

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

August 20, 2024

Present: Mayor Dawn R. Ramsey, Council Member Patrick Harris, Council Member Kathie Johnson, Council Member Don Shelton, Council Member Tamara Zander, Council Member Jason McGuire, City Manager Dustin Lewis, Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen, City Attorney Ryan Loose, Director of Strategy & Budget Don Tingey, Director of City Commerce Brian Preece, Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison, CFO Sunil Naidu, City Engineer Brad Klavano, Director of Administrative Services Melinda Seager, Director of Planning Steven Schaefermeyer, Police Chief Jeff Carr, Fire Chief Chris Dawson, IS Systems Administrator Ken Roberts, IS Senior System Administrator Phill Brown, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, IS Systems Administrator Ken Roberts, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, City Recorder Anna Crookston, Meeting Transcriptionist Diana Baun, Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson, Community Center Manager Jamie Anderson, Planning Commissioner Sam Bishop

Absent:

Others: Erie Walker, Linda Walker, Ted Knowlton, Lauren Victor, Kendal Willardson, Carlton Christensen, Tim Sullivan, Kai Tohinaka, Bryan F.,

4:39 P.M.
STUDY MEETING

A. Welcome, Roll Call, and Introduction: *By Mayor, Dawn R. Ramsey*

Mayor Ramsey welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

B. Invocation: *By Council Member, Kathie L. Johnson*

Council Member Johnson offered the invocation.

C. Mayor and Council Coordination

Mayor Ramsey mentioned the Legislative Policy Committee (LPC) meeting she attended yesterday and noted there is a lot to come for the next legislative session.

Council Member Shelton mentioned Generation Day tomorrow at the Community Center.

Council Member McGuire mentioned the Leagues Conference in September.

D. Discussion/Review of Regular Council Meeting

Public Hearing Item:

- Resolution R2024-40, Authorizing Mayor Dawn R. Ramsey to execute a property exchange agreement transferring one acre of land to Utah State University Bastian Agricultural Center and receiving 0.96 acre of land from the Utah State University Bastian Agricultural Center.

E. Discussion/Presentation Items:

E.1. Senior Advisory Committee member appointment. (*By Director of Recreation, Janell Payne*)

Recreation Director Janell Payne and Community Center Manager Jamie Anderson introduced Erie and Linda Walker to the council.

Mayor Ramsey invited Mr. and Ms. Walker to share with the council a little about themselves and why they are interested in serving on the Senior Advisory Committee.

Erie Walker said they have been residents for about thirty three years, raised their children here and he has since retired from software development in the past two years. He has always been involved in the community, being on the Community Council in Millcreek before moving to South Jordan. Both he and his wife have been involved at the senior center now for a few years, starting during Covid. He likes being involved in the community as much as possible and would love an opportunity to help plan activities and share his ideas on this committee.

Linda Walker has been a homemaker, raising kids for many years. She has also been involved, until recent changes in the process, in local elections.

Council Member Shelton asked the Walkers what their favorite activities are at the Senior Center.

Ms. Walker responded she enjoys the strength training classes.

Mr. Walker responded the lunches, as well as the trips and outings available.

E.2. Transit Fresh Look. (*By Wasatch Front Regional Council*)

Lauren Victor (WFRC)

Kendal Willardson (Mountainland Association of Governments)

Deputy Director Ted Knowlton (WFRC)

Ted Knowlton (Deputy Director WFRC) – reviewed his prepared presentation of the 2024 Transit Fresh Look Study (Attachment A). He recognized Mayor Ramsey as the Chair of WFRC, and that it has been her leadership, in conjunction with other mayors in the area, that brought

together this effort to refresh the transit plan. South Jordan staff has been heavily involved on the committee creating this, making the city a key partner in this. He reviewed the process used for this study as summarized in his presentation, as well as the current partnerships listed and their roles in the study process (Attachment A). The goal of the partnerships is to better connect this area to the broader region with transit, ensuring people can get to where they need to go and help encourage economic development. WFRC is hoping this is the last study of its type for a long time, and what follows this is more implementation oriented efforts. When talking about public transportation, it is part and parcel with understanding development patterns. When planning for a major transit investment, like a rail line, much of what goes into making that viable is the thoughts around potential riders and station areas; not just homes, but also jobs. They need to understand what that looks like here in South Jordan; is the city interested in exploring some changes towards getting the aspiration they are working towards? He discussed getting the foundation right in all this, with a sense of momentum, and discussed the different colors and what they represent in the study. Blue represents getting the foundation right, including understanding development patterns; orange represents exploration, which is the current stage; red represents working towards coming together on a common vision that can then be implemented. There is a lot of activity happening through the end of this calendar year, and he is confident it will continue into the next year as well. He reviewed the near term steps from the end slides of Attachment A and summarized their plans. He then invited questions and comments from the audience.

Carlton Christensen (UTA) – he expressed his appreciation, on behalf of UTA, for all the partners participating here. UTA is currently going through their five year plan process, which is when the wheels really hit the road and they decided where the routes are, where the services will be. They have made some refinements during their open period and they will be out here in the next few weeks with those and the plan is to adopt them by December, with services beginning as early as April of 2025. There is service in this general area being contemplated, and he reiterated that local service was never part of the regional transportation process; that local service component is now moving forward and some of that should be seen sooner than later.

Mayor Ramsey thanked Lauren Victor for her patience through this, starting with the first meeting they were in where Mayor Ramsey refused to accept their proposals without service heading this way and asking for things to be looked at again, since the original plans would not work.

Lauren Victor – reiterated that the meeting in September discussed by Mayor Ramsey was a draft meeting, they are not trying to create packages and tell the cities what is good and what they should be doing; it is more trying to take ideas, put options together, and then have cities respond to them and rework them.

Mayor Ramsey appreciates that approach here, and agreed this isn't about anyone telling communities what they can and can't do; this is everyone getting together and discussing what things need to look like, while working together with the communities on those draft routes.

Mr. Christensen noted that before this process began and they met with the communities, every community had their own vision, and those didn't naturally align. Having a common vision come out of this process will be much more helpful in getting to an end goal.

Mr. Knowlton noted that many of the same frustrations were coming out on the Utah County side as well, with multiple studies added for them. He has been noticing people perking up with this bigger partnership, and this is definitely being looked at much differently than it has been in the past.

Mayor Ramsey noted the way to bring about transit in this area many times takes elected officials to get it done, which is not the typical way of thinking for this. WFRC has been an excellent method to convene everyone including the counties and cities, as well as the partners weighing in on this. She knows the right people have been brought to the table to figure this out, and she is very optimistic they will be able to come up with some kind of plan that puts obligation on the part of cities, as well as requiring justification and creating a better understanding overall.

Council Member Johnson asked if there is a current website with this information for elected officials and others to review and think about before giving additional suggestions.

Mr. Knowlton responded that no, they don't have one.

Ms. Victor added they started one, they have the language for it, and she agreed it was a great idea to have updated steps and where they are at in the process with pertinent contact information. They feel they are at the point in the project where they will actually have information for the website, and they agree it's a great idea to get that up and running.

Mr. Knowlton agreed that keeping councils, staff and the broader public aware of what's happening is really important.

Council Member Shelton thanked the presenters for everything and shared two things that stuck out for him from the presentation. One was the various types of transit, and the notations regarding densities and asked if those were also the requirements for the related types of transportation noted.

Mr. Christensen responded that historically UTA has been very dependent on discretionary grants for a lot of construction, and those types of standards are the kind a federal government might look at when justifying those types of transit. More importantly, they know from transit usage and the propensity to transit, that those kinds of land uses lend themselves better to successful outcomes. A community may choose to have a very suburban theme, in which case micro transit probably is the best option and most likely to succeed. But with the variations of that, the different modes can follow and he acknowledged traffic generators like a community college or large employer that can change those dynamics and do factor into those equations in the end. He shared, for instance, that in the evening the riders' purposes change and having a wider variety of uses along those corridors make for a much more viable transit line.

Mr. Knowlton added that the numbers being discussed came from their consultant as they looked at peer cities, and what has generally made sense as those communities have made the kinds of transit investments being contemplated here. These aren't things that can be relied upon with something like a math formula, and as Mr. Christensen noted, sometimes big generators like a community college or stadium can make a big difference and shift thoughts towards something more like a park and ride. It is both important to emphasize here that transit and land use are important together, but that those are not the whole thing. Other pieces might be broader willingness to fund something, essentially political will.

Mr. Christensen added that everything does not have to be federally funded, things can be locally funded through city or state funds, so the criteria mentioned may not always be the standard. While federal groups have ridership models they will run information through, there are things that can be done to lend themselves to encouraging that ridership model. He noted they were lucky to build light rail out in 2010 and 2013, because if they went by the current federal standards, that would not have been possible and that is why you don't see a lot of light rail lines and would have probably prohibited the building of the red or green lines currently.

Council Member Shelton asked to confirm, in the light of previous comments, that they would not rule out light rail if it didn't have the indicated level of density at stops.

Mr. Knowlton responded that he doesn't believe every station needs to meet the requirements exactly, but if a line affected three different cities, all those cities would need to come to the table and have those conversations. This project will be hard and rewarding, but he believes they have the right people at the table to do it.

Council Member Shelton noted that one of the steps referenced the goals of the partnerships from Attachment A, and he asked if there are actual goals at this point.

Mr. Knowlton responded they have categories, and there is a detailed list of nine criteria currently that they will send to everyone after this meeting for review.

Mayor Ramsey said it sounds simple, but this has been an immense amount of work with a lot of professional time going into creating those criteria mentioned. She also added that having the Olympics come does not automatically come with an infusion of federal money. It may help put the area in a better position when applying for certain things, and helps the area look more attractive, but there is no automatic money granted for infrastructure projects or anything like that. This is the reason for having a balance of aspirational projects and all the master plan projects.

Council Member Zander joined the meeting

E.3. Shields Lane Update. (By Deputy City Engineer, Jeremy Nielson)

Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson gave a brief review of the purpose of the Shields Lane Solutions Development Study currently being done. He then introduced the consultant team, Tim

Sullivan and Kai Tohinaka with the Parametrics Team, and explained that they are at the point in the study where they are looking at alternatives.

Tim Sullivan - began reviewing the prepared presentation (Attachment B) and noted there is a stakeholder committee, which includes Council Members Johnson and Harris, as well as city staff, residents, and regional transportation representatives. That group first got together in March and established the three groups of goals as listed on the prepared presentation (Attachment B). He continued reviewing the presentation, including the outreach done in the past, takeaways from the public engagement, and the potential ideas for the future based on all input received.

Kai Tohinaka - Continued reviewing Attachment B, noting they have begun reviewing costs overall. They took many of the great ideas from the public engagement and folded in other things they knew will need to be considered, developing four alternatives to offer with different goals and tradeoffs. He began reviewing the four concepts in Attachment B.

Mayor Ramsey asked where along the corridor they were suggesting eliminating the middle turn lane.

Engineer Nielson noted there is a stretch from about 2700 W up to 3200 W that does not have many accesses.

Mr. Tohinaka noted that additionally, coming out of the River Bottoms would be an area without many left turns. He continued reviewing the concepts from Attachment B. He noted a key point for Concepts 1 and 2, that they would not require any tree removal, relocations or utility pole changes.

Council Member Harris asked how they would clarify the condition of the sidewalks and curbs currently along the corridor.

Mr. Tohinaka noted they did not study that here, but they do want to be sensitive to the sidewalks and provide more space for pedestrians with wider sidewalks; however, the existing five foot sidewalk is constrained with the existing trees and park strips. He then continued his review with Concept 3 from Attachment B.

Council Member Zander shared that she appreciates the fact that this will be a lovely paseo opportunity for this section of city, but asked how this benefits the city at large as this street has long been problematic in regards to traffic and the flow being both too slow and too fast throughout. This will be a huge investment, are they expecting two-thirds or three-fourths of the city to make it to this spot to have that great flow to I-15, or are they just saying they are prioritizing this street. Is this really creating connectivity to the whole city, or are they prioritizing a small strip of one part of the city and pushing cars to other parallel streets that are already overburdened. She acknowledged that she is looking at this from a different point of view than a council member directly in this area, and noted that residents from further away would be looking at traveling to this area to take advantage of the space. She also asked if at

these open houses, are they presenting enticing options that the city in reality doesn't even have the budget for. She thinks it's lovely, she loves the two lanes and the options as someone who rides bikes and walks with strollers. She is a huge fan of active transportation, but this is such a small piece of a big city as a whole.

Engineer Nielson responded those questions are really the reasons for doing this study, to understand the priority for active transportation in the city. Looking at the city, we are long and narrow, with many options to go north and south through the city, but east and west travel is a big problem. When looking at east/west opportunities, 11400 S has a solutions development study and they are planning a 14 foot multi-use path on the south side of the street which takes care of the south half of the city. However, when looking at the north half, there is South Jordan Parkway and Shields Lane, those are really the only two options. South Jordan Parkway is dedicated to cars, and it's hard to say it's anything else. Shields Lane however is a street where they could put a bit more priority on active transportation along the corridor and possibly relieve some of the complaints received in the past about traffic, noise, speeding, etc. Shields Lane has a lot of potential with a lot of things going for it with the overpass over Bangerter and the underpass under I-15 including a future connection to Frontrunner off the Jordan River Trail when the bridge over the river is completed and many schools directly connected. The big questions asked of the public in the survey was how willing they were to make the tradeoff of a little extra travel time in exchange for safer bike and pedestrian facilities.

City Manager Lewis added that there is also a bigger vision of this tying into the Jordan River Trail, which is a great north/south travel route in that part of the valley, which once there would tie people into the vast network. On the western edge it will eventually tie to the Bingham Creek Trail, which ties into all the trails on the west side of the valley. So this would enable a connecting link between two of the great trail systems that can get you all over the valley. When looking ahead 10-20 years, this becomes a critical part of that interconnectivity for the whole area.

Council Member Zander responded that makes much more sense than just looking at it as prioritizing this little strip and push cars to other arteries through the city that are already overworked. With that connectivity piece, she can buy into this and make it make sense for those she represents on the other side of the city because it does help with their connections too.

Manager Lewis also noted that as Mountain View Corridor and U-111 are completed, many of those on the west side will have less of a need to come east to go north. They will be able to leave that area and go north or south with those options. Right now, those people don't have a lot of options to move north/south, so we need to think in terms of those projects being finished and what affect they will have on traffic.

Council Member Zander noted that was what wasn't presented, showing her and those she represents, how she can get from I-15 on a bike safely all the way to the west side. If the Bingham Creek Trail system goes to Skye Drive, then this needs to go all the way to Skye Drive in her opinion; you can't stop at Bangerter as presented. If they are going to go through all this

effort, bring it all the way up to the Bingham Creek Trail system without a gap they would have to come back and fix another day.

Engineer Nielson said the current funding only allows a study from I-15 to Bangerter, but the intent is to do exactly what Council Member Zander is suggesting. Once a solution is developed that works along this corridor, then the intent is obviously to move to the next corridor and either mimic that, or look at what solution makes the most sense to convey those pedestrians and cyclists further to the west.

Council Member Johnson noted that if this road is already all 25 to 30 mph, it's already a slower route for traffic, and that some of the comments from the public asked for the speed to stay the same throughout the corridor rather than jumping around like it does now. She added that for her, it seems like this would allow people wanting to bike to be on this road, rather than 11400 S or 10600 S in cars.

Mr. Tohinaka noted there are existing bike lanes on Skye Drive, so they already have something that functions better than this studied area of Shields Lane, and the volumes are much lower as well.

Council Member Zander thanked everyone for explaining this as a connection and asset for the entire city, rather than just being an upgraded section serving one specific area. She also noted that she prefers the two bike lane option far better than anything else presented tonight. The safety of the strollers, bikers and walkers will be much higher if coupled together, rather than splitting them on either side of the street.

Mayor Ramsey agreed with Council Member Zanders preference and observations.

Council Member Harris also likes the multi-use option because parents will feel more comfortable with their kids being off the road. Otherwise, with just the painted line separating the bike lane, you will get the professional, adult cyclists who are willing to take that risk on the road, but then you'll have all the parents who don't want their kids there; he thinks that would restrict use too narrowly. What will attract the most users, and he doesn't know if that's part of the study but he would really like to know what will attract the most cyclists, walkers, those with strollers, etc.

Mr. Tohinaka added that with their study, they will be leveling the level of traffic stress, and that has already been done on the existing conditions; that will then be done with the solutions brought forward, allowing them to quantify that better.

Council Member Harris asked if there were any scenarios or information on a situation where they have the multi-use option, but cyclists want to go fast like traffic. Would it be possible to have a space for the road bikers, possibly on the other side, to allow for those higher speeds.

Mr. Tohinaka said there was a variation that was shown with one side having a bike lane and the other side having a multi-use lane. There is ultimately limited space so it's hard to accommodate

both on street and pathway users. Their thoughts are that there will be on-street road lanes, and those types of users will be more comfortable mixing with traffic; they will probably be mixing with vehicles already. In his own experience he tends to avoid shared use paths because there is too much going on. There wouldn't be as much safety provided, but those users could still be on the road. The other consideration is that since they are reducing the lanes down, there would be less through traffic, and it would be slower, so it would be comfortable for those "Type A" users.

Council Member Harris shared that his family would be on the multi-use path, but if they are really trying to accommodate all users those more serious bikers might not want to be on that type of path and he would like that considered.

Council Member Zander discussed the commuter bikes, the ones you are clipped into and headed somewhere long and hard, and asked if those wouldn't be more of the morning/evening users, with the middle of the day users being more of kids going to school, moms walking strollers, etc.; would time of day filter some of this.

Mr. Tohinaka responded that it might to an extent, but they also have school drop-off with that confluence of commuters, along with all the kids trying to get to school; that's where you wouldn't see that. However, the daytime users are going to have the pathway more to themselves, and it's really those weekend users where they would have more issues with people trying to get their training in, trying to get out to places like Butterfield Canyon, versus the families out on the trail.

Council Member Zander noted that for that purpose, the open house should really include more people than the residents on Shields Lane; those people commuting probably don't live on Shields Lane, they are probably in a whole other section of the city and coming through the area.

Mr. Sullivan responded that they definitely want people throughout the entire city, or even the region, for the whole project process because they have always looked at this as the nexus of trails coming together. Certainly, it has always been the goal to get people throughout the city of South Jordan to share input.

Mr. Tohinaka added that they have been working to advertise for the public events through social media, being for everyone. The first open house did have mailers along the borders to target that group of people, but it was also shared on South Jordan's social media channels and was open to everyone.

Mr. Sullivan shared some of the relevant numbers, noting that they had the 360 survey respondents who were asked whether they lived on the corridor or somewhere else. It was definitely concentrated on the corridor, but he believes it was a good 25%-30% who responded they were from elsewhere.

Mayor Ramsey suggested amending the agenda to recess the remainder of the study session to the end of the regular council meeting tonight. The council decided to keep Item F.2. in this meeting, and move Item F.1. to after the regular council meeting tonight.

Council Member Shelton motioned to recess the City Council Study Meeting and move to Executive Closed Session. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

RECESS CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING AND MOVE TO EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION

F. Executive Closed Session

F.1. Discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual;

Council Member McGuire motioned to adjourn the Executive Closed Session and return to the City Council Study Meeting. Council Member Zander seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

ADJOURN EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION AND RETURN TO CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

Council Member Shelton motioned to recess the City Council Study Meeting and move to Executive Closed Session. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

F.2. Discussion pending or reasonably imminent litigation.

Council Member McGuire motioned to adjourn the Executive Closed Session and return to the City Council Study Meeting. Council Member Zander seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Zander motioned to adjourn the August 20, 2024 City Council Study Meeting. Council Member McGuire seconded the motion; vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

The August 20, 2024 City Council Study meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.