



EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY COUNCIL JOINT WORK MEETING – SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION SESSION

JANUARY 8, 2025, 6:00 PM
FOX HOLLOW GOLF COURSE CLUBHOUSE
1400 N 200 E, AMERICAN FORK, UT 84003

***Minutes provided by American Fork City*

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT: Councilmembers Donna Burnham, Melissa Clark, Rich Wood, and Brett Wright. Mayor Tom Westmoreland and Councilmember Jared Gray were excused.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Benjamin Reeves, City Manager; Steve Mumford, Deputy City Manager/Community Development Director; Gina Olsen, City Recorder; Vince Hogge, City Engineer; and Brandon Larson, Planning Director.

AMERICAN FORK OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mayor Brad Frost, Councilmembers Ryan Hunter, and Ernie John; City Administrator David Bunker; Assistant City Administrator Camden Bird; Public Works Director Sam Kelly; Police Lieutenant Stuart Fore; and City Recorder Terilyn Lurker.

TOWN OF CEDAR FORT OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mayor Wyatt Cook.

FAIRFIELD TOWN OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mayor Hollie McKinney; and Councilmembers Richard Cameron, and Michael Weber.

LEHI CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mayor Mark Johnson; Councilmembers Paige Albrecht, Paul Hancock, Heather Newall, and Michelle Stallings; City Engineer Lorin Powell; and Assistant City Engineer Brad Kenison.

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS OFFICIALS PRESENT: Mayor Jim Miller; Councilmembers Aubrey Barton, Christopher Carn, Lance Wadman, and Stephen Willden; City Manager Mark Christensen; and Public Works Director/City Engineer Jeremy Lapin.

OTHERS PRESENT: Jeff Acerson, UTA Boardmember; Eric Rasband, UDOT Region 3 Planning Manager; Josh Gibbons, Hales Engineering; and Rob Shelton, American Fork Resident.

6:00 PM JOINT WORK SESSION

1. WELCOME

Mayor Brad Frost welcomed everyone to the meeting at 6:05 p.m. and explained the purpose of the joint work session was to discuss the transportation needs of the communities. They were there to receive information and data from the consultants and engineering groups that had been meeting. They needed to look at the transportation needs for build-out, not just the current needs. He indicated Eric Rasband, Josh Gibbons, and Sam Kelly would present information to the attendees.

2. DISCUSSION ON TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

Eric Rasband, UDOT, explained that they were approached by Lehi City with proposals regarding transportation in the vicinity of Camp Williams. They then brought in a firm to come in and help with that. The population they were given at the start of the study was about 200,000 less than what would be covered in today's presentation, but the information would still be similar. They looked at the freeway connection, which would carry a lot of traffic and pull traffic off 2100 North. They are dumping 60,000 to 70,000 trips a day onto I-15 and Mountain View Corridor. The initial look validated their concerns that there would be congestion. They ran through several options for what they could do to make it work. and came up with a collector-distributor system. This is a one-way frontage road system where they exit off the main line lanes and the entrances/exits happen along the frontage road. He noted they would need to add 3-4 collector-distributor lanes on I-15 at the point of the mountain to make this work. Mr. Rasband stated this was in MAG's plan as a vision, unfunded project. He indicated that WFRM and MAG have been heavily involved and the information they put together will be shared with them.

Josh Gibbons, Hales Engineering, stated they have been working with Lehi and other cities on transportation issues trying to find solutions that benefit everyone. He presented the growth projections, went over the two focus areas, origin-destination analysis, and transportation options. (*See attached presentation.*)

Growth Projections

Mr. Gibbons said they reached out to city personnel and asked for a full buildout population, which was overall around 670,000 people between all the participating cities. The 2024 numbers they had seen were low across the board.

Mr. Mark Christensen stated he will be advocating they go to an occupancy number as they look at growth projections. He pointed out that with incorrect data, they would always be behind in all their projections.

Mr. Gibbons continued there were two focus areas: Point of the Mountain and the area north of Utah Lake.

Point of the Mountain.

They have done some analysis on these to see what the road would look like and the impact it would have on other roads. A map showed the current plan and funded roads, trends for traffic, and the impact on connections. Mr. Gibbons went over the calculations with the proposed routes, with the projected traffic volumes. Overall, there are benefits for shorter travel distances, and helps Porter Rockwell work as a 7-lane road. He noted that UDOT was ramping up their study and there would be better information available.

North Lake Area

He noted that MAG has a freeway on three potential alignments: Pioneer Crossing being converted from an arterial road to a freeway; Pony Express alignment that would come from I-15 on the southeast to tie into Mountain View Corridor; and the third proposed was to go off 1500 South, across Utah Lake, and tie into a variety of points.

Mr. Gibbons stated that the capacity was how much a road can manage, and presented the maximum they could carry. However, congestion and delay come when the volume is less than what was shown

in the chart. He noted the information on the slide was for one freeway for each option, not multiple freeways. Mr. Gibbons presented the estimate of cars on the road for each of the scenarios, which helps them understand the routes that would be more desirable for people to take. It was noted that if the freeway roads are taken out or shut down, it results in a lot of traffic on other roads. The idea behind these scenarios is that they have more alternatives in emergency situations.

Origin-Destination Analysis

He showed the map of the routes people take that will use the proposed freeways using all three scenarios. It shows where the majority of roads are being used. He explained that all roads were included in the maps, but each individual map showed who was using that particular freeway and where they started and were heading; it was specific to those people on that freeway.

Some of the attendees did not agree with what was shown on the map and the assumptions made.

Transportation Options

Mr. Gibbons stated they also needed to talk about other transportation options, such as high-capacity transit routes. As the routes are planned, they need to talk about whether they want that route to include high-capacity transit.

Mr. Gibbons also went over a few specific spots, such as American Fork Main Street. The traffic volume is 35,000 to 40,000 cars a day, and they would expect some growth here. This was one spot that needed to be looked at as a potential problem spot, as it is already congested. There were also impacts along Pony Express Parkway and Ranches Parkway that have similar issues.

Sam Kelly, American Fork City Public Works Director, stated the technical group of engineers and public works directors have been meeting and looked at the data. They understand there are still issues they need to have addressed, but they created a spreadsheet to list the support or opposition to the different options. This was simply looking at the data, and the general feelings of the cities.

There was a discussion on whether the cities were in support or opposition of the options. Some attendees felt the councils were not presented with this information, nor did they give any implied support. They felt the information needed to be given out to the cities so each council can review the information and make an informed decision. Frustration was expressed that they were back to square one, where there was a lack of communication and incorrect data. It was noted that if the cities had better information to be used, then they should provide the data they have to the consultants. The engineering group does their best with the information they are given, but the data presented will not be correct if the numbers are not correct.

Mr. Bunker stated this was a starting point, not the end, and if there is information that needs to be corrected, they need to provide that to the engineering group. It was restated that the data used in the calculations was obtained from city planning and engineering departments or UDOT. The purpose of this meeting was to constructively say where there were inaccuracies and what they need to do to move forward. The data they were using was the full build-out numbers, which was higher than current assumptions.

Mayor Mark Johson stated he was the one who suggested the consultants reach out to City staff members to allow for work to be done independently of any political group, as they did not want to

influence any of the decisions. He felt the City engineers were working hard and would love to have updated information so the projections would be correct.

Mayor Frost stated they are moving this forward by learning something. He stated one question was if the City engineers had the most current information, and they needed to leave this meeting figuring out how they come up with the best solutions. It was acknowledged that one benefit of this body was that they recognized other organizations do not have the correct numbers, which would hinder them if they were using the wrong numbers. It was noted that the data used was for buildout, which was provided by the cities; it was not based on MAG numbers.

One attendee commented that they need to come up with a southern solution, or they are not solving the problem. They need something on the lake. It was pointed out that all scenarios presented did include a planned lake connection at Pelican Point.

Attendees agreed that the correct data needed to be included in the models. The numbers for Cedar Fort and Fairfield have been included, but it was the data that was provided by MAG; they need to get the correct data.

Mayor Frost stated they need to talk about how the City engineers get together and compile data, as well as how they obtain their data. He noted that everyone has skin in the game, but it has been Lehi that has been paying for everything; it should be a shared cost as it takes time and money. He questioned what information they would like to see moving forward. One request was that the models include all the roads, as well as information on how one road would impact the other roads, such as the difference in traffic flow.

Lehi City Engineer Lorin Powell explained they have been developing this for the last few years, and they were there to get information from the cities. They got the data from the planners, which is the information they put into the models. He was not sure if the staff went back to the councils with information. One attendee stated he wanted to trust their staff but wanted to know that the correct data was included.

An attendee commented that once some of the roads go in, the building patterns can shift. For instance, if a road goes in over the lake, it will open development further south in Saratoga Springs.

Lorin Powell noted they have not even talked about water rights. If they do not have water, the projections they have will not matter. If they do not have water, they do not have any development.

A concern expressed was that the support/opposed chart was premature and should be left off until the councils have a chance to look at the data.

The updated information should be given to any member of the technical group, but Lehi City could take the information. It was suggested that each city give directions to their staff to take back to the technical group.

Mark Christensen expressed his concern that there wasn't a whole lot to do to change the course until the environmental impact studies (EIS) are done. An EIS will not take place as there is no funding for that, so they need to aim for funding. He felt that the talk on the Utah Lake crossing is contingent on the EIS.

Where should they focus their energy? He felt they needed to all work together on projects today that will help the cities with transit now, while they work on long range plans.

There was a discussion among the attendees about what they should focus on. Some felt they needed to focus on what they can do now, while others felt they needed to come up with an end goal or they could miss the mark now and must build the same road over and over.

Mark Christensen stated it was important that the cities work together so one community was not finished with their portion of a road while the other cities are not; he felt it was critical to solve that in the next couple of years. Mayor Johnson commented that Lehi was working on obtaining funding for transportation; they have obtained funding for two lanes on the Pony Express parkway and are asking for funding for five lanes. He felt that without funding, they didn't have a project. Lehi has the best transportation lobbyist in DC working for them to secure funding for projects.

Lehi Assistant Engineer Brad Kenison explained they have \$6 million to purchase ROW for Pony Express and were waiting for additional funding and the EIS to begin moving forward. It was important they determine the road width, so they know what to build.

Mayor McKinney said one thing that needed to be considered was what traffic was currently on the road. For instance, there are landfills in Fairfield that bring in 150 semi-trucks on the roads each day. Mr. Kenison explained the MAG models are based on land use and not just population and pointed out they were looking at build-out numbers.

Mark Christensen questioned when they would begin construction, to which Mr. Denison explained they were moving forward and hoping to start on the two lanes in 2027-2028.

Mayor Frost explained that the councils need to make sure their engineers have the information they need. It was expressed that the technical group should not make assumptions that everyone knows what is included when they put out any projections.

Mark Christensen stated the city councils need to give the Hales Engineering group direction, or they will continue to work in circles. For example, Saratoga Springs has set aside a 180-foot cross section preserved for Pony Express Parkway. They may not agree on everything, but they can agree on what to preserve for the corridor so future development does not overrun it. Mr. Christensen explained they are ready to build the first three lanes of the road to Lehi now, but if Lehi was still five years off then it did them no good. He stated they need relief now, not five years down the road.

Mr. Christensen added he hoped that Lehi and American Fork were amenable to asking MAG for their funding sooner. Mayor Frost answered that it was important for them to see the end goal; once he saw that he felt they could make short- and long-term decisions. Councilmember Rich Wood disagreed, stating they needed to provide services to those who have elected them, which means they need to plan for the future but they can't sacrifice what they need now. He questioned if Lehi and American Fork would partner with them now to finish short-term solutions; they cannot wait for 2028 for this to take place.

Mayor Mark Johnson noted there were only a handful of those in attendance that are voting members of MAG. He commented they do want to improve Pioneer Crossing, and MAG has agreed to fund them.

They have done what they can do. He felt that if they all agree to a plan, it will make it easier for them to vote together at MAG for funding.

Councilmember Richard Cameron commented they need to know what the action items are and who was making the assignments for the next meeting, so they do not feel frustrated or like they are going backwards. If everyone puts forth an effort to accomplish their task, they can get things done at the next meeting.

Councilmember Ernie John stated they needed simple updates such as adding Cedar Fort and Fairfield and verifying they have the correct data so they can start moving. He commented that currently, Lehi was footing the bill, and it was not fair. They need the data so they can make decisions, and he felt they needed to know what the end goal was.

Councilmember Aubrey Barton stated they have not talked about what they can do. Next time, they could focus on what they can do now with the information they have rather than what they need to do.

Councilmember Heather Newall felt they needed to have a priority list and a timeline for the projects.

Councilmember Barton thought that they should put one person in charge to keep this moving in one direction.

Mayor Frost felt they needed to know what the end goal at build-out was so they could start moving forward.

Mark Christensen asked if one of the action items was for the engineering groups to get the EIS in front of MAG or determining the corridor width? He felt they needed to keep everything moving forward.

It was noted the legislative session was soon starting and they needed to make sure they had a presence there.

It was noted the next meeting would be on April 29, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. in Eagle Mountain.

3. ADJOURNMENT

The work session ended at 7:55 PM.

Approved by the City Council on January 21, 2025.



Gina L. Olsen, CMC
City Recorder

