

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, April 28, 2005

STUDY SESSION

Present: Chairman Cory Ritz, Commission Members Keith Klundt, Annie Hedberg, John Montgomery, Kevin Poff, Cindy Roybal, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen, Recording Secretary Jill Hedberg, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman.

David Petersen informed the Planning Commission Members that the Planning Commission agenda for the April 28, 2005 session was advertised in the Farmington City Newsletter. It listed the start time for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) discussion as 7:00 p.m.. It was then decided that the BRT discussion should begin earlier so the start time was changed to 6:00 p.m. Approximately 270 residents located between State Street and Lund Lane received notification by mail stating the new start time.

The Commission Members agreed it would be beneficial to “continue” the public hearing for BRT until the end of the meeting, thus allowing the citizens who arrived late to the BRT hearing to be heard.

Mr. Petersen informed the Commission Members that he had received numerous phone calls from citizens who were concerned about the Bus Rapid Transit system. After he would explain the details of the system to them, most had their concerns relieved.

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Cory Ritz, Commission Members Keith Klundt, Annie Hedberg, John Montgomery, Kevin Poff, Cindy Roybal, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen, Recording Secretary Jill Hedberg, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman.

Chairman Ritz called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. **Jim Talbot** offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

John Montgomery moved that the Planning Commission approve the minutes of the April 14, 2005, Planning Commission Meeting. **Keith Klundt** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor. **Cindy Roybal** abstained due to her absence at the last meeting.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

Chairman Ritz apologized for any confusion that may have occurred as result of beginning the Bus Rapid Transit hearing one hour earlier. He assured citizens that their input would be heard. He then invited **Dave Petersen** to introduce the City's Master Transportation Plan (MTP) and the items that were to be specifically considered.

Mr. Petersen informed the citizens that vast growth had occurred since changes were made to the Master Transportation Plan (MTP) seven years ago. He explained that Horrocks Engineering had been contracted to evaluate Farmington's Master Transportation Plan.

Mr. Petersen informed citizens that the City Council would hold a public hearing on May 17, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. He encouraged residents to submit their written comments to the City where they would be included in the permanent records. He also made them aware of Farmington City's web page which could be an informative resource.

Chairman Ritz introduced **Ron Mortimer** of Horrocks Engineering to present the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alternatives.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Alternatives

Mr. Mortimer presented the proposed BRT system which included the following points:

- The proposed corridor would be 200 East because of it's limited stop signs and traffic signals. The Frontage Road could also be considered.
- There would be three proposed BRT stations which could be located at Lagoon Amusement Park, the commuter rail station, and south Farmington. Stops would include physical stations which would provide protection from the elements.
- BRT buses are larger and quieter than regular buses.
- Specific lanes for the buses could be considered, although **Mr. Mortimer** recommended incorporating the buses into the regular traffic system.
- Q-Jumpers would occur at the signal light intersections. The system would notify the bus driver that it was in the right turn lane. It would then be allowed to proceed without waiting for regular cars. Q-jumpers would make the BRT system possible without having to intrude on the width of the current roadways.

Public Hearing

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Leo Wilcox (1110 South 200 East) stated that he had previously submitted letters expressing his disapproval regarding the BRT system on 200 East. He said he was disappointed that the leaders would think the system was necessary, as was stated in the Deseret News article that he submitted. He did not feel the system was needed because he felt the current bus system was lacking riders. He felt the citizens were being forced to choose between street cars and bus systems. He would like UTA to recognize that Farmington is not an urban area and suggested running mini-buses between Farmington and Kaysville instead.

Tricia Anderson (671 Somerset Street) encouraged the Planning Commission to create the BRT system as a minor footprint to Farmington with minimal stops and minimal running time. She was concerned about the speed of the buses and the effect it would have on Main Street. She had questions she would like answered about BRT and said she would like to receive additional information. She felt the system should be limited because of the residential nature of Farmington.

Eugene Mann (56 North Main) resided on Main Street for twenty years. He did not feel there were sufficient riders to justify creating another busing system. He was concerned about the cost to loop the BRT system over the freeway to access Lagoon. He stated that if BRT were approved, it would be better served on the Frontage Road so 200 East would not have to be widened. He was against BRT and the confusion it would create in the community.

Russell Workman (1099 South 200 East) said there were two types of riders - the “park and rider” (citizens that needed to park their car at the bus station in order to ride) or the “walker” (citizens who walked to the bus station). He felt the Frontage Road would be more convenient for the “park and rider”. He did not feel the system would be beneficial to the “walkers” because there was too much distance between the stations. He was concerned about the safety of the students who walked on 200 East to attend one of the three schools in that area. He hoped that the Planning Commission Members would be sensitive the residents who lived on the proposed route.

Dal Freeman (1825 Oak Hampton Court) stated that he was a representative of Lagoon Amusement Park. He felt the Bus Rapid Transit system would solve transportation problems for Farmington by linking the east and west side commuter rail station together at the heart of the city. He informed the Commission that Lagoon was the largest employer of youth in the State and that BRT would help ensure the safe arrival of their employees and guests. Lagoon did not have an opinion as to where the BRT corridor should be constructed but was in favor of the service and asked that it be considered by the City.

Jim Barnett (938 South Creekside Court) felt the BRT goal was a commuter concept. He did not think citizens were in need of additional ways to travel within Davis County so the lack of ridership would not justify the construction cost. If BRT were approved, he felt the Frontage Road would be the best location due to the residential nature of 200 East. He was concerned that if BRT were approved, the footprint would likely increase in the future.

Chairman Ritz announced that the public hearing would continue.

Dave Petersen explained that the six mayors in South Davis County had proposed that Wasatch Front Regional Council and UTA conduct a transit study to explore the feasibility of a fixed guide way system in the area, which may include, among other things, light rail, street car, or BRT. Several years ago, voters approved a sales tax increase for transit. The six mayors wondered how this could be best spent in South Davis County. It would be costly to construct light rail so BRT was suggested. UTA studies showed that BRT would be as successful as light rail. The Wasatch Front Regional Council reported that bus ridership remained flat while light rail systems were full. **Mr. Petersen** stated that 200 East was recommended as the best corridor for BRT because of the access to the downtown area. Lagoon's business is seasonal, so without downtown access, the cost to run BRT would not be justified during Lagoon's off season. Many felt BRT would be more of an impact than Route 70 already was.

Chairman Ritz stated that if the Bus Rapid Transit system were approved, it must access Lagoon due to their heavy traffic.

Mr. Mortimer of Horrocks Engineering said the BRT system would coincide with the Master Transportation Plan proposals of UTA and Wasatch Front Regional Council which would attempt to maintain continuity. He stated that while flexibility exists in the plan, it is imperative that there be service to the downtown area and to Lagoon. He said that the Frontage Road was an option but that 200 East had the best continuity for developments further south and for service planned in Centerville.

John Montgomery stated that he dislikes following the existing Route 70 buses. He questioned how Bus Rapid Transit would be better than the system that was currently in place.

Mr. Mortimer said that the most noticeable change would be that BRT vehicles were larger and quieter. There would be fewer stops so traffic would be less affected. The stations would be built in safe locations, even if street reconstruction were necessary. He suggested that a light rail system would be feasible if BRT were successful.

John Montgomery asked if Mr. Mortimer could foresee Route 70 buses becoming nonexistent.

Mr. Mortimer replied that he could only speculate based on what had happened in other cities. In Sandy, the regular buses became feeder buses to the light rail system.

Mr. Montgomery asked if the feeders would be able to feed out of downtown and the Frontage Road. He also questioned whether it was an option to keep the heavier buses running more on the Frontage Road.

Mr. Mortimer responded by saying that it was a possibility. He stated that he did not like to speak for UTA but he did know that they would like to keep the transfers to a minimum. UTA would rather provide transfers than keep the BRT system running in a route that would not be appropriate.

Cindy Roybal questioned how the parking issues would be handled.

Mr. Mortimer stated that parking would have to be provided for the BRT stations. He stated that some stations require less parking because people are coming from other towns.

Jim Talbot stated the Frontage Road could be a positive alternative. It would avoid schools and would provide access to Lagoon. He requested that Horrocks do further research on the Frontage Road as an alternative to 200 East.

Mr. Mortimer said that the Frontage Road research could be provided within a months time. He advised the citizens that the information would be posted on Farmington City's web page for their review as well.

Annie Hedberg requested that the citizens who reside along the Frontage Road be advised as to the possibility of the BRT corridor.

Mr. Mortimer said he would work with **Dave Petersen** to find the best way to communicate any future developments to the citizens.

Keith Klundt questioned how advanced UTA's studies were and whether they had a preference between 200 East and the Frontage Road. He questioned how much impact Farmington City had on the final decision.

Mr. Mortimer said UTA had done additional studies of which the results had not been disclosed at that time. He stated that he would attempt to find out if there were any new information that could be released since the last time Horrocks Engineering had met with them.

John Montgomery stated that he was concerned as to whether the BRT would be the best option for the tax dollars spent. He questioned whether there would be a smaller scaled alternative that would deliver the same type results.

Keith Klundt said that he shared the same concerns as many of the citizens. He questioned whether the end result would justify the tax dollars spent. He felt that the BRT issue was a result of Farmington being in the middle of Ogden and Salt Lake. He expressed concern that the mixed-use solution would become a more intrusive transit such as light rail. In the end, he felt that Farmington would have to accommodate the growth and development so the best possible solution needed to be found.

Chairman Ritz requested more information from Horrocks Engineering in regards to the alignment with other cities.

Chairman Ritz reopened the public hearing for Bus Rapid Transit Alternative.

Harlow Wilcox (1149 South 200 East) submitted a written statement prior to the Planning Commission meeting. He felt that Horrocks Engineering saw transit lanes as a preferred road. He expressed concerns that signals would create traffic jams. He encouraged the Commission to take a vote as to whether the BRT be approved. He thought UTA's ridership count was skewed because one rider could be counted as more depending on the amount of stops that were passed. He also questioned the amount of money that light rail generated due to the fact that University of Utah riders were not charged. He preferred street cars over buses and did not see the need for increased bus use in the future.

Citizen (902 S 200 East) She felt that the Frontage Road would be the better alternative if the BRT were to be approved. She was concerned about the students that used 200 East to commute to and from school. She felt the beauty of 200 East should be preserved for posterity.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) stated that the proposed BRT system would only serve the southern portion of the City, the downtown area, and Lagoon Amusement Park. There were not busing options for the citizens on the northern half of the City and he would like to be assured that it would be accessible for them as well.

Todd Plumley (1006 Waterturn Drive) felt that with the growth Utah had experienced, a new alternative was necessary. Although, he didn't feel there would be an increased ridership due to the increased time the BRT would take over a street car. He questioned where the downtown Farmington employees were commuting from and whether the BRT would be beneficial. He expressed concern for the safety of the students who walked on 200 East to Reading Elementary. He thought the Frontage Road would be a better alternative because of the limited residences with driveways directly accessing the Frontage Road.

Ray Wilcox (1111 South 120 East) questioned how much money light rail generated and whether it was a success. He stated that he would like access to more information on the BRT specifics. He felt that the BRT would benefit residents of Ogden and Salt Lake at the expense of the 200 East residents. He was concerned that Farmington would lose its small town feel.

Glenn Schimmelpennig (1100 West 387 South) felt frustrated that proposals for the east side of Farmington resulted in petitions to move the item to the west side. He felt the east side should carry their share of the improvements. He was not in favor of BRT but thought 200 East was a better alternative than the Frontage Road. He felt 200 East had a larger population so there would be less parking required.

Jon Ball (717 South 200 West) stated that there were residents who lived on the Frontage Road who needed to be considered as well.

Chairman Ritz acknowledged that there were residents on the Frontage Road and stated that the decision would be handled with great care.

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing.

John Montgomery stated that the light rail system was not a means to generate income but was rather a service provided to the public.

Kevin Poff questioned what the estimated travel time would be for BRT as compared to the current busing system.

Mr. Mortimer said he had access to the projections and would make them available.

Kevin Poff suggested looking at options other than 200 East because if the freeway were to shut down, the buses would not be able to progress either.

Chairman Ritz asked that Horrocks Engineering further research where the majority of Farmington's downtown employees resided in order to determine whether the BRT system would benefit them.

Mr. Mortimer said he would find out what the downtown ridership statistics source was.

John Montgomery said it would make more sense to collect riders in the transit center. This would accommodate the cities to the north and south of Farmington, as well as Farmington's residents. He felt this would be a less intrusive alternative.

Mr. Mortimer agreed that it would be wise to feed into the intermodal center. He suggested feeder buses for riders that were not going to downtown Salt Lake City.

West State Street/South Interchange

Russell Youd of Horrocks Engineering stated that the current transportation plan needed to address issues relating to the West State Street and Frontage Road connection. He suggested creating an at-grade intersection at that location which would reduce traffic, although other traffic calming alternatives existed. He stressed that the timing of this improvement was critical and would need to be done as part of the Legacy Highway reconstruction of the State Street overpass. The Legacy team would be willing to consider the improvement if the City were to present a plan to them. He said he would like input on the matter, especially Lagoon's input as to what their future plans were.

Mr. Youd explained that the other issue that needed to be addressed was the configuration of the south entrance entering 200 West. The new plan would create an at-grade system and provide continuity on the Frontage Road. He stated that different traffic calming techniques could be incorporated such as landscaped raised medians. Raised medians were known to slow traffic due to the narrower road space and were also considered safer for pedestrians. He stated that the 1998 Master Transportation Plan proposed a round-about at that location but due to the high traffic volume, the intersection would likely be signalized. He stressed that it was critical to address this issue in a timely manner so UDOT could carry it into their I-15 reconstruction. He invited comments regarding the reconfiguration of the off-ramp.

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Clark Skeen (380 South 200 West) attended as a representative of Quantronix (a business located on 200 West). He stated that Quantronix was located at the end of 200 West. Quantronix could see the value in the proposed interchange but would like to study the ramifications. He had the following questions:

- Would the proposed changes affect their property line?
- Would the City re-landscape the northwest side of 200 West?
- Will curb and gutter be replaced?
- Will Quantronix have access to the new frontage road from their property?

Mr. Youd's opinion was that there would likely be access to the Frontage Road from 200 West.

Alyssa Revell (208 West State) believed that traffic had quadrupled in the past five years. She felt that both plans could be beneficial but questioned whether the cost was justified. She also questioned why three bridges would be rebuilt without freeway access. She was in favor of the traffic calming on State Street, although she stated that raised medians would interfere with residents that utilized horse trailers. She expressed interest in the plans for the freeway going north and south. She was also interested in how the City would want the residents in the new development on the south to access the freeway.

Dal Freeman (representative of Lagoon) stated that on weekend days and holidays, approximately 13,000 people traveled under the overpass two times per day which equates to approximately 3,200 cars. He said the frontage road served as a “below the city” street to those cars both in the morning and evening. If those cars were to be incorporated into the downtown, State Street congestion would be considerably heavier.

In regards to the South Interchange, **Mr. Freeman** stated that adding an intersection with a traffic signal would create extreme traffic backup. He encouraged the Planning Commission Members to take into consideration the amount of cars that pass through that area daily.

Keith Klundt asked if Lagoon had considered reconfiguring their main entrance.

Dal Freeman stated that Lagoon owned property on Park Lane but was not considering reconfiguring the main entrance or relocating the parking area.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) was not in favor of the 200 West option due to Lagoon’s heavy traffic. He suggested finding an alternative that could incorporate the great amount of land not being used to prevent the traffic congestion.

Jeff Tolman (433 South 200 West) suggested Glover Lane or an alternative where people on the west and south sides could access closer to their homes. He felt this would help reduce the traffic within the city, but encouraged a new trail be created to address the pedestrian concerns. He was in favor of a true north/south bound interchange that would reduce traffic within the city.

Charles Clark (368 West State Street) stated that he and his neighbors in the Historic District were in favor of an at-grade intersection. He felt that putting the intersection at-grade and raising the frontage road would slow traffic. He suggested providing a southern exit that would prevent people from entering downtown and interfering with school zones. He stated that the biggest benefit of the at-grade intersection would be to provide a natural sound barrier to the three block area. **Mr. Clark** also suggested that Lagoon’s main entrance be relocated to the interchange on Park Lane.

Jon Ball (717 South 200 West) suggested Glover Lane as an option. He shared the same concerns as the Quantronix representative.

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing.

John Montgomery asked **Mr. Freeman** if Lagoon had any solutions regarding the southern access to Lagoon.

Mr. Freeman stated that Lagoon would be willing to consider improvements. He stated that the main entrance was now in the south with the parking overflow in the northern field. He said they were not working on plans to change the access to the main entrance. It would be a huge reconstruction project.

Kevin Poff stated that he appreciated the Lagoon representatives sharing their traffic statistics. He questioned what Lagoon's peak arrival times were and how Lagoon was able to process patrons through their entrance gates.

Dick Andrew (Lagoon Representative) stated Lagoon's statics in terms of times of arrival. On Saturdays, half of their attendance would have arrived by 1:00 p.m. and would average between 1500-1800 vehicles. On Sundays, a higher percentage would arrive before 1:00 p.m.. On weekdays, there would be a big influx before noon with another big influx around rush hour at the end of the day. Lagoon tracked their statistics in two hour increments.

Kevin Poff questioned the speed at which Lagoon could process their guests through their parking entrance booths.

Dick Andrew stated that there were wait times that occurred on Saturdays but they were efficient, considering the amount of guests arriving.

Cindy Roybal asked if Lagoon encouraged their patrons to enter Farmington on Park Lane.

Dick Andrews stated that Lagoon encouraged their patrons to access Lagoon any way they were able due to the confusion of the freeway systems.

Cindy Roybal asked what Lagoon's preferred route would be.

Dick Andrew responded that they would prefer patrons come from the south. If the patrons were to come from Clark Lane, they would have to loop back without traffic control and would also have to make a left turn to access the main gates. He stated that restructuring the access and parking areas would be a major undertaking but Lagoon would be willing to research the possibility.

Jim Talbot stated that Lagoon's entrance did create congested traffic patterns and that the community would be better served if Lagoon would provide an alternative entrance. He stated that as a patron, if access to Lagoon was difficult, he may not attend. He suggested Lagoon show good faith and consider a better traffic pattern for patrons and residents of Farmington.

Dick Andrew stated that Lagoon was looking at different alternatives to solve the current problem.

Cindy Roybal asked Mr. Youd if it would be an option to reconfigure the south interchange to allow citizens coming from the west the option to go northbound.

Mr. Youd stated that creating an entrance from the west would be a problem due to the current ramp configuration. He also stated that considering Glover Lane would be extremely expensive because there would not be enough room with the future commuter rail. He said there would need to be an interchange reconfiguration that would allow for access.

Cindy Roybal questioned the possibility of queing back on the freeway.

Mr. Youd said it would be beneficial to study Lagoon's traffic statistics, but that the intersection did have the ability to handle large traffic numbers. He felt the patrons of Lagoon would eventually use the Park Lane interchange for access. He stated that the west side development had a big impact on the roadways as well.

John Montgomery suggested there needed to be an access point from the west side due to the recent residential development, as well as the future commercial developments. He suggested considering realignment of the frontage road due it's awkward turn. He was opposed to the idea of landscaping the raised medians stating that attractive landscaping can not survive Utah's winters. He suggested finding other decorative alternatives.

Chairman Ritz said he was a resident of the west side who agreed that traffic calming needed to be created on 200 West and State Street. He stated that freeway access had improved on the west side with the opening of the Park Lane interchange. He would be in favor of the at-grade intersection at State Street and suggested analyzing Lagoon's statistics to determine whether it would be advantageous.

Chairman Ritz invited Horrocks Engineering to introduce the next item on the agenda.

North Main (north of Shepard Lane and south of the Cherry Hill Interchange)

Ron Mortimer of Horrocks Engineering stated that their recommendations for North Main were not impacted by specific developments. Their goal was to try to preserve as much of North Main as possible.

In regards to Main Street, it was felt that the location was too close to create a signal. **Mr. Mortimer** stated that two signals would interfere with one another. One improvement would be to create a roundabout which would allow vehicles to proceed smoothly.

In regards to the Shepard Lane and Main Street intersection, **Mr. Mortimer** suggested it could be configured in the future and would appreciate any input from the Planning Commission members and citizens.

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Tricia Anderson (671 Somerset Street) was not in favor of a roundabout at Northridge. She felt it was a “band-aid”, not a permanent solution. She suggested Historic Main Street be taken into consideration. She stated she would like to see drawings created that were to scale. She believed the intersection would fail if the traffic coming from Fruit Heights were not redirected and that Fruit Heights should take responsibility for their traffic. She encouraged the Planning Commission Members to take into consideration the amount of cyclists, pedestrians, and joggers that used this area and to seriously consider the size and impact the roundabouts would have.

Dave Mulholland (434 West Welling Way) questioned who would pay for the improvements and what the estimated cost would be. He suggested Fruit Heights fund the improvements.

Dave Petersen replied that it would be difficult to convince Fruit Heights to fund improvements done in Farmington City. He said the funding for the improvements could either come from Farmington City, tax payers, or Utah State money. It had not been decided at that time.

Dave Mulholland stated that 1400 North was dangerous in the winter because the cars would slide onto Main Street. He said he had previously suggested the City address the problem but received no response in return. He suggested the new system was being addressed because of future developments.

Drew Neil (1454 North 900 West) resided north of Smiths. He stated that most cars traveling on the Frontage Road were going at least 40 miles per hour. He was concerned that there was not a de-acceleration lane so there was the risk of getting rear ended or having the patrons of Smiths collide with the Frontage Road traffic.

Mr. Neil stated he was familiar with the physics of roundabouts. The smaller the roundabout, the slower the traffic moved. If a traffic signal were to be near a roundabout, it would create backups. He felt this area was used as an alternative to Highway 89 and I-15 when accidents occurred and that further congestion would be present when the Old Farm area was developed.

Carlie Neil (1454 North 900 West) wanted to comment about the roundabout issue. She stated that if commercial development occurred on the Old Farm, it would be comparable to the

roundabout located near the Park City outlets. She felt that roundabouts do not relieve congestion but rather create further traffic delays. She was also concerned about the non-existence of a de-acceleration lane and was surprised that the issue had not been previously addressed.

Richard Heindel (715 Somerset) said he had seen similar plans before and felt the proposal for the three intersections were generated by potential development in the area. He was in favor of a traffic light at Somerset. He stated that people who were familiar with roundabouts were not in favor of them. He felt that roundabouts had a negative effect because the traffic was reduced from five lanes down to two. He was concerned teenagers would use the roundabouts recklessly. He stated that roundabouts were not practical, but problematic.

Sharon Treu (931 West Northridge Road) felt that development in northern Farmington would continue to grow and that an entrance off Highway 89 would alter the quality of neighborhood life. She suggested the City find other alternatives that would maintain the roads for cyclists, pedestrians and joggers. She had encountered many individuals who were familiar with roundabouts who were not in favor of them. She felt the proposals were in preparation for future development and suggested resolving the development issues before changing the roadways.

Amy Hayter (1752 North Ramsgate Road) stated that the City had done well at notifying citizens regarding the Planning Meeting but would have liked access to more information prior to the Meeting. She stated that if there were an option between a traffic signal and a roundabout, she would be in favor of a roundabout. She was concerned about getting children to school safely and felt the traffic light was the safer alternative.

Dave Guilles (1222 West Oakridge Park Drive) represented the Legacy Homeowners Association with concerns regarding the west intersection and Shepherd Lane. He stated that the developer of the Fieldstone Subdivision had deposited money into escrow for a light at the specified intersection. As a citizen and a homeowner, he strongly encouraged the Planning Commission Members to consider installing a traffic light instead of a roundabout. He felt that even if a roundabout were installed, a light would be required within five years due to the increased development on the west of Farmington.

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing.

John Montgomery did not think roundabouts would be a long-term solution due to the increased developments and the congestion roundabouts could create. He also thought the safety of the children walking to school should be considered on Main Street.

Cindy Roybal asked the Horrocks Engineers if a traffic light would be preferential to a roundabout.

Mr. Mortimer replied that a traffic light could be used on 1400 North. He said the issue that needed addressing was the amount of traffic that was coming from outside of the community. He also suggested the future development be taken into consideration to ensure traffic circulation. In regards to the Frontage Road de-acceleration concern, he assured the citizens he would research it and have UDOT address it as well. He stated that the issue should have been addressed at the time of construction.

Cindy Roybal stated that the roundabout on Shepard Lane had been addressed at a previous Planning Commission Meeting. She would like to have the issue reconsidered due to the growth in that area.

Mr. Mortimer felt a roundabout would work at the Shepard Lane intersection. He stated that roundabouts work best with balanced flows.

Keith Klundt stated that he was in favor of a roundabout because problems occurred sooner with the signal at 1075 West than had been anticipated.

Dave Petersen said the request had already been granted for a roundabout at Shepard Lane and 1075 West Street.

John Montgomery stated that sometimes inaction is the best action. He felt that if the issue was left unresolved, Fruit Heights may find solutions.

Mr. Mortimer said safety could not be compromised while waiting for Fruit Heights to take action. Farmington citizens could be the ones who were jeopardized. He stated that most of the travelers on that road had a destination within our community or were Farmington residents.

Chairman Ritz asked if a roundabout would be beneficial on the Farmington / Fruit Heights border.

Mr. Mortimer said he would do further research to find methods to create traffic calming, as well as discourage traffic flows.

Keith Klundt felt that traffic on Main Street should be kept to a minimum. He suggested diverting traffic into commercial or residential developments in order to keep Main Street traffic volumes low and at desirable speeds.

Mr. Mortimer said the Master Transportation Plan called for an “intersection improvement” but felt **Mr. Klundt’s** suggestion was worth considering.

Annie Hedberg questioned whether Horrocks Engineering would respond to the Planning Commission regarding the specific findings on each issue.

Mr. Mortimer replied that the response would not take place in a public hearing forum. He stated that various options could be implemented and that they would like to deal with each situation as the City deemed appropriate. He said site specific options would become available as they arose but that the current focus was the Master Transportation Plan.

Kevin Poff said he was not in favor of roundabouts. He felt signage could be a good alternative and said he would like to see all options exhausted before putting a roundabout into effect.

Jim Talbot asked Horrocks Engineering to inform them of the cost differential between a roundabout and a traffic light (semi-4).

Mr. Mortimer stated that a traffic light would cost approximately \$100,000 - \$200,000. A roundabout would cost approximately \$150,000 - \$400,000.

Mr. Talbot stated that the 1400 North issue was critical and that it needed to be addressed. He also felt the Frontage Road de-acceleration issue needed to be further researched. His main concern was the Main Street issue in regards to the Fruit Heights traffic. He felt that there needed to be a solution found due to the 300 + homes that would be developed in the area but was unsure as to the appropriate solution.

Mr. Talbot stated that there was a roundabout in the St. George area on the Bloomington border. He felt it was comparable to the roundabout that would be constructed in Farmington, if approved. He felt the biggest obstacle to a roundabout would be educating the citizens. He did express concerns as to the young drivers misusing it and the landscaping issues that would need to be addressed. He stated he may be in favor of other alternatives due to the lack of roundabout knowledge.

Chairman Ritz asked if Farmington had sufficient space for the size of roundabout that would be needed.

Mr. Talbot said that he believed Farmington did have ample space.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) wanted to include in the hearing that he was not an advocate of roundabouts. He encouraged the Planning Commission Members to petition the City Council to install a two-way stop sign as an alternative to the roundabout at 1075 West and Shepard Lane. He felt it would be successful since the Cherry Hill interchange had been opened.

Chairman Ritz called for a recess at 9:06 p.m. and reconvened at 9:15 p.m.

Northwest Farmington/Oakridge area

Russell Youd stated that the west side of Farmington and Kaysville was changing from agricultural uses to residential uses which had brought significant traffic changes. There had been proposals to run North Legacy through Davis County. The right of way for the North Legacy had been set to run alongside the railroad tracks. Several years ago, Wasatch Front Regional Council conducted a study to determine the course of the North Legacy. It was determined that it should use a corridor to connect to the interchange complex at Highway 89 and I-15. Since the time of the North Legacy Study, commuter rail had been proposed for that location. **Mr. Youd** asked for input on how North Legacy could be connected to Legacy Parkway. He was concerned that if a connection was not made, Farmington and Kaysville traffic would use Shepard Lane, Park Lane or West State Street as alternate routes. He stated that other corridors had been explored but because of local transportation issues, Kaysville was not an option for the North Legacy Connection. He stated that the most favorable option to access I-15 from Legacy North would be Legacy Parkway or to the south. He informed the Planning Commission Members that additional studies needed to be done but that Horrocks Engineering did recommend considering this for the Master Transportation Plan.

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing and stated that the Legacy North connection was the best alternative he had seen thus far.

Paul Hayward (1663 West 1410 North) felt that there was an adversarial relationship that existed between UTA and UDOT. He felt that the legislature needed to deal with the issue. He didn't understand why North Legacy would have to coincide with I-15 since UTA owned a rail line that went directly from where Legacy entered the city in Centerville to where Legacy entered in Kaysville. He suggested blending North Legacy with South Legacy. He questioned the studies which prevented Kaysville from being considered and was also concerned with how the studies were being paid. He suggested that the best solution was to do nothing.

Henry Warner (127 West State Street) wanted to address the agenda item titled *Other*. He was more concerned with having people leave Farmington than with the people entering Farmington. In regards to the interchanges that serviced Lagoon and downtown Farmington, **Mr. Warner** suggested considering a rapid freeway on/off ramp for buses to access Lagoon then return to the freeway. He suggested servicing Glover Lane and the courthouse with smaller buses that would circle through Farmington. He felt this would be a better alternative for the community.

Bob McKeen (1351 North 1670 West) considered the proposal to be an improvement but still saw a single point of failure. He thought that blending Legacy South with I-15 would still leave a possibility of traffic congestion. He felt that using Legacy South to access Legacy North

would create traffic criss-crossing. He suggested the government obtain the necessary land to maintain two separate freeway systems. In regards to roundabouts, he felt that people who understood them were in favor of them. He felt that educating the citizens was the key point to successful roundabouts.

Bruce Richards (1184 North 1500 West) stated that the recent development on the west side was resulting in traffic issues. He said that Legacy Highway would be approximately 20 years away and that there were issues which needed to be addressed now. He suggested creating a frontage road on the west side of I-15 which would divert traffic away from Shepard Lane. He stated that UDOT did not include a connection so North Legacy would then connect to Park Lane. He stated that Farmington does not create all of the traffic issues, but prepares solutions to resolve them.

Mike Romney (1451 W Burke Lane) said he was representing people who lived in the Burke Lane area who were concerned about new road developments. He did not think there had been efforts made to avoid creating major roads in his area. Burke Lane was supposed to be a dead end road and is now being considered as a possibility for a major through road that would serve west Farmington as well as west Kaysville. He felt this would be an unsafe and undesirable location for a major roadway. He felt the City Planners could make minor adjustments to avoid this major road. He felt misled by Council Members who had reassured the residents in the past that they would be looked after.

Don Clark (1774 West Burke Lane) stated that the road closure would create access issues for the school zones and would affect 12-15 buses per day. He felt the road should be closed or left as a minor secondary road. He suggested keeping Kaysville's traffic out of Farmington's residential areas. He was frustrated because residents had purchased homes with the assumption the road would remain a dead end.

Kyle Stowell (1764 West Burke Lane) purchased land 14 months ago in order to build his residence. Prior to purchasing the property, he was told by City Planners that Burke Lane would remain a dead end street. Since that time, it had been proposed that Burke Lane be changed from a dead end road to a main road. This was of great concern to him because he had an eight year old son that suffered from CFC syndrome. This syndrome would require his son to need a quiet road for safety reasons. **Mr. Stowell** took every precaution to make sure that his son's needs would be met. He felt that he had not received adequate response from Farmington City and that Burke Lane residents should be taken into consideration instead of Kaysville residents.

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing.

Cindy Roybal questioned Horrocks Engineers as to whether it would be possible for the Legacy North loop to come closer to the Park Lane interchange. She also questioned how the golf course would be impacted.

Mr. Youd informed the Planning Commission Members that the City had paid for the study and would be reimbursed by UDOT. Some of the questions could not be addressed until the study was complete. There would need to be further research to determine the impact of the golf course. He stated that the real concern would be to shorten the CD Road. He said it would be hard to relocate it to the south but that further studies could be done.

In response to a question by planning commissioners, Russell Youd commented that citizens were in favor of using the railroad corridor as an alternative but that it was not in the best interest of Farmington as a whole. He said that there were significant issues that would have to be dealt with in regards to west side development. He said a number of homes would be jeopardized and there were a number of sensitive wetlands that could not be altered. He felt there would be significant negative impacts to face if the City were to utilize the railroad corridor. The lands to the west would always be preserved.

Chairman Ritz stated that he would like to avoid affecting the homes on Burke Lane.

West Farmington major collector alternatives

Mr. Youd spoke regarding the west Farmington major collector alternatives. He stated that in developing communities, the residents to occupy first were usually the ones to endure the ramifications of development. He stated that long roads were usually the ones to be altered. He said 1100 West was an option to extend Park Lane to a proposed road in Centerville which would take traffic further south. He said it would give Farmington another road to exit the city.

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing.

Earnest Hill (720 West 2350 North, West Bountiful) purchased a piece of property 1 ½ years ago assuming it would remain a dirt road. The original proposal for a road to Centerville was 650 West, which he was in favor of. He could not foresee there ever being development in that area and that the cost for improvements would be excessive.

Glen Schimmelfennig (1100 West 387 South) was in favor of utilizing 650 West as the road to access Centerville because it was already half way there. He suggested that using a left turn on the Denver Rio Grande would have less impact on people who backed onto the main road. He expressed concern for the residents who owned horses that lived on 1100 West if the road extension were to be approved.

Cheryl Farnsworth (287 South 1100 West) said that 1100 West was a residential street which was already struggling with issues concerning traffic speeds. She was in favor of creating a road on the west side of the Denver Rio Grande or extending 650 West to Centerville. She stated that many of the residents on 1100 West owned horse property which would no longer be of value if a major road were to occur.

Heidi Ritz (903 West 500 South) stated that there was not sufficient signage on 500 South and 1100 West to direct people to their destinations. She felt too many people were finding themselves in neighborhoods they did not desire to be in. She stated that Farmington residents needs should be served, not the needs of Kaysville residents.

Niels Plant (311 South 650 West) stated that he was involved with the Master Transportation Plan when it began in 1994. He was concerned that if there were a chemical spill from the rail road it would be difficult to exit Farmington. He felt another alternative was needed as far west as possible to have access to the south. The 1998 Master Transportation Plan included the Haul Road as an alternative road. **Mr. Plant** felt this was a better alternative than extending 650 West. He also suggested that traffic from Park Lane could be directed to 1100 West to the cattle (or Haul Road) road which would then connect with Centerville. He was in favor of keeping the roadway lines straight and finding an additional route to exit Farmington.

Glen Schimmelpfennig (1100 West 387 South) was in favor of utilizing land just east of the Denver Rio Grande between the Fair Grounds and Glover Lane as the location of the future major collector.

John Montgomery asked how feasible it would be to utilize the Denver Rio Grande.

Dave Petersen stated it would be a disruption to the property owners on the rear property line. He was concerned the County would be opposed because it would take parking from the fairgrounds. He said further exploration could be done. He added that the Cattle Road (which ran along the west side of the Denver Rio Grande tracks) was owned by the County. He said it was already a straight-through street to Centerville. There were no wetland issues that he was aware of so there should not be permit problems with the Army Corp. of Engineers. 650 West, which was a proposed road, did not yet have access to Centerville. **Mr. Petersen** said that east Farmington and west Farmington should both have equal roads to exit the City. At the current time, the east side had two exiting routes while the west side only had one planned. **Mr. Petersen** felt the Cattle Road could be that second option.

John Montgomery agreed with **Dave Petersen**. He suggested working with the system rather than against it. He said a lot of money would be saved while disrupting very little. He felt the residents would rather have a road on the back side of their property than the front.

Chairman Ritz thought most citizens would be in favor of using the Cattle Road.

Annie Hedberg asked **Mr. Hill** what their property would have been used for.

Mr. and Mrs. Hill responded that they had intended to become residents and business owners in Farmington but if the 1100 West proposal were to go through, they would sell the property.

Annie Hedberg stated the importance of being sensitive to the residents in that area. The horse property and the lifestyles of the residents could be very much affected.

Kevin Klundt expressed concern about ways for residents to get their horses to and from the Fairgrounds. He stated that trails were necessary. He asked if there were any possibility of linking I-15 or Legacy connections with Glover Lane.

Mr. Youd responded that the answer today would be “no”, but that things could change twenty years from now.

Chairman Ritz stated that traffic calming was necessary regardless of the decisions made due to the increased traffic speeds. He stated that something was needed for the long term and the present. He questioned what could be done to improve the traffic exiting Park Lane.

Dave Petersen addressed the Burke Lane residents stating that the northwest area had been a central concern and more time and resources had been spent on that item than all of the other areas of the nights meeting combined. He stated that he and the City Manager, Max Forbush, were constantly looking for solutions. He said there were always negatives that they had to balance and weigh. He reassured the Burke Lane residents that they were being heard and that efforts were being made to better their situation. He invited any comments or suggestions that they may have.

No votes were taken.

Annie Hedberg moved that the issue be tabled until Horrocks Engineering was ready to bring it before them again. **Kevin Klundt** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

City Council Report

Dave Petersen reported that the City Council had approved the re-zoning of the Tuscany Cove subdivision from A-F to L-R-F.

The City Council tabled Ron Martinez's request for final plat approval for the Silverwood Estates subdivision.

Jim Talbot suggested hearing the City Council report at the beginning of the Planning Commission Meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Cory Ritz, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission