Work Session
October 30, 2012
6:30 pm

Those present: Mayor Kenneth Romney, Council members James Ahlstrom, Mark Preece, James Bruhn, Dave Tovey, Debbie McKeen, Craig Howe (City Administrator), Heidi Voordeckers (City Recorder/Auditor), Cathy Brightwell (Deputy Recorder), Ben White (City Engineer), Steve Maughan (Public Works Director), Nathalie Ellingson (secretary)

Visitors: Alan Malan, Kelly Enquist

The meeting started at 6:35 pm

1. Impact Fee Discussion – Jason Burningham

Mayor Romney – the primary focus of this work session is to discuss options for park impact fees. He had asked James Ahlstrom to go over the Utah Code regarding this.

Jason Burningham of Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham explained that impact fees are collected on new developments, and are a funding source for a city to use for capital facilities that fit under a narrow definition. The facility or improvement must have a useful life of 10 years or more. It must fall under a category that would be used by new residents as they move into the city. Before a city can charge an impact fee, it must develop a capital facility plan. In doing so, an inventory is done of current facilities and the current level of service to the community is defined.

A plan was updated in 2008 for development of parks and trails. The level of service was measured as a certain number of acres of park and so many linear miles of trail per 1,000 residents. The plan was based on a population of 5,000, and estimates were made as to what would be needed to provide the same quality of service to a population of 8,000 or 9,000. Impact fees may not be used to increase the level of service per person, only expand services to accommodate new residents. Specifically, according to the plan, impact fees could be used to buy new property for new parks and put in the same amenities as those in existing parks.

The council has been talking about using impact fees for improvements to the main park, particularly upgrading the restrooms and putting in a walking trail. Jason explained that the current plan is limited to improvements related to facilities per capita and renovations do not fit in that ratio. This method does not allow for changes in demographics or the wishes of constituents. Jason gave an example where the level of service approach would allow the city to add a baseball field to match an already-existing baseball field. Currently soccer is played more often than baseball, but the plan would not allow adding a soccer field. He suggested they instead use level of investment to develop a new plan. In this type of plan, you measure the existing value of improvements and determine the dollar amount paid per capita, regardless of what the amenity is. Jason’s opinion was that enlarging the restrooms will accommodate more people and thus it fits under the proper use of impact fees.

Council concluded they should work on a new level of investment plan. The process would take some time because they would need a public hearing which would require a notice period. Then they would have to write the new plan into the ordinance and go through the approval process. If impact fees will decrease, the plan can go into effect immediately. However, if impact fees need to be increased, there would be a 90-day waiting period before the policy could go into effect.

Ben stated it was his understanding, and Jason agreed, that they could work on the restrooms under the current plan if the upgrade results in 50% more capacity, in which case they would only pay 50% of the cost with impact fees. They can also do the trail in the park under one of the current trail descriptions, and then in the meantime, Debbie suggested they work on the new plan over the winter.

James Ahlstrom suggested that citizens are not going to be concerned how the money is being spent as long as they see it is being spent on parks and trails.

2. Discussion on Ranches at Lakeside Development

This actually became a general discussion regarding a proposal for a development near the equestrian center. The proposal came to the staff several times as a concept, but it never moved forward. Ben passed around a map showing the proposed location. It is to be divided into one-acre lots. The
discussion was regarding how the development would be accessed. Access could possibly affect the property where the city yard is located so there was a little discussion as to alternate locations for the shops.

Work meeting ended at 7:25 pm.
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