

Heber City Corporation
City Council Meeting
09/30/2010
6:30 p.m.

SPECIAL MEETING

The Council of Heber City, Wasatch County, Utah, met in **Special Meeting** on September 30, 2010, in the City Council Chambers in Heber City, Utah.

Present:	Mayor	David R. Phillips
	Council Members	Eric Straddeck Nile Horner Robert Patterson Alan McDonald Benny Mergist
Also Present:	City Recorder	Paulette Thurber
	City Engineer	Bart Mumford
	City Planners	Allen Fawcett/Tony Kohler
	Chief of Police	Ed Rhoades

Others Present: Willa Motley, Harry Zane, Dennis Schindler, Mike Thurber, Eleanor Nelsen, Mark Webb and others whose names were not legible.

Capital Facilities Master Plan Update
Special City Council Meeting with Planning Commission

Mumford said he was appreciative of the time people took to attend this meeting and that to the Engineering Department this was a very important meeting. He suggested those attending would learn more tonight about the workings of the City's facilities and the process and planning that affect development than at any other meeting where just basic services provided was discussed.

Mumford said that normally a master plan update was done every 6 years but it had been almost seven since an update had been done for Heber. He indicated the materials the Council received prior to the meeting were not final documents. He suggested the Department wanted input sooner than later in the process from the Council and Public Works. He said he was getting input much sooner during the process than he did during the last update.

Mumford said there was a lot of information to go over--seven sections--and he was hoping to get this done in a three-hour period with 20/30 minutes on each section. He said he would

present a brief overview and then ask for questions. Mumford explained there would have to be a public hearing held before the final revised master plan was adopted.

Mumford indicated the City had retained Horrocks Engineers to do this work and that Willa Motley had done most of the work. He said she was very detail oriented and had done an excellent job putting it all together.

Discussion that a master plan was created and put into place to plan for future needs, maintain and enhance the quality of services provided, and provide equitable funding mechanisms for growth.

Mark Webb asked where the population data had come from and wondered if the economy downturn had been taken into account. Motley indicated that when they began the project earlier in the year, the 2010 census had not come out. Consequently, they had to use the 2000 census. She indicated the numbers turned out to be very close to the 2010 census. Motley reviewed table 3-1 and 3-2 which showed population projections to 2030 and land use densities, both residential and nonresidential.

Mumford reviewed the Culinary Water System. An overhead was shown with 2010 data and 2030 projected data. The graph showed that indoor usage was going down. He said he did not recommend the City have more than one class of usage since overall usage was going down. Outdoor usage was about the same for those using culinary water for outdoor. From the original master plan some facilities were eliminated--Red Ledges for example was with Twin Creeks. He explained if there were more homes to divide with, the impact cost went down. Mumford said the City had leveraged the developer to build infrastructure because they could normally build cheaper than the City in most cases.

Webb asked if current City wells could handle future growth and at what point should the system be upgraded. Mumford said the City had just upgraded the Hospital Well. Tony Kohler suggested that as the secondary demand got higher, the culinary demand went down. Mumford said conservation plays into this, as well.

Councilman McDonald asked about tying into the Daniel system. Mumford said if the Council wanted to spend that money, it could happen, but he did not think it was needed. Mumford said a source study had been done and the most cost effective solution was to expand the Hospital Well which had been done. He suggested the next upgrade would be a similar project at Broadhead Springs, if necessary. Mumford thought there were locations to take the City beyond 20 years. He suggested also that storage facilities were good.

Projects – future projects – Mumford reviewed his listing of recommended culinary water improvements. He suggested combining of some Zones and said that the Valley Hills area needed to have a new zone created. He indicated the City had been working on some of these projects

and was on track to do others when the bad economy hit. He suggested that when development stopped, the City's means of help also stopped.

Water rights – Mumford said that one of the questions he always got was why the City required water rights as people feel the City had tons of water. He explained the City had to have water rights to provide water. In simple terms, the City had to transfer into wells their water rights which is called municipal water--also irrigation shares which was a different animal. He said the water we pumped out of the wells was 100 acre feet a year. As the City used more water, the City had to transfer irrigation water into the wells. He said the City had about 2900 shares. But out of the 2900 shares, some of it was used for secondary water (1200 acre feet) and also had to deduct for lots that didn't have homes on them yet. When that was deducted the City had about 400 acre feet of water surplus. However, this winter discussion has to be held about secondary for central Heber which would require about 780 acre feet of water. So that would put the City in the negative. Mumford said the City was okay but would still need to collect from developers. He said the City needed to keep the process now in place by collecting from future developers in order to have enough water.

Sanitary Sewer System – Motley referred to an overhead. She talked about infiltration and that the average was 34%. She said sometimes it would go to 20% . She suggested the impact fees would go down from \$1593 to approximately \$1531. Motley indicated officials were looking at a mechanical plant and that what was planned was not for secondary use but to go back into the ground. Mayor Phillips indicated they were looking at reusing the water..putting it back into the system.

Discussion about serving the PCMU Zone. Discussion about Elmbridge and a couple other businesses being on the current system temporarily until another sewer line could be built. Kohler said he would encourage the Engineering Department to look at a sewer line in the area along Highway 40 by Horners, Cooks, etc. He said there was a need there and he wanted that to be discussed. Motley talked about future projects that would be partially paid for by developers and partially by impact fees. Discussion about Twin Creeks using the City's sewer lines and not pumping to their own system.

Street System – It was indicated there were three types of streets, local, collectors and arterial and that most street systems were designed around that. A few years ago the bypass was added to the plans. It was indicated that in order to coordinate with UDOT, the City had changed some names--local/local; collector/minor collector; arterial/minor arterial; bypass minor arterial bypass and minor arterial. As far as impact fees were concerned the current fee was \$127 per trip for non- residential with \$70 subsidy for non-residential. That equals \$1,219 per single family. It would be recommended to increase that fee to \$1,556 per single family; the multi-family fee was currently \$734 and the proposal would be to increase that to \$937. Mumford explained the increase was because asphalt pricing had significantly increased. An overhead was shown with

the adopted bypass and some other future streets because of development. Mumford said the hope was to use Corridor Preservation fees and UDOT funding on the rest of the bypass. He said that for the 300 West project 65% would be impact fees. Mumford said he would make a note about sidewalk on 300 West and if the cost did not change a lot it would be worth including that.

Storm Water System – Motley said that some of the standards currently in place for storm water were good and they wanted to keep them. Most changes were directed toward flood control, flow control and quality control. She said that because Heber’s population was over 10,000, the EPA would be looking more towards quality.

Motley said that right now the City did not have a storm water management cleanout plan. However, with this master plan, they were looking at that. She said there was a need to educate the public about cleanout and suggested a Community Outreach Program. She recommended the City adopt a regular maintenance program.

Motley said the City currently did not have a storm drain utility fee and that this updated master plan proposed a fee. She said the current system of smaller retention ponds was working quite well. However, when roads were upgraded, there was a need to collect the storm water runoff from those. She said that impact fees would go towards first flush ponds.

Secondary Water System – It was indicated there were 2300 connections--on average 1.1 million gallons water a day. It was indicated that right now the City did not have an impact fee for secondary water. It was suggested impact fees would help fund projects--the main project being peak storage.

Trail Master Plan – Mumford said the Trail Master Plan in the proposed update was pretty much the same as already accepted about 1 ½ years ago and the fee would be similar. He said there was not a summary sheet with materials submitted but it would be included later.

Councilman McDonald suggested there were some grants out there but they would go to the health department. Mumford said when the City’s updated Master Plan was in place, it might be possible to submit for those--but the Plan had to be in place and then the City had to be in the right place at the right time.

Impact Fees – Mumford indicated in the last few years the legislature had tightened up what could be done with impact fees. He said projects had to be planned in 5-year increments. He said he had built in a bonding mechanism because impact fees could be used for bonding. Mumford explained that every year the City’s impacts fees were adjusted based on cost of living increases.

At this time the meeting was adjourned with the planned public hearing to adopt the revised Master Plan being set for December 16, 2010.

Paulette Thurber, City Recorder