Minutes of the regular meeting of the City Council held January 3, 1996 at 7:00 p.m. in the auditorium of the Bountiful High School, Bountiful, Utah.

Present:	Mayor:	John Cushing
	Council Members:	Samuel Fowler, Barbara Holt, Alan Johnson, Harold Shafter and Ann Wilcox
	City Manager:	Tom Hardy
	City Attorney:	Russell Mahan
	City Engineer:	Jack Balling
	City Recorder:	Arden Jenson
	Recording Secretary:	Nancy Lawrence

Official Notice of this meeting had been given by posting a written notice of same and an Agenda at the City Hall and providing copies to the following newspapers of general circulation: Davis County Clipper, Deseret News, and Salt Lake Tribune.

Mayor Cushing called the meeting to order, following which Councilwoman Wilcox led the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Mayor Cushing noted that this meeting was scheduled for the purpose of discussing the proposed extension of Bountiful Boulevard into Salt Lake City. He reviewed the format for the meeting (a 1/2-hour presentation by staff followed by a 45-minute presentation by the opposition and 45 minutes allotted to those who favor the road extension). He urged the capacity crowd to use courtesy and professionalism.

Mr. Balling presented an historical analysis of the construction of Bountiful Boulevard including studies from 1963 to the present. The Wilbur Smith study recommended a "parkway-type" facility and scenic highway connecting the upper bench of south Davis County to Salt Lake City via the Ensign Peak area. In 1974 the Bountiful City Council reaffirmed the future need for extension of Bountiful Boulevard into the upper bench of Salt Lake City. Salt Lake officials voiced strong opposition to the road coming in at the capital hill residential area and the Wilbur Smith alignment was dropped.

As the east bench developed, a citizen's committee (organized to assist in development of a Master Plan) recognized that the existing heavy flow of southbound traffic from the east side of Bountiful westward to 1-15 and then south is *an abnormal imbalance of* traffic flow. They pointed out that this imbalance demonstrated the need for a free-flow north south corridor serving the population centers on the east side of Bountiful. The recommendation of the study for Bountiful Boulevard was as follows: "it is strongly recommended that Bountiful Boulevard be developed as a major north-south arterial to serve the east side of Bountiful. The character of this roadway must be a free flow limited access facility. These requirements are necessary to insure adequate travel speeds and capacity. The southern terminus of Bountiful Boulevard must tie directly to 1-215 in a M interchange with 1-15. Wayne T. VanWagoner and Associates, traffic engineers, prepared the transportation and circulation plan for the Master Plan, incorporating the citizen committee recommendation.

Following the VanWagoner report, three observations were made in the Master Plan: (1) North Salt Lake residents were strongly opposed to the proposed 4-lane status of *Davis Boulevard*, which would tie to Bountiful Boulevard; (2) Bountiful Boulevard was thought to become nothing more than a collector street, with little need to continue north of the City; and (3) with the impact of Items 1 and 2, greater emphasis needed to be placed on improving the traffic movement capacities of the east/west streets. The Master Plan was adopted and all of the east/west streets designated have since been improved to their maximum traffic-carrying capacity.

In 1994 a feasibility study was made under the direction of UDOT to see if a road could be built extending Bountiful Boulevard into Salt Lake City. The study showed a route south from Bountiful Boulevard along the bench to the Beck Street gravel pits, south through the pits on a decreasing grade to intersect Highway 89 in the vicinity of the Victory Road intersection. The City Councils of Bountiful and North Salt Lake have endorsed this plan, which would relieve the intensive traffic on the east-west collector streets, provide another access to the central business district of Salt

Lake City, reduce congestion on 1-15, provide a second access to Salt Lake City in event of a major transportation breakdown on 1-15, and provide a more efficient route for residential development along the bench to meet the origin destination objectives as described in the Master Plan.

Mr. Balling noted that the proposed extension is not in Bountiful City, but lies in Davis and Salt Lake Counties. Because of the different jurisdictions involved, the City staff felt that the State should fund the Salt Lake county portion of the project. The estimated-cost of the Salt Lake County portion of the road is 11. 1 to - 15.3 million dollars, depending on its terminus. The projected buildout of the North Salt Lake/ Davis County/ Bountiful area along the proposed Bountiful Boulevard is approximately 1,500 homes, resulting in additional traffic which the east/west collectors are not capable of handling.

It is the recommendation of staff that Bountiful Boulevard be extended in the straightest, safest alignment possible with the least amount of interruptions and the shortest distance to our objective.

Mr. Hardy reported that the City recently contracted with a survey research firm to assess citizen knowledge and opposition/support for Bountiful Boulevard. He reported the results of the study indicated that 80 percent of the citizens polled classified themselves as quite familiar with the extension; based on what they knew, 70 percent of the citizenry were very supportive of the extension; 94 percent stated that additional north/south routes into Salt Lake City was very important; and 80% felt that the extension would greatly relieve the present traffic congestion. Of those surveyed, 78 percent drove to Salt Lake City daily or at least three times a week. If the Boulevard were extended, 49 percent of the citizens being polled indicated that they would use this street 3-4 times weekly, 22 percent would use it 1-2 times each week, and 29 percent said they would hardly ever use it. The greatest opposition to the proposed extension was from the citizens who live east of Bountiful Boulevard, with 32 percent in opposition and 54 percent supportive.

Greg Ericksen, representing the citizens opposed to the extension, **(**4110 South Bountiful Boulevard) thanked the Council for the hearing and the opportunity of the citizens to become involved in this issue. He said that *the extension does not make sense*, for the following reasons: (1) it is opposed by Salt Lake City residents and leaders; (2) without the Boulevard extension, North Salt Lake will not be developed in this area and the critical need will be eliminated; (3) it is not economically feasible and the cost/benefit ratio is very low; (4) the proposed road, with a 10 percent grade and 150-ft. cuts and 800-ft. fills, would be very dangerous to traverse; (5) it does not make sense as a secondary emergency access inasmuch as the proposed alignment traverses a major fault line; (6) UDOT has indicated that the road would be very difficult to maintain in terms of snow removal and rock slides. Mr. Ericksen suggested a preferred alternative would be an access into Orchard Drive or a west Davis highway.

Mr. Ericksen expressed concern about the additional traffic which would be generated as a result of the Bountiful Boulevard extension (2,800+ homes and 33,600 vehicle trips per day) and pointed out that much of the land will not develop if the road is not there. He expressed concern that the extension would most likely result in the existing road being widened and the speed limit increased. He said that the road extension was being pushed by a State legislator who owned property contiguous to the proposed extension. However, the Transportation Committee ranked the extension as the 8th priority of ten projects for Davis County. He urged the Council to seek a better alternative and assist in better prioritization of public money.

Randy Feil, 3748 Bountiful Boulevard, *(opposed)* pointed out that a change in our lifestyle has resulted in more "trips per day" and the east bench residents will continue to traverse east and west to the grocery store, lessons and recreational activities for families, school, etc. He said that only 10 percent of the vehicle trips generated by the east bench homes go into Salt Lake City; 30 percent go to Bountiful. He suggested that growth on the east bench be limited by requiring developers to provide better access. He noted that even though the extension of Bountiful Boulevard has been on long range plans of the City, it has not been on the Master Plan. He also pointed out that every agency that has looked at the proposed Bountiful Boulevard extension has concluded it is not a good plan (UDOT, WFRC, etc.).

Mark Dale, 2126 South Cave Hollow, said he was *opposed* to the extension of Bountiful Boulevard because of the negative impact it would have on the crime rate. A quick, easy access from Salt Lake to the east bench area would invite all types of criminal activity from Salt Lake City; traffic accidents would also increase. The road would also invite a

petition for convenience stores and gas stations.

Rulon Gill, 532 Heritage Drive, expressed supportfor the extension of Bountiful Boulevard based on the relief of congestion going to Salt Lake. He said that the slower moving traffic presently on 1-15 results in greater ozone contamination and the alternate route would reduce that risk. He pointed out that, although construction of the road would be expensive, 51 percent of our road taxes are going someplace else, and we deserve our necessary projects. He explained that the trips per day is not the issue; the issue is what a traffic lane is worth between 7:30 and 9:00 a.m. and between 4:30 and 6:00 p.m.

Les Merrell, 2347 South Orchard Place, pointed out that whether we are for or against this project, all citizens in the community need to work together for the good of all and seek a positive answer for the traffic problems which we have.

Sheryl Allen, referenced earlier as a State legislator who owns property in the area of the proposed extension, expressed appreciation for the public hearing process being facilitated by Bountiful officials and the involvement of the citizens. However, she did not appreciate the half-truths spoken about her. She clarified her personal real estate involvement, noting that the property in North Salt Lake is pending sale (depending on financing). She said she would not benefit whether the road goes through or not. She said she is looking for answers to the traffic problems and will continue to look for good answers. She requested support of those in attendance for the Bonneville Shore Lines Trail (an alternative transportation source) to be used by bikers.

Wilford Cannon, 872 East 250 South, a partner in the Eaglewood development, spoke in favor of the road extension. He pointed out that Eaglewood Drive has steep grades and the opportunity to travel south on Bountiful Boulevard instead of using Eaglewood would be safer for him. He challenged the statistic of Mr. Ericksen of 2,800 additional homes and said it would be more like 1,500. Although the extension of Bountiful Boulevard would be expensive, he challenged the Council to do the responsible thing and provide for north/south traffic flow to alleviate the congestion on the east/west streets.

Steven Greenhalgh, 3759 Cardiff Way, pointed out that he is for extension of the Boulevard. He noted that Bountiful Boulevard would most likely become a route of UTA and that would be an asset to the residents of the area.

Jim Reading, 1298 East Millbrook Way, stated that he *supported* the Bountiful Boulevard extension because it would make his drive to work (University of Utah) faster and shorter. He cited instances when 1-15 had had emergency problems and had been closed for 23 hours and emphasized the need for another north/south route, as well as another access to Salt Lake City. He said that it is impossible to prohibit development; therefore, it needs to be planned for.

Kenneth LeFevre, 39 East 3300 South, thanked the City officials and staff for their concern on this issue and emphasized that the good of the majority needs to be addressed.

Richard Kirkham, 43 West 3 100 South, read a statement from David Racker (3120 South 950 East), supporting the extension of Bountiful Boulevard. He said that good planning has been done and needs to be followed. Mr. Kirkham said that we all need to work for the good of the community. To oppose the extension of Bountiful Boulevard is to say that we need to have increased traffic on the east/west streets.

Robert Brady, 1504 Lakeview Drive, said that the Concerned Citizens of Bountiful went on record two years ago in opposition to the extension of Bountiful Boulevard. However, more study has been done in the meantime and the following is the position of that group: (1) It is not fair that the center and west sides of the City should have to bear the burden of traffic from the east bench; (2) there needs to be more than two roads into and out of Salt Lake City; (3) the current system of residents driving across town adds to congestion at intersections; (4) although we would all like to live on a street with no traffic, the extension will not turn into an expressway and we need to provide for the most efficient movement of those who have created the traffic.

Walley Given, 1885 South 50 West, pointed out that all of the major transportation routes, pipelines, railroad

tracks, communication lines, etc. are in the narrow corridor in the vicinity of the proposed extension and vouch for the safety of the area. He asked if there were suggestions of a different route.

Mary Sharp, 47 East 4050 South, concluded the remarks by asking what has happened to the "genetic pool" from Brigham Young, the planner of wide roads with easy access.

Mayor Cushing thanked everyone for their attendance and their input, following which the meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m. on a motion made by Councilwoman Holt and seconded by Councilman Johnson.