



# Memo

---

**Date:** 9 January 2023  
**To:**  
**Cc:**  
**From:** Brad Wilson, City Recorder  
**RE:** Minutes of the 6 December 2022 City Council Work Meeting

---

Please note that the following minutes await formal approval and are in draft or unapproved form.

**MINUTES OF THE  
MIDWAY CITY COUNCIL  
(Work Meeting)**

**Tuesday, 6 December 2022, 5:00 p.m.  
Midway Community Center, City Council Chambers  
160 West Main Street, Midway, Utah**

**Note:** Notices/agendas were posted at 7-Eleven, Ridley’s Express, the United States Post Office, the Midway City Office Building, and the Midway Community Center. Notices/agendas were provided to the City Council, City Engineer, City Attorney, Planning Director, and The Wasatch Wave. The public notice/agenda was published on the Utah State Public Notice Website and the City’s website. A copy of the public notice/agenda is contained in the supplemental file.

**1. Call to Order**

Mayor Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m.

**Members Present:**

Celeste Johnson, Mayor  
Steve Dougherty, Council Member  
Jeff Drury, Council Member  
Lisa Orme, Council Member  
Kevin Payne, Council Member  
JC Simonsen, Council Member

**Staff Present:**

Corbin Gordon, Attorney (Arrived at 5:23 p.m.)  
Michael Henke, Planning Director  
Wes Johnson, Engineer  
Brad Wilson, Recorder

**Note:** A copy of the meeting roll is contained in the supplemental file.

**2. Strategic Planning Meeting / Date** (Approximately 5 minutes) – Discuss a date for the Midway City Council’s 2023 strategic planning meeting.

The Council decided to have a strategic planning meeting on January 12<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 a.m. at the Valais PUD Clubhouse.

**3. Town Square / Improvements** (Approximately 55 minutes) – Discuss improvements to the Midway Town Square and the associated costs.

Mayor Johnson reported that IBI, the firm whose design was chosen by Midway City, prepared an approximate cost for each phase of construction.

Council Member Simonsen reviewed the phases and made the following comments:

- The costs were a high-level estimate but useful.

- Wanted the community's feedback which had partially been done.
- Wanted to make changes to the design.
- Wanted a design with strong support from the public and the City.
- The cost of the project was significant.
- How would the City pay for the project?
- The costs were for construction and did not include detail design, engineering, and project management.

Brad Wilson reviewed the availability of money for each phase of the project. He indicated that funds would be readily available for the first and second phases. He thought that funds would be available for the third and fourth phases if the project was a focus of the Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Fund. He noted that the fifth phase included rebuilding the Community Center and would require bonding, grants, etc.

The Council, staff, and meeting attendees discussed the following items:

- A paragraph summary was needed of the project.
- The Council's opinions differed on certain parts of the design.
- The City Engineer was comfortable with the cost estimates.
- The costs, especially for Phase Five, were too much.

**Note:** Corbin Gordon arrived at 5:23 p.m.

- Other projects like trails on Pine Canyon Road and north Center Street were significant, addressed safety issues, and needed to be done.
- The expectations for the proposed pavilion were greater than what IBI had designed.
- The estimate for resurfacing the ice rink was low.
- A year would be needed to plan and budget for the project. Another year would be needed to begin execution.
- The needed engineering should be done after the improvements to Alpenhof Park were completed.
- The design needed to be refined.
- The longer the project the greater the impact of inflation.
- The City was also working on improving the open space which was owned by the Hamlet PUD HOA and next to the sewer treatment plant.
- How important was the project? What if another project came up?
- Design and engineering should be done per phase. Phase Three might take two years.
- Someone would need to oversee construction.
- Engineering for the project could be five to ten percent of the overall cost.
- The design needed more review.
- The design was a guiding light that could take 20 years to complete.
- The promenade was a good idea.
- There were questions if the ice sheet needed to be resurfaced or completely replaced.
- Expanding the Community Center, to include facilities for the ice rink, could be an add-on.
- The Community Center, which IBI called the Lodge, should be a different project. Its redesign should be dictated by needs.
- The cost should be presented to the public for comment.

- There was a lot of feedback that the Community Center needed to be replaced because of aesthetics and functionality.
- There were a lot of residents that wanted to save the Community Center.
- How would you keep a 20-year project on track or not have it fade away?
- The design should be posted in public places to encourage continuity.
- A separate CIP Fund department could be created for the project to differentiate it from a park.
- The Community Center could be improved to look more Swiss.
- The Council's thoughts on the design should be emailed to Council Member Simonsen for the planning meeting. This should be done by January 6<sup>th</sup>.
- A final voting committee was needed for the project.
- Some council members did not like the water feature.
- The resurfacing of the ice rink was not necessary for skating.
- A wish list should be prepared for the ice rink. A better warming area, lockers, etc. were needed.
- Electricity would be needed for food trucks.

#### **4. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

---

Celeste Johnson, Mayor

---

Brad Wilson, Recorder