MINUTES
SUMMIT COUNTY
BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCIL
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2020
SHELDON RICHINS BUILDING
PARK CITY, UTAH

PRESENT:

Doug Clyde, Council Chair
Glenn Wright, Council Vice-Chair
Chris Robinson, Council Member
Kim Carson, Council Member
Roger Armstrong, Council Member

Tom Fisher, Manager
Janna Young, Deputy Manager
Dave Thomas, Chief Civil Deputy
Margaret Olson, Attorney
Kent Jones, Clerk

The Council was called to order at 3:04 p.m.

Closed Session – Personnel and Property Acquisition

Council Member Carson made a motion to convene in closed session to discuss personnel. The motion was seconded by Council Member Armstrong and passed unanimously, 4 to 0. Chair Clyde was absent.

The Summit County Council met in closed session from 3:05 p.m. to 3:43 p.m. to discuss personnel. Those in attendance were:

Glenn Wright, Council Vice-Chair
Chris Robinson, Council Member
Kim Carson, Council Member
Roger Armstrong, Council Member

Tom Fisher, Manager
Janna Young, Deputy Manager
Dave Thomas, Chief Civil Deputy
Margaret Olson, Attorney
Brian Bellamy, Personnel Director

Council Member Armstrong made a motion to leave session to discuss personnel and convene in closed session to discuss property acquisition. Council Member Robinson seconded the motion with all voting in favor, 4-0.

The Summit County Council met in closed session from 3:43 p.m. to 4:47 p.m. to discuss property acquisition. Those in attendance were:

Glenn Wright, Council Vice-Chair
Chris Robinson, Council Member
Kim Carson, Council Member
Roger Armstrong, Council Member
Doug Clyde, Chair (via phone)

Tom Fisher, Manager
Janna Young, Deputy Manager
Dave Thomas, Chief Civil Deputy
Margaret Olson, Attorney
Derrick Radke, Public Works Director
Mike Kendell, Engineer
Council Member Carson made a motion to leave closed session to discuss property acquisition and convene in open session. Council Member Armstrong seconded the motion and all voted in favor, 5-0.

Vice Chair Wright assumed the chair temporarily.

Pledge of Allegiance

Convene as the Governing Board of the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District

Council Member Carson made a motion to convene as the Governing Board of the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District. Council Member Robinson seconded and all voted in favor, 3-0. Chair Clyde and Council Member Armstrong were not present for the vote.

Discussion and possible adoption of amendments to the District's Policies and Procedures, Personnel Policies and Operational Policies; Brian Hanton, Megan Suhadole and Melissa O'Brien

Megan Suhadole, District Administrator, and Melissa O'Brien, Planning and Legal Affairs Manager, of the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District, reviewed proposed changes to the District's Policies & Procedures, Personnel Policies, and Operational Policies, as has been recommended for approval by their Administrative Control Board.
To: Summit County Council

From: Brian Hanton, District Director  
Megan Suhadolc, District Administrator  
Melissa O’Brien, Planning & Legal Affairs Manager

Date: January 16, 2020

Re: Discussion and Possible Adoption of Amendments to the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District’s Policies & Procedures, Personnel Policies and Operational Policies

*****

Background
In 2016, the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District ("Basin Recreation" or the "District") filed its (1) Policies and Procedures, (2) Personnel Policies, and (3) Operational Policies with the Summit County Council for approval. Instruction was given to evaluate the policies annually and bring any recommended changes first to the District’s Administrative Control Board for recommendation and then to the County. Up-to-date Policies and Procedures and Operational Policies are publicly available on the District’s website. Up-to-date Personnel Policies are available on the District’s internal employment website.

On December 5, 2019, the District Board voted to forward a positive recommendation to the County Council to approve the proposed changes as described below.

Discussion
This memorandum is accompanied by redlined versions of each set of policies with the requested language.

District Policies and Procedures
Basin Recreation is recommending the following changes to the District Policies and Procedures. At the request of a Board member the last review cycle, mention of County Council was clarified throughout to show that it is the Governing Body (where appropriate). In addition, changes have been made throughout to ensure consistency in short-forming names. The following changes have been provided to Dave Thomas for review.
1. *Introduction*: The District’s mission and vision have been changed. The values remain the same.¹

2. *Chapter 1; Legal Authority*: As the architecture of the Purpose, Mission and Values is proposed to be changed, a description of the District’s general purpose has been added in this section. Purpose has been struck throughout the remainder of the document.

3. *Chapter 1; Tax Identification*: The website for the Utah State Tax Commission has been updated; all references to Business Manager have been changed to District Administrator to reflect the accurate title.

4. *Chapter 2 (Administrative Control Board Rules & Regulations); Article II (Purposes and Authority of the Administrative Control Board); Section 3*: Changes have been made to the District’s mission and vision.

5. *Chapter 2 (Administrative Control Board Rules & Regulations); Article III (Membership of the SBSRD Administrative Control Board); Sections 4 and 8*: Language was changed to clarify that a new (or re-appointed existing member) of the Board will take office after taking the oath of office. Language was deleted that required provision of a Form 1099 to align with operations.

6. *Chapter 2 (Administrative Control Board Rules & Regulations); Article VII (Amendments to the Rules and Regulations); Section 2*: The timing by which Staff provides proposed amendments has been changed to make consistent with the issuance of Board packets.

7. *Chapter 2 (Administrative Control Board Rules & Regulations); Article VIII (Conflict of Interest); Section 2*: Language was added to provide that each Board member will submit any potential conflicts of interest annually to be consistent with current procedures and Chapter 7, GP-10.

8. *Chapter 3 (Relation of SBSRD to Other Agencies); Section II (Summit County Planning and Building); C*: Language about the Recreation and Trails Master Planning documents was made more flexible to allow for separation of the documents and regular updates.

9. *Chapter 3 (Relation of SBSRD to Other Agencies); Section IV (Other Agencies); B*: Dates of amendments to the Joint Use Agreement were added.

10. *Chapter 4 (Open and Public Meetings); Section VI (Application of this Policy); A (Emergency Meetings)*: Reference to the Bylaws was deleted as the Policies and Procedures serve as bylaws. Emergency meetings shall be noticed in accordance with State law.

11. *Chapter 5 (Records Access and Management Policy (GRAMA)); Section 3 (Compliance with State Law)*: Section titles were amended to be consistent with current law.

¹ Should the Council ultimately approve the mission and vision amendments, Basin Recreation will start incorporating the new mission and vision in its other documents. For instance, such will need to be updated in the Trails Master Plan and Trail Design Standards.
12. Chapter 5 (Records Access and Management Policy (GRAMA)); Section 8 (Designation, Classification and Retention); D: Retention schedules were changed slightly to reflect the State retention schedule.

13. Chapter 5 (Records Access and Management Policy (GRAMA)); Section 15 (Records Officer): Language was added to make clear that the Records Officer would receive certification from the State.

14. Chapter 7 (Governance Process); GP-1 (Governance Commitment) and GP-2 (Governing Style): Changes were made to reflect the new mission/vision architecture.

15. Chapter 9 (Executive Limitations); EL-9 (Asset Protection): Changes were made to allow flexibility consistent with State law with regard to general fund balances. The Board discussed whether or not a minimum general fund balance was prudent or if reference to State law was sufficient and asked Staff to follow up with the District's Auditor and Dave Thomas. Per Greg Ogden, the State has imposed a 5%-of-revenues minimum. The Board decided to reference state law for flexibility. Changes were made to reflect the new mission/vision architecture.

16. Chapter 10 (Ends Policies); E-1 (Purpose and Mission of Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District): Changes were made to reflect the new mission/vision architecture.

17. Chapter 11 (Budgetary/Fiscal Policies); Section III (Accounting and Internal Controls); n (Financial Records): Retention schedules were changed slightly to reflect the State retention schedule.

18. Chapter 11 (Budgetary/Fiscal Policies); Section VI (Reporting); F (Continuing Disclosure): Website references have been updated.

District Personnel Policies
Changes have been made throughout to implement consistent nomenclature – i.e. "department head" has been changed to "department manager," "Personnel Manager" has been changed to "Personnel Director," "District business office" has been changed to "District Administrative office." The below changes have been discussed with Brian Bellamy and Jami Brackin.

1. Section 1 (Personnel System Provisions); B (Functions of the Manual); 3: Language was amended to make it the responsibility of the District Director to disseminate any new policy information.

2. Section 2 (Equal Employment Opportunity); D (Nepotism): This section has been updated to include household members following legislation that required such.

3. Section 3 (Administration); E (Official Personnel Records): Changes removed the Personnel Director from the list of recipients of personnel record changes and added the District Administrator.
4. **Section 4 (Position Management); B (Job Description):** Modifications clarify that any necessary verification will be conducted by the District Administrator, as opposed to the Personnel Director.

5. **Section 4 (Position Management); D (Reclassification):** Modification clarifies that any analysis to determine reclassification eligibility would be conducted by the District Administrator, as opposed to the Personnel Director. Changes further clarify that the Personnel Committee will assist in reviewing and finalizing the job description.

6. **Section 5 (Hiring for New and Vacant Positions); F (Hiring Procedures):** Changes clarify that current employees must apply for a new job through the normal process within seven days of the posting date. Changes allow for a designee of the District Administrator to receive and do an initial review of applications.

7. **Section 5 (Hiring for New and Vacant Positions); G (Employee Induction):** Changes make the policy consistent with how orientation processes are operationally handled.

8. **Section 6 (Employment Status); E (Part-time Employees):** Language has been removed to account for those employees that work in different positions.

9. **Section 7 (Personnel Actions); F (Resignation):** Changes have been made to clarify responsibilities in the case of a resignation.

10. **Section 8 (Compensation); G (Separation Pay):** Language has been added to clarify that retirement is not paid on vacation payouts.

11. **Section 8 (Compensation); (M) (Additional Assignment):** A section was added similar to that approved at the County level to allow for the situation when the District Director sees the need to provide employee oversight or expertise to projects beyond the scope of the employee’s regular duties.

12. **Section 8 (Compensation); (now O) (Performance/Incentive Awards & Bonuses):** Any nomination for an instant bonus shall be included in the employee’s personnel file. Language was clarified to provide that an employee’s most recent performance evaluation must be at least above the District average to qualify for a merit bonus.

13. **Section 9 (Fringe Benefits); F (Vacation):** Language was added to allow for modification of the vacation schedule at hire based on relevant previous experience.

14. **Section 9 (Fringe Benefits); G (Sick Leave); 4:** Language was changed to provide that notification of the use of sick leave is made to an employee’s immediate supervisor.

15. **Section 9 (Fringe Benefits); N (Family & Medical Leave Without Pay):** Language was added to clarify how the District defines the 12-month FMLA period.

16. **Section 9 (Fringe Benefits); O (Retirement):** Language was added to clarify that seasonal employees, temporary employees and part-time non-benefitted employees are not eligible for URS benefits.
17. Chapter 10 (Reimbursement for Expense); A (Travel): Language has been changed from vouchers to reimbursements to better reflect how the District addresses travel expenses.

18. Chapter 13 (Disciplinary Procedures); B (Process); 6 and 7: Individuals were removed from the disciplinary process as inapplicable at the District.

19. Chapter 13 (Disciplinary Procedures); C (Types of Discipline); 3: Language was added to clarify that suspension with pay would not exceed 30 calendar days.

20. Chapter 16 (Occupational Laws); A (Occupational Health & Safety); 8: Language was deleted to allow for all on-the-job injuries to be reported.

Operational Policies
Throughout the Operational Policies, insurance limits were made consistent with two million dollars ($2,000,000) per each occurrence and four million dollars ($4,000,000) general aggregate. The Operational Policies were provided to Dave Thomas for review.

Chapter 1 General District Operational Policies

1. Cell Phones: This policy has been expanded to include other personal devices and provisions have been added as suggested by the District’s insurance carrier and IT provider to increase the security of the IT system.

2. Biometric Information Privacy Policy: Though not required by law, the District has added a new section to inform employees how the District will treat biometric data collected for timekeeping purposes.

3. Confined Space Entry: Following a voluntary UOSHA audit on District facilities, this provision has been expanded beyond Parks employees to all departments as required.

4. Secondary Employment: The policy was amended to clarify that self-employment qualifies as secondary employment.

5. Enforcement of Rules and/or Instructions: This section was added to formalize a process by which the District can enforce its posted rules and/or the instructions of District employees.

6. Sponsorship Policy: Items of each event sponsorship were deleted to allow for flexibility.

7. Tax and Disclosure Compliance Procedure: This section has been replaced with an updated version received from bond counsel and reviewed by Dave Thomas.

Chapter 2 Parks Policies

1. Hot Air Balloons: The allowable limits and launch deadlines were modified and combined. The mention of specific District facilities was deleted as not comprehensive. Reporting of emergency landings was given a deadline. Contacts at the District was broadened.
Chapter 3 Fieldhouse Policies

1. **Fieldhouse Use:** Language defining stakeholders was amended to make consistent with outdoor stakeholder policies; specific hours were deleted as they are seasonal and the title of the section was changed to indicate its actual purpose.

2. **Fitness Pass Policy:** Pass holder privileges were expanded to include the gymnasium, pool and hot tub; policy was clarified that requests for pass account holds are to be submitted to the manager and a hold can not be placed for less than two weeks.

3. **Personal Trainer Policy and Private Swim Instructor Policy:** Mention of swim instructors was struck from the policy to allow for a pilot program to bring private swim instruction in-house. As such, private swim instructors would be employed by the District and no longer subject to the rules which govern personal trainers as independent contractors.

4. **Benefits Available During Active Employment with the District:** Fieldhouse memberships and fitness classes for spouses, partners and children were made available to seasonal employees (after six months of consecutive work). It was specified that if an employee does not have a spouse, partner or child to designate, he or she could designate another individual. Further, all employees and board members were given 15 percent off Fieldhouse pro shop purchases.

Chapter 4 Special Event Policies

1. **Special/Reserved Events on District Fields:** Language was amended to clarify that returning events could apply for the same time the subsequent year immediately following an event with the understanding that fees may change. Parking requirements and the consequence for not following such were clarified. Provisions regarding lightning were deleted.

2. **Special Events at Trailside Bike Park & Skate Park:** Allowable limits were deleted but what constitutes an “Event” was redefined; both changes are intended to better reflect current operations.

3. **Special Events on District Trails:** Allowable limits on events were modified and “event” was redefined; both changes are intended to better reflect current operations.

4. **Park Room Rental:** Language about clean-up has been added.

5. **Pavilion Rental:** Language was changed to clarify that payment is due before the date and time can be reserved.

6. **Fieldhouse Special Event Policies:** Language defining stakeholders was amended to make consistent with outdoor stakeholder policies.

**Recommendation**
Staff recommends approving the changes to the Policies and Procedures, Personnel Policies and Operational Policies.
Some minor language changes were suggested and would be incorporated in the final approval.

Council Member Carson made a motion to approve the amendments to the District’s Policies and Procedures, Personnel Policies and Operational Policies as discussed including changes suggested. Council Member Robinson seconded and all voted in favor, 4-0. Chair Clyde was not present for the vote.

**Dismiss as the Governing Board of the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District**

Council Member Carson made a motion to dismiss as the Governing Board of the Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District. Council Member Robinson seconded and all voted in favor, 4-0. Chair Clyde was not present for the vote.

**Consideration of Approval**

**Council Comments**

- Council Member Carson attended the CDBG meeting. Local presentations for funding last week did not include a match and she suggested considering a 10% match to enhance the approval process. Manager Fisher will review
- She noted invitations for events including the Chamber Economic Forecast, U of U Behavior Health meeting, and Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District strategic action plan
- Council Member Armstrong noted Council Member Carson’s announcement to not run for election again and thanked her for her dedication and contributions to the Council
- Council Member Wright attended a Public Lands Committee conference call including discussion of two main issues, Predator control and a NEPA proposal to scale back regulations regarding climate change. He proposed sending written comment

Chair Clyde was present and assumed the chair.

**Manager Comments**

- Manager Fisher noted January 30 as County Elected Officials Day on the Hill
- He is working on naming a representative for the Community Action Group
- Next Wednesday’s meeting is cancelled
- February 19 is Rural Day on the Hill. It may conflict with the Council meeting schedule

**Public Input**

There was no public input.
Continued discussion and possible decision regarding Silver Creek to Bitner connection; Derrick Radke and Michael Kendell

Derrick Radke, Public Works Director, and Michael Kendell, Engineer, reviewed the following presentation regarding the Silver Creek to Bitner road connection. Several hearings have been held previous to gather information for Council consideration. The options outlined have been recommended to complete a connector road for safety, response, and ingress/egress issues.
PURPOSE AND NEED
(WHY DO THE PROJECT AT ALL)

1. HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE OF THE AREA RESIDENTS
   a) PROVIDE FOR IMPROVED EMERGENCY RESPONSE
   b) PROVIDE SECONDARY EMERGENCY INGRESS/EGRESS

2. PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES
   a) NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTIVITY
   b) ALTERNATIVE MODES (BIKE/PEDESTRIAN)
   c) EFFICIENT TRANSIT

Silver Creek Road-Bitner Ranch Road Connector
STAFF RECOMMENDED CRITERIA FOR SELECTING ALIGNMENT

- Ability to get appropriate width of right of way to provide space for bike lanes and separated trail(s) (Provide for Alternative Transportation Modes)
- Consider the distance from I-80 to provide best alternative route during emergencies
- Consider the length of Bitner Ranch and Silver Creek roads used to minimize costs of new road construction and long-term maintenance to the County (the County should assume maintenance of Bitner Ranch Road and Silver Creek Road up to the connector)
- Consider future transit route options; allow for enhancement of SA3 community area if used as Park and Ride
- Consider Emergency access – both emergency services response and emergency evacuation
- Consider improved traffic flow

Silver Creek Road-Bitner Ranch Ranch Road Connector
Proposed Roadway Section

Paved Path

Fence

8' to 10'

6'
Paved Shoulder

12'
Travel Lane

12'
Travel Lane

6'
Paved Shoulder

Evaluate Potential Equestrian Trail

70' to 80' R/W

Paved Path

8' to 10'

6'
Paved Shoulder

12'
Travel Lane

12'
Travel Lane

6'
Paved Shoulder

Typical Section No. 1

Typical Section No. 2

Summit County
# Preferred/Recommended Alignments

##因子

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>因素</th>
<th>Frontage Rd.</th>
<th>Church St.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>湿地</td>
<td>0.4 Ac.</td>
<td>0.3-0.5 Ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>交通2030</td>
<td>5400-5600 ADT</td>
<td>3300-3700 ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>响应时间</td>
<td>3-4 Min.</td>
<td>5-6 Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>成本</td>
<td>$2.59M</td>
<td>$2.65M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**注释:** 成本不包括通货膨胀，湿地保护，R/W，或Silver Creek Road或Division St. 交界处改进的额外成本。
# PROJECT IMPACT MITIGATION MEASURES, PUBLIC COMMENT

## FRONTAGE ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route/Option</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Road</td>
<td>Added Traffic to Existing Roads/Cut-Through Traffic</td>
<td>Design Separation of Greenfield Dr. and Earl St. from Frontage Road (allow for Emergency ingress/egress/Landscape/Pedestrian Zone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Speeds</td>
<td>Narrow Travel Lanes (Use AASHTO 11 foot lanes + 6 foot Shoulders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curvilinear Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersection Design (Roundabouts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median (Landscape) at strategic Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce Speed Limits near development (at each end of the roadway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian/Children Safety</td>
<td>Sidewalks or Separated Path from Division Street to Community Center, Include Shoulder Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separated Path/Trail along new roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crosswalks with Flashing Warning Lights (Division Street, Earl Street, Valley Drive, Bitner Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added Traffic to Bitner</td>
<td>Bitner Road has capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kimball Junction Congestion Planning in the works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Car/Truck Conflicts at Division Street</td>
<td>Use innovative design to construct new intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include UDOT Truck Parking in analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity of Road to Woodside Back Yards</td>
<td>Add R/W width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berm/Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Move road South to allow new commercial between road and backyards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bitner/Silver Creek Road Maintenance Responsibility</td>
<td>County will maintain from I-80/US 40 line to Bitner Road Traffic Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROJECT IMPACT MITIGATION MEASURES, PUBLIC COMMENT
### FRONTAGE ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route/Option</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Service</td>
<td>Work to Improve Community Center Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity for &quot;Looped&quot; Service (most efficient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wetland Impacts/High Groundwater</td>
<td>Minimize Impacts through Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create/Consolidate Mitigation Wetlands to create more beneficial Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Added Noise</td>
<td>Buffer, Berms, Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced Speed Design in areas of Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Farm Preservation</td>
<td>Use Church Street Option to minimize Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Build in crossings to allow for animal movement across road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Crime Rates due to multiple accesses</td>
<td>Reduced Speed Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development approvals</td>
<td>There are no new zoning or development approvals attached to this connector road. There are existing entitlements or processes that current landowners can utilize. Does not change zoning. A parcel split by the road would create another parcel within the zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Project Impact Mitigation Measures, Public Comment

## Church Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route/Option</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>Cut-Through Traffic from Bitner Road Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Truck Route Signs (non-regulatory)[State Law prohibits truck ban]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Speeds</td>
<td>Narrow Travel Lanes (Use AASHTO 11 foot lanes + 6 foot Shoulders)</td>
<td>Curvilinear Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Children Safety at Silver Creek Road &amp; Bitner Ranch Road</td>
<td>Sidewalks or Separated Path from Division Street to Community Center include Shoulder Areas</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Traffic to Bitner</td>
<td>Bitner Road has capacity</td>
<td>Kimball Junction Congestion Planning in the works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity of Road to Valley Drive Residents Back Yards</td>
<td>Add R/W width to push road North</td>
<td>Berm/Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks/Construction Vehicles</td>
<td>Add Truck Route Signage</td>
<td>Reduced Speed Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitner/Silver Creek Road Maintenance Responsibility</td>
<td>County will maintain from I-80/US 40 line to Bitner Road Traffic Circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Summit County**
# Project Impact Mitigation Measures, Public Comment

## Church Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route/Option</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands Impacts/High Groundwater</td>
<td>Minimize Impacts through Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create/Consolidate Mitigation Wetlands to create more beneficial Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide appropriate drainage across the road so that the lower wetlands are not effectively drained i.e. hydrology is not impeded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Impact</td>
<td>Reduce Speeds v Speed Limits and/or Design Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wildlife Fencing - Would require underpass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewshed</td>
<td>Buffer, Berms, Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Noise</td>
<td>Buffer, Berms, Landscaping</td>
<td>Reduced Speed Design in areas of Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Values</td>
<td>Cannot be definitively determined. Typically, more access increases property values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service</td>
<td>Work to Improve Community Center Site</td>
<td>Opportunity for “Looped” Service (most efficient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Crime Rates due to multiple accesses</td>
<td>Reduced Speed Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development approvals</td>
<td>There are no new zoning or development approvals attached to this connector road. There are existing entitlements or processes that current landowners can utilize. Does not change zoning. A parcel split by the road would create another parcel within the zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation – Once Council decides on the route, this should not be the end of the Public Input Process. Staff must work with Service Area #3, Bitner Ranch Road Association, directly impacted property owners, UDOT on the Truck Parking Area Impacts, Bell’s Truck Stop if project includes Division Street Intersection, and small stake holder group from directly impacted neighborhoods to produce a recommended final draft plan. The Draft Plan will need to come back to Council for final approval.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

Silver Creek Road-Bitner Ranch Road Connector
Chair Clyde allowed for public comment.

Mathew Alton asked questions about road width, pinch point, and snow plow access.

Newt Collinson voiced support for the frontage road option. He questioned why other options were not included tonight and noted no studies, cost estimates, or traffic counts are current.

Linda Miller feels the frontage road is the best option from safety and response time.

Brad Benz questioned emergency access as the basis of needing a road.

Mark Jennings asked where sidewalks and paths would lead to as presented. He supports shorter response time and feels it makes a difference.

Eric Klostersmann noted response time is relative to location. He questioned what development would result from action taken.

Ted Barnes stated the frontage road option would split the Bitner Ranch. They support the Church Street option.

There were no other comments.

Chair Clyde responded to comments made and assured issues regarding traffic, response time, safety, wetlands, cost estimates, and planning and design would be professionally addressed with any option approved. He opened the discussion from Council Members.

Council Member Carson spoke of the need to improve Silver Creek Road and the importance of connectivity to address ingress/egress issues. She also noted the historic nature of the Bitner Ranch property and its identity to the area. She feels approval of Church Street as the better choice.

Council Member Wright noted many issues with both options are similar. He feels the emergency access using the road so close to I-80 is not a good idea. He supports Church Street as the route superior that would improve traffic flow and circulation for bus transit.

Council Member Robinson concurred with previous Council statements. He supports the Church Street option and feels the Frontage Road option is more detrimental to the neighborhood. He also does not want to divide the Bitner Ranch and knows commercial properties will increase on Plat I.

Chair Clyde prefers the Frontage Road option as normal traffic models indicate more cars are intercepted there. That is what a frontage road is meant to do. It would include fixing problems with the truck stop access and he feels it makes more sense to align traffic near I-80 and not through the meadow.
Council Member Armstrong feels strongly that the Council has a responsibility to connect Silver Creek to Bitner and mitigate impacts discussed for either road approval. He would like to support the Frontage Road but the proximity to Division Street and the neighborhood are negatives. Also, disrupting operations for the Bitner Ranch, facing condemnation of property, and open space would be lost, makes him to feel the best choice is the Church Street option.

Chair Clyde called for a vote.

Council Member Robinson made a motion to approve the Church Street alignment as the choice for Public Works moving forward with design/build for the Silver Creek to Bitner road connection. Council Member Armstrong seconded with the motion passing 4-1. Chair Clyde voted nay.

The Council meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Doug Clyde, Chair

Kent Jones, Clerk