% if any):

Unless shown state sales tax not included

EQUIPMENT

Quantity: 1	New Model: 600BAH	Sales Price:	\$260,900.00
		Less: trade-in old TYMCO	<u>-\$65,000.00</u>
		Finance Amount:	\$195,900.00

	OPTION I	OPTION II	OPTION III
No. of Years:	3	4	5
Pmt. Frequency:	Annual	Annual	Annual
Advance/Arrears:	Arrears	Arrears	Arrears
No. of Pmts.:	3	4	5
Finance Amt.:	\$195,900.00	\$195,900.00	\$195,900.00
A.P.R.:	2.95%	3.05%	3.15%
Payment-periodic:	\$69,190.03	\$52,765.43	\$42,959.03
Pmt. Factor:	0.353191	0.26934880	0.219291
Total Annual Pmt:	\$69,190.03	\$52,765.43	\$42,959.03
VALID THROUGH:	07/01/17	07/01/17	07/01/17

Notes: Budgetary Proposal. Financing based on approved credit and acceptance of TYMCO's lease purchase documents. Rates subject to change. Down pmt on delivery, pmts begin a yr after. No lease document fees. No prepayment penalties. Non-binding until lease is signed.

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

SUBJECT: Design Standards Ordinance Amendment (Private Streets)

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: 27 June 2017

PETITIONER: Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Amend Design Standards Ordinance as Proposed

APPLICABLE STATUTE OR ORDINANCE: Design Standards Ordinance (Article 4.7)

PETITION IN COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCE: Yes

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Alpine City has very few private streets that were approved several years ago. In more recent years, the City has planned and worked with developers with the assumption that private streets are not allowed. However, there is mention of private streets in one spot of the development code. This proposed ordinance change would clean up that section of ordinance which indicates that private streets may be allowed after a recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval from the City Council. This change would be in harmony with the intentions that Alpine City has for not wanting public streets. The few private streets that do exist in the City would be considered non-conforming if private streets are prohibited in the ordinance.

PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION:

David Fotheringham moved to recommend that Article 4.7 of the Development Code be amended as proposed.

Carla Merrill seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous with 7 Ayes and 0 Nays. Bryce Higbee, Jason Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cosper, Jane Griener, John Gubler and Carla Merrill all voted Aye.

ARTICLE 4.7

DESIGN STANDARDS (Amended by Ord. 2014-12, 7/08/14; Ord. 2016-03, 02/23/16)

4.7.1 DESIGN STANDARDS

All subdivisions shall comply with the following standards unless an exception from one or more provisions of this chapter is approved by the City Council in accordance with the exception procedure of this ordinance.

4.7.2 GENERAL STANDARDS

1. The design and development of subdivisions, shall preserve insofar as possible the natural terrain, natural drainage, existing topsoil, and trees.
2. Land subject to hazardous conditions such as slides, mud flows, rock falls, snow avalanches, possible mine subsidence, shallow water table, open quarries, floods and polluted or non-potable water supply shall be identified and shall not be subdivided until the hazards have been eliminated or will be eliminated by the subdivision and construction plans.
3. The subdivider shall comply with landscape requirements of approval and mow and maintain vacant lots, keep sidewalks clear and streets swept during subdivision construction and until the lots are sold.

4.7.3 LOTS

1. No single lot shall be divided by a municipal or County boundary line.
2. A lot shall not be divided by a public road or alley or other lot.
3. Lot Lines. Side lot lines shall be at right angles or radial to street lines, except where justified by the subdivider and recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council.
4. Street Frontage. All residential lots in subdivisions shall front on a public street, ~~or on a private street recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council.~~ Private streets are prohibited. Double frontage lots are prohibited unless recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council.
5. Buildable Area. A Designated Buildable Area shall be not less than five thousand (5,000) sq. ft. except the lots in the TR-10,000 zone. In that case the lots must meet required setbacks.

ORDINANCE NO. 2017-12

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 4.7 OF THE ALPINE CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE RELATING TO PROHIBITING PRIVATE STREETS

WHEREAS, The City Council of Alpine, Utah has deemed it in the best interest of Alpine City to amend the ordinance to prohibit private streets; and

WHEREAS, the Alpine City Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Amendments to the Development Code, held a public hearing, and has forwarded a recommendation to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Alpine City Council has reviewed the proposed Amendments to the Development Code:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE ALPINE CITY COUNCIL THAT:

The Amendments to Article 4.7 contained in the attached document will supersede Article 4.7 as previously adopted.

This Ordinance shall take effect upon posting.

Passed and dated this 27th day of June 2017.

Sheldon Wimmer, Mayor

ATTEST:

Charmayne G. Warnock, Recorder

ARTICLE 4.7

DESIGN STANDARDS (Amended by Ord. 2014-12, 7/08/14; Ord. 2016-03, 02/23/16)

4.7.1 DESIGN STANDARDS

All subdivisions shall comply with the following standards unless an exception from one or more provisions of this chapter is approved by the City Council in accordance with the exception procedure of this ordinance.

4.7.2 GENERAL STANDARDS

1. The design and development of subdivisions, shall preserve insofar as possible the natural terrain, natural drainage, existing topsoil, and trees.
2. Land subject to hazardous conditions such as slides, mud flows, rock falls, snow avalanches, possible mine subsidence, shallow water table, open quarries, floods and polluted or non-potable water supply shall be identified and shall not be subdivided until the hazards have been eliminated or will be eliminated by the subdivision and construction plans.
3. The subdivider shall comply with landscape requirements of approval and mow and maintain vacant lots, keep sidewalks clear and streets swept during subdivision construction and until the lots are sold.

4.7.3 LOTS

1. No single lot shall be divided by a municipal or County boundary line.
2. A lot shall not be divided by a public road or alley or other lot.
3. Lot Lines. Side lot lines shall be at right angles or radial to street lines, except where justified by the subdivider and recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council.
4. Street Frontage. All residential lots in subdivisions shall front on a public street. Private streets are prohibited. Double frontage lots are prohibited unless recommended by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council.
5. Buildable Area. A Designated Buildable Area shall be not less than five thousand

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

SUBJECT: Fence Ordinance Amendment (Open Style Fence on Retaining Wall)

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: 27 June 2017

PETITIONER: Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Amend Fence Ordinance as Proposed

APPLICABLE STATUTE OR ORDINANCE: Fence Ordinance (Section 3.21.6)

PETITION IN COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCE: Yes

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Alpine City recently amended the fence ordinance to address fences on top of retaining walls. The intention was to regulate the circumstance where a fence and wall made of similar materials would create a very tall sheer surface that would be unsightly for the neighbors. After a few months of applying these new regulations, it was determined that there could be some further language to help alleviate some specific situations that created safety concerns. This proposed ordinance would clarify a way for someone to put a fence on the same plain as the wall but only if the fence where an open style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Carla Merrill moved to recommend that Section 3.21.6 of the Development Code be amended as discussed.

Jane Griener seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous with 7 Ayes and 0 Nays. Bryce Higbee, Jason Thelin, David Fotheringham, Steve Cosper, Jane Griener, John Gubler and Carla Merrill all voted Aye.

Under no condition shall a privacy fence and wall exceed nine (9) feet on the same plane. If a privacy fence that is on top of a retaining wall would exceed nine (9) feet, the fence shall be set back at least four (4) feet from the back side of the retaining wall. Open style fences including but not limited to rail fences, field fences, or chain link fences are permitted to be on the same plane as a retaining wall.

3.21.6 FENCES, WALLS AND HEDGES (amended by Ord. No. 2005-02, 2/8/05; Ord. No. 2013-10, 7/9/13; Ord. No. 2015-06, 05/26/15; Ord. No. 2017-01, 01/10/17)

- 3.21.6.1 Requirement.** All fences must be approved by the planning and zoning department and a building permit obtained.
- 3.21.6.2 Front Yard Fences.** Privacy fences, walls and hedges along the street frontage of a lot shall not exceed 3 feet in height when placed within 10 feet of the front property line. Open style fences shall not exceed 4 feet in height when placed within 10 feet of the front property line. Front yard fences may be eight (8) feet in height if they are placed at least 10 feet back from the front property line.
- 3.21.6.3 Interior Side Yard Fences.** Fences alongside yards shall not exceed 3 feet in height for privacy fences and 4 feet in height for open style fences when they are within 10 feet of the front property line. Side yard fences may be eight (8) feet in height when they are located at least 10 feet back from the front property line.
- 3.21.6.4 Rear Yard Fences.** A rear yard fence may be eight (8) feet in height.
- 3.21.6.5 Corner Lot Fences within the Sight Triangle.** The sight triangle on corner lots shall not be obstructed. Privacy fences, walls, or hedges shall not exceed three (3) feet in height, and open-style fences shall not exceed four (4) feet in height, when located within the sight triangle on a corner lot. The sight triangle is defined as the area formed by connecting the corner of the property to points 35 feet back along each property line abutting the street.
- 3.21.6.6 Corner Lot Fences outside the Sight Triangle.** Side yard fences abutting the street may be eight (8) feet in height when they are located at least 35 feet back from the front property line, outside the sight triangle. For interior side fence see 3.21.6.2.
- 3.21.6.7 Fences on Retaining Walls.** A [privacy](#) fence that is on top of a retaining wall shall be set back at least four (4) feet from the backside of the retaining wall. Under no condition shall a [privacy](#) fence and wall exceed nine (9) feet on the same plane. [Open style fences such as rail fences, field fences, or chain link fences are permitted to be on the same plane as a retaining wall.](#)
- 3.21.6.8 Agricultural Fences.** Fences on property where an identifiable commercial agricultural product is produced shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height, and shall be an open style fence.
- 3.21.6.9 Fences Along Public Open Space and Trails.** See Articles 3.16, Section 3.16.10.1 and Article 3.17 Section 3.17.10.3.1.

Fences or borders along property lines adjacent to a trail or open space must meet with the City Planner and meet specific standards.

1. When the width of the open space or trail easement is less than 50 feet, bordering fences may not exceed eight (8) feet in height, and shall not obstruct visibility. (Open style fences such as rail fences, field fence, or chain link are preferable.)
2. When the width of the open space or trail easement is 50 feet or more, fence standards as specified elsewhere in this ordinance apply.
3. Fences and hedges must be completely within the boundaries of the private

property.

4. Hedges or shrubs must be maintained to the same height requirements as fences.
5. The owner of the fence or hedge must maintain the side facing the open space.

3.21.6.10

Conditional Uses for Interior Fences. A conditional use permit may be approved by the City Planner for an interior fence over eight (8) feet in height for such things as sports courts, gardens and swimming pools. A conditionally approved interior fence shall not exceed twelve (12) feet in height and shall be an open style fence. (Ord. No. 2015-06, 05/26/15)

ORDINANCE NO. 2017-13

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 3.21.6 OF THE ALPINE CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE RELATING TO OPEN STYLE FENCES ON TOP OF RETAINING WALLS

WHEREAS, The City Council of Alpine, Utah has deemed it in the best interest of Alpine City to amend the ordinance to allow open style fences directly on top of retaining walls on the same plane; and

WHEREAS, the Alpine City Planning Commission has reviewed the proposed Amendments to the Development Code, held a public hearing, and has forwarded a recommendation to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Alpine City Council has reviewed the proposed Amendments to the Development Code:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE ALPINE CITY COUNCIL THAT:

The Amendments to Section 3.21.6 contained in the attached document will supersede Section 3.21.6 as previously adopted.

This Ordinance shall take effect upon posting.

Passed and dated this 27th day of June 2017.

Sheldon Wimmer, Mayor

ATTEST:

Charmayne G. Warnock, Recorder

3.21.6 FENCES, WALLS AND HEDGES (amended by Ord. No. 2005-02, 2/8/05; Ord. No. 2013-10, 7/9/13; Ord. No. 2015-06, 05/26/15; Ord. No. 2017-01, 01/10/17)

- 3.21.6.1 Requirement.** All fences must be approved by the planning and zoning department and a building permit obtained.
- 3.21.6.2 Front Yard Fences.** Privacy fences, walls and hedges along the street frontage of a lot shall not exceed 3 feet in height when placed within 10 feet of the front property line. Open style fences shall not exceed 4 feet in height when placed within 10 feet of the front property line. Front yard fences may be eight (8) feet in height if they are placed at least 10 feet back from the front property line.
- 3.21.6.3 Interior Side Yard Fences.** Fences alongside yards shall not exceed 3 feet in height for privacy fences and 4 feet in height for open style fences when they are within 10 feet of the front property line. Side yard fences may be eight (8) feet in height when they are located at least 10 feet back from the front property line.
- 3.21.6.4 Rear Yard Fences.** A rear yard fence may be eight (8) feet in height.
- 3.21.6.5 Corner Lot Fences within the Sight Triangle.** The sight triangle on corner lots shall not be obstructed. Privacy fences, walls, or hedges shall not exceed three (3) feet in height, and open-style fences shall not exceed four (4) feet in height, when located within the sight triangle on a corner lot. The sight triangle is defined as the area formed by connecting the corner of the property to points 35 feet back along each property line abutting the street.
- 3.21.6.6 Corner Lot Fences outside the Sight Triangle.** Side yard fences abutting the street may be eight (8) feet in height when they are located at least 35 feet back from the front property line, outside the sight triangle. For interior side fence see 3.21.6.2.
- 3.21.6.7 Fences on Retaining Walls.** Under no condition shall a privacy fence and wall exceed nine (9) feet on the same plane. If a privacy fence that is on top of a retaining wall would exceed nine (9) feet, the fence shall be set back at least four (4) feet from the back side of the retaining wall. Open style fences including but not limited to rail fences, field fences, or chain link fences are permitted to be on the same plane as a retaining wall.
- 3.21.6.8 Agricultural Fences.** Fences on property where an identifiable commercial agricultural product is produced shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height, and shall be an open style fence.
- 3.21.6.9 Fences Along Public Open Space and Trails.** See Articles 3.16, Section 3.16.10.1 and Article 3.17 Section 3.17.10.3.1.

Fences or borders along property lines adjacent to a trail or open space must meet with the City Planner and meet specific standards.

1. When the width of the open space or trail easement is less than 50 feet, bordering fences may not exceed eight (8) feet in height, and shall not obstruct visibility. (Open style fences such as rail fences, field fence, or chain link are preferable.)
2. When the width of the open space or trail easement is 50 feet or more, fence standards as specified elsewhere in this ordinance apply.

3. Fences and hedges must be completely within the boundaries of the private property.
4. Hedges or shrubs must be maintained to the same height requirements as fences.
5. The owner of the fence or hedge must maintain the side facing the open space.

3.21.6.10

Conditional Uses for Interior Fences. A conditional use permit may be approved by the City Planner for an interior fence over eight (8) feet in height for such things as sports courts, gardens and swimming pools. A conditionally approved interior fence shall not exceed twelve (12) feet in height and shall be an open style fence. (Ord. No. 2015-06, 05/26/15)