



CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE

CITY COUNCIL MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA MAY 3, 2022

Posted May 2, 2022

Notice is given that the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake will hold a regular meeting on **May 3, 2022** at City Hall, 10 East Center Street, North Salt Lake, Utah. A work session will be held at 6:00 pm in the Council Conference Room followed by the regular session at 7:00 pm in Council Chambers. Some members may participate electronically.

The following items of business will be discussed; the order of business may be changed as time permits.

WORK SESSION – 6:00 p.m.

1. Department Update – Community Development
2. Approval of City Council Minutes of March 26, 2022 and April 19, 2022
3. Action Items
4. Council Reports
5. City Attorney Report
6. Mayor's Report
7. City Manager Report
8. Adjourn

REGULAR SESSION – 7:00 p.m.

1. Introduction by Mayor Brian Horrocks
2. Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance ~ Council Member Knowlton
3. Citizen Comment
4. Consideration of Appointment to the Parks, Trails, Arts and Recreation Advisory Board
5. Consideration of Bid Award for the Frontage Road, 75 East, 125 East, 175 East, and 190 East Street Reconstruction Project in the Amount of \$321,350
6. Consideration of Resolution 2022-R14: A Resolution Increasing User Fees and Charges for Culinary Water, Secondary Water, and Storm Water in the City's Comprehensive Fee Schedule
7. Consideration of Resolution 2022-R16: A Resolution Adopting the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 Tentative Budget and Setting a Public Hearing Date
8. Consideration of the City's Draft Response to UDOT Regarding the I-15 Environmental Impact Statement

9. Discussion of Invocations in City Council Meetings
10. Adjourn

CLOSED SESSION

1. Possible closed session for the purpose of discussing the character professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual; to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; to discuss the purchase, exchange, sale, or lease of real property; or to discuss the deployment of security personnel, devices, or systems. *Utah Code 52-4-205*

The public is invited to attend all City Council meetings. If you need special accommodations to participate in the City Council meeting, please call the City office at 801-335-8709. Please provide at least 24 hours notice for adequate arrangements to be made.

Notice of Posting:

I, the duly appointed City Recorder for the City of North Salt Lake, hereby certify that the foregoing agenda was posted on the Utah Public Notice website, at city hall, and sent to the required newspapers this 2nd day of May, 2022.

Dated this 28th day of April, 2022.

Wendy Page



1 CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
2 CITY COUNCIL MEETING-BUDGET
3 MARCH 26, 2022

4
5 **DRAFT**
6

7 Mayor Horrocks called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m.
8

9 PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
10 Council Member Lisa Watts Baskin
11 Council Member Natalie Gordon
12 Council Member Ted Knowlton
13 Council Member Stan Porter
14 Council Member Alisa Van Langeveld
15

16 STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; Paul Ottoson, City Engineer; David Frandsen,
17 Public Works Director; Janice Larsen, Finance Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Sherrie Pace,
18 Community Development Director; Wendy Page, City Recorder.
19

20 OTHERS PRESENT: Keith Larson, Bowen Collins & Associates.
21

22 1. INTRODUCTION
23

24 Ken Leetham thanked executive staff and the department heads for the capability in which they
25 performed their responsibilities. He also commended the city councils that had been in office
26 over the last 12 years. Mr. Leetham spoke on the forward strides and positive changes the City
27 had made due to staff and the council members working as a team. He said the City was in
28 excellent financial condition but there were several adjustments and corrections to be made in the
29 coming weeks, months, and years.
30

31 Ken Leetham level of service (LOS), which was an affirmative standard established to provide
32 desired outcomes. An example of this would be the condition of the roadways at the last budget
33 retreat and the City Council's decision to spend \$400,000 per year on road maintenance. He said
34 there were technical LOS such as response times or maintenance schedules and social/quality of
35 life levels such as certain park/trail amenities, firework shows, farmers, markets, etc. Mr.
36 Leetham explained the City Council established the LOS including ordinances and the general
37 plan for staff to implement. He said the LOS related to the budget retreat because the budgeting
38 process determines what is needed to maintain services in a changing environment including
39 growth, cost unpredictability, tools and equipment, and adapting to changing public needs. The
40 executive staff identified corrections, which should be made to continue LOS standards and the
41 City Council's role was to determine LOS and approve or modify the proposed implementation.
42 The budget retreat was just one part of the process on how budget requests were made with
43 additional steps including the measurement of operational services, daily and long-term

44 evaluation and problem identification, reviews of alternatives and resources, the creation of a
45 budget and policy recommendations, and the adoption of the budget by the Council.
46 Consideration was also given to LOS standards, plans and ordinances, grant availability, funding
47 opportunities, cost increases, revenue projections, tool and equipment needs, training, and the
48 long term versus short term impacts and returns.

49
50 Ken Leetham spoke on the General Fund, which was the largest governmental fund at \$15
51 million. He said the City's financial health was excellent particularly sales tax and staff often
52 under predicted the percentage that would be collected. Mr. Leetham said the State had seen
53 positive sales tax growth overall, which was impacted by shopping habits during COVID as well
54 as an agreement with Amazon to collect and remit sales tax. He recommended the Council and
55 staff needed to create a long-term property tax policy, during a future meeting that would be
56 sustainable for the City.

57
58 Council Member Van Langeveld asked about the collection of franchise tax from Google Fiber.
59 Ken Leetham replied per their contract with the City, Google Fiber would remit 2% of their
60 gross revenue to the City as a fee for using the streets.

61
62 Ken Leetham reported on important budget issues for the upcoming fiscal year including cost of
63 living adjustments (COLA). Staff researched data from Zions Bank and Western Region CPI
64 along with what other cities were offering and determined that a 7% COLA was appropriate.
65 This amount was built into the proposed budget. Other parts of this budget included the potential
66 hiring of parks, police, and golf maintenance employees, as well as increases in the water rate,
67 storm drain, and solid waste fees. The water rate increase was to encourage conservation, the
68 storm drain fee increase was to cover projected capital facilities, and the solid waste fee increase
69 was to cover operational costs and the service provider (ACE) cost increase.

70
71 He suggested as there would be a yearly 7-10% increase in the fire department contract that the
72 fire chief attend a future Council meeting to discuss department funding.

73
74 Mayor Horrocks said the City had only done one property tax increase, which was used to help
75 fund police department employees, in the last 25 years.

76
77 Ken Leetham commented on the long term challenges including water conservation and
78 availability, infrastructure replacement, expanding costs, and housing affordability. He said the
79 City was collecting housing funds through two CDAs and needed a housing policy for the use of
80 those funds. Mr. Leetham also said there was a need for a stronger property tax policy, which
81 would sustain the City's financial wellbeing. He then explained the budget process would
82 include another meeting to adopt rate increases with staff to prepare impact samples of different
83 bills for geographic locations in the City, refined cost estimates for Council Member requests,
84 the adoption of the tentative budget in May, a public hearing in June, and the adoption of the
85 final budget prior to June 22nd.

86

87 Ken Leetham reported the compensation survey was still two weeks from completion. He said
88 the initial results showed that overall the current compensation was comparable to the
89 marketplace.

90

91 Mr. Leetham said there would need to be a discussion related to the funding of Hatch Park. The
92 South Davis Recreation District Board was reviewing several options including a general
93 obligation bond that would be voted on by residents. He said the City could do a bond election to
94 fund the redevelopment of the park as well.

95

96 Mayor Horrocks commented that the Recreation District was there to provide a service but did
97 not have enough funding to do so. He did not think that they would be able to obtain all of the
98 funding they would ask for which meant the City would need a solid plan B to move forward.

99

100 Council Member Porter said recent inflation and supply availability made it difficult to budget
101 due to unpredictability even with signed contracts.

102

103 Ken Leetham reported that Janice Larsen would provide a detailed overview of the City's funds
104 with an explanation on how they were all interconnected.

105

106 2. FINANCIAL OVERVIEW

107

108 Janice Larsen reported staff had prepared a working draft budget for every fund. She focused on
109 governmental funds, what cash was available in each fund, and how it could be spent. There
110 were two types of funds including governmental and enterprise/proprietary funds. The
111 governmental funds were funded by taxes, development fees, grants, and impact fees. The
112 proprietary funds were utility and golf funds that were driven by user fees. In the governmental
113 funds there would be many transfers back and forth while there would not be as many transfers
114 in the proprietary funds. A large sheet detailing each fund was given to those present. Ms. Larsen
115 reviewed the transfers and activities in each fund including the estimated ending cash fund
116 balance and how the fund could be used.

117

118 The General Fund was the primary operating fund of the City and included City Council,
119 administration, development, fire, police, and the maintenance of streets and parks. Transfers out
120 of the General Fund were to the roads and capital projects. General Fund revenues included
121 property tax, sales tax, franchise tax, ARPA federal grant funds (in 2021 and 2022), and
122 community development. There was significant growth in sales tax with a 37% increase over the
123 past four years and 34% of the sales tax was from online sales.

124

125 Council Member Porter asked if sales tax included the RAP tax. Janice Larsen replied that it did
126 not as it was part of Fund 32 but the ratio increased the same. The online RAP tax was still
127 collected.

128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168

Mayor Horrocks asked about the intergovernmental revenues and the restrictions. Janice Larsen responded there was a standard allowance, which allowed for \$10 million or the full ARPA for anything. She said the ARPA amount shown would be transferred to Fund 40 to be saved for future use by the Council.

Janice Larsen commented on COLA and said payroll was not charged in Funds 25-44 due to impact fee revenue in those funds. Payroll would be found in all of the enterprise funds such as water, golf, etc. She said General Fund expenditures included COLA, fuel costs, inflation, cost for contracted fire services, and the transfer of \$705,000 of unrestricted cash to road Fund 44 for repair and maintenance. One change from the State included the ability to retain a fund balance of 35%. Ms. Larsen estimated that if the budget was adopted as presented that there would be \$2.7 million of available cash in the General Fund.

Janice Larsen reported on Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Fund 25, which primarily collected tax increment revenue. Developer agreements, administrative fees to the General Fund for payroll, and a transfer to Fund 27 for moderate to low income housing projects were paid with these revenues. Fund 27 was specifically setup to collect the revenue and keep it separated. One noticeable item about Fund 25 this year was the debt for the construction of the Wetlands Park and the incoming bond proceeds. At the end of 2023 there would be a strong cash balance but as they were restricted funds they could be used for the debt payment or in the project area such as Redwood Road. Fund 27 collected the restricted housing funds including grants with an ending cash balance next year of \$600,000.

Local Building Authority (LBA) Fund 28 was created as the City purchased homes around Hatch Park with the intent of renting them until construction began on the park. In order to collect rent the LBA and Fund 28 were created for IRS and tax code reasons. The transfer in of \$505,000 in the current year was to purchase a property adjacent to the park for future expansion. The transfer in was from Fund 41 which was the park capital project, and where park impact fees were collected. The remaining items in that fund were revenues from rental income and the expenditures of property management expenses and debt payments.

The Debt Service Fund 32 collected RAP tax revenue including sales tax with the expenditures to bond payments and the transfer out to other funds for park related expenditures. The bond was from 2010 and primarily for the Foxboro North park.

Mayor Horrocks asked about the remaining length of that bond. Janice Larsen explained the bond was refunded in 2019 with another 20 year bond. She said all of the debt schedules and amortization by year were listed in the back of the proposed budget book presented to the Council.

169 Janice Larsen spoke on Fund 32 and said there was \$376,000 in available cash that could be used
170 for parks and trails. She then focused on Capital Projects Fund 40 and said per State law any
171 excess balance in the General Fund could be moved to the Capital Projects Fund. She said the
172 CARES and ARPA monies would be transferred over to this fund. Any building remodel
173 generally utilized this fund including grant revenues associated with those projects and
174 expenditures included the police parking garage, building remodels, electronic signs, and the
175 sound and recording system. The landslide agreement and repairs were also managed through
176 this fund. With the CARES and ARPA funds the cash balance of unrestricted was \$5.7 million
177 and could be used for any Citywide project including operations in the General Fund.

178
179 Council Member Knowlton asked about the best plan for those funds and what percentage of
180 those funds were already planned for. Janice Larsen replied that none of the \$5.7 million was
181 already planned for and would be up to the Council's discretion. The Council could use these
182 funds for one project, in lieu of a tax increase over the next five years, or a mix.

183
184 Ken Leetham commented that earlier he had mentioned a property tax policy and said the cash
185 balance in Fund 40 might impact that policy. He said a fund balance or cash balance policy could
186 also be created to help retain some of these funds for emergencies.

187
188 Janice Larsen reported on the Parks Capital Project Fund 41 with revenues from park impact fees
189 and grants as well as a transfer in from Fund 32. The expenditures included park impact fees
190 transferred to the Local Building Authority Fund 28 and park constructions, major repairs or
191 maintenance. The cash available for park projects was about \$304,900.

192
193 Council Member Knowlton asked about the restricted growth related cash. Janice Larsen replied
194 every time a new home/development was constructed that the City collected park impact fees.
195 These funds could then be used for a new park, new facility, or other expanded service at a new
196 or existing park.

197
198 Council Member Baskin asked about the impact fee and how it was calculated. Janice Larsen
199 responded the impact fee was a specific revenue collected on every permit. She explained the
200 impact fees were collected and then used for any growth related project.

201
202 Ken Leetham commented the impact fees were adopted at a certain dollar amount based on a
203 study that projected the City's growth. He said all impact fee amounts were based on an
204 equivalent residential unit and estimates projected at the time the impact fee was adopted. Mr.
205 Leetham suggested it was probably time to review the road and park impact fees to ensure they
206 were covering the cost of future growth. He explained it was growth when there was an
207 expansion of capacity improvements and impact fees could be used to pay for those. Impact fees
208 collected should cover 100% the expanded capacity required by the projected growth.

209

210 Janice Larsen reported on Public Safety Capital Project Fund 43 with revenues from public
211 safety impact fee revenue and expenditures as a transfer out to the Capital Project Fund 40 to
212 repay the cost of building construction. The Roads Capital Project Fund 44 revenues included
213 road impact fee and grant revenue and transfer in from General Fund 10 of transportation tax and
214 unrestricted cash. Expenditures included annual maintenance such as seal coating and crack
215 sealing, road reconstruction such as overlay or mill and fill, new road construction or street
216 widening, railroad crossings, and streetlights.

217
218 Council Member Porter asked if funds were collected from the motel in the City. He wondered if
219 those fees could potentially cover the firework show. Janice Larsen replied that it was a minimal
220 amount and was in the franchise fee.

221
222 Mayor Horrocks commended Janice Larsen for this report. Council Member Baskin agreed.

223
224 **There was a brief recess from 9:47 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.**

225
226 3. PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED WATER AND STORM WATER RATE
227 INCREASE - KEITH LARSON, BOWEN COLLINS

228
229 Keith Larson reported they had presented rates to the Council approximately three weeks ago
230 and combined this into specific recommendations for consideration. The rate study process had
231 three steps including revenue needs, actual cost of service, and then design a rate to accomplish
232 the needs and actual cost. The three challenges facing the City were aging infrastructure, the
233 groundwater aquifer had approached or exceeded its sustainable capacity, and the annexation and
234 future growth would result in additional demands on the system. He presented a graph showing
235 ten-year revenues and expenditures for water with projected and recommended funding levels
236 based on 3% annual inflation. The recommendation was to increase revenues through gradual
237 rate increases over six years starting at 10% in 2022 and 2023, 8% in 2024 and 2025, and 6% in
238 2026 and 2027.

239
240 Mr. Larson presented the water rate comparison for light, average, and heavy water users in
241 Bountiful, Farmington, Layton, Ogden, the City, and Salt Lake City. Implementing the rate
242 increase would place the City in the middle of the group. He explained that the chart showed
243 existing rates today compared to the proposed rates for residents below 350 East. He said there
244 was a 20% increase/surcharge for those above 350 East. The cost of service and rate design
245 observations showed an industry trend moving away from a water allowance included in the base
246 rate. Currently the City charged \$25.90 for the base rate and included 8,000 gallons. The
247 recommendation was to charge from the first gallon used, which would provide an incentive for
248 conservation and would better distribute the cost based on use patterns. Some adjustment of tiers
249 may be justified based on cost of service or desire for conservation.

250

251 Keith Larson shared water tier charts that provided comparison and normalized tier rates for the
252 same six cities that were previously mentioned. These charts showed that the City was at the
253 bottom of the tiered steps and was not charging enough for larger blocks of water. He said there
254 was room for conservation potential by increasing the blocks. Mr. Larson explained the
255 advantages to the current approach included consistency and revenue stability but said large
256 properties and high water users benefited from this setup. He commented with more aggressive
257 blocks the advantages included a better alignment with cost of service and it encouraged
258 conservation.

259
260 Council Member Knowlton asked about cost of service and what was needed to be financially
261 sustainable. Keith Larson replied there was a cost per thousand gallons when water was
262 delivered. He explained based on the water needs in Utah that larger pipes were required to
263 deliver during peak days. Additional water storage and wells along with larger pump stations
264 were also required. Mr. Larson said the closer residents were to paying the rates found in the cost
265 of service envelope the closer the City was to matching the actual costs it took to provide water.

266
267 Council Member Van Langeveld asked about the average customer use in the City. Keith Larson
268 responded typical usage along the Wasatch Front was 50,000 gallons for a ¼ acre lot in the
269 summer months. He said a ½ acre lot would be approximately 80,000 to 90,000 gallons a month
270 in the summer.

271
272 Council Member Porter commented that South Davis Water was not shown on the chart, which
273 was what he used. He said his tax dollars should not pay for other resident's water and would
274 like to see how the proposed rates compared to South Davis Water. Mayor Horrocks said there
275 was a time when the City subsidized water with the General Fund.

276
277 Council Member Van Langeveld asked about the area of the City that was on South Davis
278 Water. Council Member Porter explained there was an area that was annexed into the City that
279 remained on South Davis Water. He said water rates were not a tax but rather cities just covering
280 the cost of the use.

281
282 Keith Larson reported on additional detailed rate observations including differences in the Block
283 1 water use between water users and the other blocks. He explained that residents received 8,000
284 gallons in their allowance, commercial users received 10,000 gallons, Foxboro received 6,000
285 gallons, and multi-dwelling units received 5,000 gallons included in the base rate. The
286 recommendation was to move away from the allowance and charging all customers from the first
287 gallon used.

288
289 Mr. Larson said the next recommendation was moving to an industry standard for large meter
290 base rates. A comparison of the base rate between residential and commercial customers was
291 made which provided a ratio of the cost for large and smaller meters. The water meters ranged
292 from ¾ inches to 10 inches and matched the size of pipe to the home or commercial building. He

293 then shared a chart comparing base rate ratios per the American Water Works Association
294 (AWWA). The recommendation was for the City to use a 50 percent cost to 50% capacity ratio.
295 The larger meter base rates could be phased in over several years.

296
297 Keith Larson then spoke on the power surcharge for customers above 350 East and said it was
298 currently appropriate, but the City would need to have this re-examined periodically. He
299 explained the City had 17 pressure zones with 15 located above 350 East. The power surcharge
300 for those above 350 East was 20% more on the volume charges. The revenue from the power
301 surcharge was \$130,000 in a normal water year and the total water power cost per year was
302 \$400,000. Approximately two-thirds of that was associated with producing the water and one-
303 third of the total was associated with boosting to the higher pressure zones. The recommendation
304 was that this was an adequate surcharge at this time to meet the \$130,000 power surcharge cost.
305 Mr. Larson said for simplicity all of the homes above 350 East were paying the 20% surcharge
306 but the City could decide to divide it into areas with the higher locations paying more than those
307 closer to the bottom of the hill.

308
309 Council Member Knowlton asked if there was a significant difference to provide water for those
310 higher up on the hill. Keith Larson replied it did cost more to pump water to certain areas that
311 were higher on the hillside.

312
313 The Council had a discussion on increasing the surcharge rates for those users that were located
314 higher on the hillside, charging residents from the first gallon used, hardship exemptions, and
315 decreasing the base gallons provided.

316
317 Keith Larson said this was a five year plan with all of the rates combined into a single rate for
318 culinary use based on meter size starting at \$20 for $\frac{3}{4}$ inch meters, \$30 for 1 inch meters, etc.
319 Foxboro users were paying \$16.50 and would now pay \$20 for culinary but this would be offset
320 by decreasing the secondary base rate from \$14.55 to \$5. This meant it would be uniform and
321 consistent for everyone with the same increase amount. He spoke on additional
322 recommendations including that larger meter base rates would be adjusted to match AWWA
323 meter ratios with this change to be phased in over several years, that all culinary water tiers
324 would be the same for residential that did not have access to secondary water, and that all
325 culinary tiers would be the same for residential that had access to secondary water with the tiers
326 lowered to discourage culinary use outdoors.

327
328 Council Member Gordon asked for clarification on a resident with no access to secondary, was
329 located below 350 East and used up to 8,000 gallons of water if it would be \$1.25 per thousand
330 gallons. Keith Larson replied affirmatively.

331
332 Council Member Van Langeveld asked about the comparison between tiers and where these
333 numbers came from. Keith Larson replied that the 8, 30, 60 and 100 were from the previous cost
334 of service envelope.

335

336 Keith Larson spoke on the difficulty in determining rates for those who had access to secondary
337 water versus those who did not. He said an incentive had to be provided for those who had
338 secondary water to actually use it as well as to treat all residents fairly.

339

340 The Council had a discussion about water usage for those with secondary water versus those who
341 did not.

342

343 Keith Larson explained secondary water rates and proposed that the old rates of 10, 20, 40 and
344 above be changed to 22, 52, 92 and above. He said the reason for the increase would be to give
345 everyone access to the same amount of water. These rates were set at 75% of culinary rates to
346 provide an incentive for those with secondary water to use it outdoors. The base rate would be
347 \$20.00 for all residents whether they had secondary or not.

348

349 Keith Larson reported on the additional recommendations including tier costs adjusted to match
350 cost of service and encourage conservation with the most aggressive users to increase into the
351 upper tiers, maintain the 20% power surcharge for use above 350 East, nonresidential water use
352 set to weighted average cost of water, set secondary tiers to match outdoor water use tiers for
353 culinary, secondary volume rates set at 75% of culinary rates, and the addition of a rate category
354 for secondary water above 350 East.

355

356 Ken Leetham asked how the culinary water rate was determined for commercial. Keith Larson
357 replied that \$2.01 was a weighted average of the residential rates.

358

359 Keith Larson presented a graph showing the ten-year revenue and expenditures related to the
360 storm drain system. He said the funding deficit was bigger on a percentage basis but the current
361 rates were only \$6 per month. There was a recommended \$950,000 funding increase or 110%
362 increase in revenue. Mr. Larson also showed the storm water rate comparison of the six cities
363 with the City currently charging the lowest rate. He said that the recommendation to meet the
364 gap would be a funding increase over ten years with a \$1 increase per year up to \$12 in 2027.

365

366 Ken Leetham asked if there were any changes to the commercial storm water. Keith Larson
367 responded that commercial would be charged the same as it was now but viewing the impervious
368 area and charging accordingly.

369

370 Keith Larson said they would finalize the rate study as quickly as possible, set public hearings,
371 and the City Council would then adopt the rate changes.

372

373 Council Member Porter asked for sample bills reflecting the proposed rates both monthly and
374 annually.

375

376 Council Member Baskin mentioned rainwater collection and the policy from a water rate
377 management standpoint. Keith Larson replied that a large collection of rainwater by residents
378 would result in less culinary water usage and could have positive effect on infrastructure and
379 production cost but would have a negative revenue effect.

380
381 Mayor Horrocks asked about State limitations on rainwater collection. Keith Larson replied that
382 the State only allowed 2,500 gallons of rainwater storage.

383
384 Council Member Van Langeveld asked to see information about average use throughout the City
385 along with the sample monthly and yearly bill with the proposed rate increases. She also spoke
386 on incentives to conserve and how there was no incentive for high commercial water users. Keith
387 Larson said tiers could be set based on meter size but would result in some inequities based on
388 use. He said this was difficult so it was better to look at individual customers and place them on
389 their own tiers.

390
391 Janice Larsen supported the idea and said those on larger meters could be placed in their own
392 tier.

393
394 The Council had a discussion about commercial water users, such as Big West Oil, conservation,
395 and charging an increased rate for high water users.

396
397 Council Member Porter asked about the well that Big West Oil accessed. Paul Ottoson replied
398 that well had dried up.

399
400 Council Member Gordon questioned if a rate review, increase, and a truth in taxation hearing
401 would need to occur each year or every other. Ken Leetham replied that a public hearing was not
402 required to raise water rates. The recommendation was to raise rates every year and he suggested
403 an annual adjustment until the rates were where they needed to be.

404
405 Keith Larson commented he was unaware of any State requirements for a public hearing but said
406 most cities still had one when increasing rates. He mentioned that a five year schedule had been
407 created for the City and recommended adopting that schedule.

408
409 Ken Leetham said residents should be made aware that the City's overall water system was not
410 new and rate increases were needed to address aging infrastructure.

411
412 Mayor Horrocks mentioned water rates were higher in many of the surrounding cities.

413
414 Council Member Gordon asked if the Council was interested in reviewing a larger surcharge for
415 higher elevation areas to better cover the costs of pumping water to those locations. Mayor
416 Horrocks replied this may be something to consider as it did cost more money.

417

418 Paul Ottoson explained there were 17 pressure zones but water starting at the wells would be
419 pumped up to 350 East then to the tanks in Eaglewood or the tanks above the Cove. He
420 explained it would only take four pumps to reach those living in the highest elevation of the City.

421
422 Council Member Knowlton suggested reviewing how many households and roughly how much
423 more the cost would be, then a determination could be made.

424
425 Ken Leetham expressed gratitude for the comprehensive water study as it provided a list of
426 deficiencies and better view of the overall system.

427
428 4. PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED PARKS EMPLOYEES

429
430 David Frandsen reported on staffing and said the Public Works Department was making good
431 use of the employees and thoughtful choices. He spoke on the water construction crew and said
432 there was generally a 50% savings on those projects including infrastructure replacement and
433 preventative maintenance including over 20 valves that were broken. Mr. Frandsen mentioned
434 the additional storm water employee, which allowed for street sweeping to increase from twice a
435 year to over ten times a year. He said with the inspector position that 25 miles of waterline had
436 been added to the maps and more hydrants and valves received maintenance. Forty miles of
437 Google Fiber had been added in the City, which meant more mapping, monitoring, and blue
438 stake requests. He said park water usage had been cut in half last year due to staff conservation
439 efforts.

440
441 David Frandsen spoke on population growth in the City with 6,474 residents in 1990 compared
442 to 24,180 residents in 2022. He focused on the Parks Department and showed a map of areas that
443 were maintained prior to 2005 compared to those after 2005 as well as those in the near future.
444 Before 2005 there were 19 properties that the City maintained versus 57 properties now which
445 was a 200% increase. He also showed mowing turf maintained by the City from before 2005,
446 which was 17.72 acres or 13.42 football fields compared to 48.79 acres or 36.96 football fields
447 now which was a 175% increase. Of those 36.96 acres, 31.07 were added since 2005.

448
449 David Frandsen talked about the number of City Parks employees before 2005 with one fulltime
450 and seven part time employees compared to three fulltime and three seasonal employees in 2021.
451 He said it was very difficult to find employees, particularly seasonal, at this time. There were
452 only six applicants for the recent water and fleet positions.

453
454 Council Member Van Langeveld asked how many seasonal employees would have been
455 preferable. David Frandsen replied at least four to five seasonal employees for Parks would be
456 adequate.

457
458 David Frandsen spoke on warm weather duties including phragmites, tree maintenance, laying
459 bark, weed removal, mowing, etc. Parks Department winter duties included snowplowing roads,

460 snow removal on sidewalks, trails, and parking lots, irrigation inventory, water leaks, cleaning,
461 restroom repairs, painting, training, detailing, etc. He spoke on weekend needs at the park
462 including splash pad chemical inspections, pavilion cleaning, garbage/pet waste stations, and
463 eyes on the park. Historically the time was divided into 33% maintaining facilities, 16% turf
464 care, 16% sprinkler work, and 11% tree care.

465
466 Mr. Frandsen reported on the request for two Parks maintenance workers, which would be grade
467 12 at \$15.37 per hour/\$31,978 annually. He said there was an advancement system based on
468 certifications and experience.

469
470 David Frandsen spoke on level of service and said there was some areas including trails
471 maintenance and aging infrastructure, which was impacted by not having adequate staffing.

472
473 Council Member Van Langeveld asked if the \$15 an hour was industry standard. David Frandsen
474 replied these were the job comparisons and with the advancement system he hoped to attract new
475 employees. He said one issue the City and other cities had faced was cities recruiting certified
476 employees from other cities.

477
478 Council Member Porter asked if the proposed new hires would operate the snowplows. David
479 Frandsen replied a CDL was required for all positions.

480
481 There was a discussion that the entry-level wages were low especially compared to other jobs in
482 the current market. Ken Leetham commented the compensation study would help address this
483 and wages could be discussed again before the adoption of the final budget.

484
485 Council Member Van Langeveld spoke on several ways to attract employees including increased
486 wages and a better work/life balance such as offering part time positions.

487
488 David Frandsen commented many of the jobs included certifications such as chemicals for the
489 pool, CDL for truck driving, etc. so 16 year olds could not be hired for those positions.

490
491 Ken Leetham addressed flexibility and nontraditional work hours such as weekends and said the
492 City had received complaints about inattention to the parks on the weekends. He said this
493 showed the department was understaffed especially with the major increase in additional parks
494 property and the heavy use of the parks on the weekends.

495
496 Council Member Van Langeveld commented part time employees could work in the parks on the
497 weekends. She asked if consideration had been given to contracting out cleaning of the park
498 pavilions and restrooms. Mr. Frandsen responded many alternatives had been considered.

499
500 5. PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED POLICE OFFICER
501

502 Chief Black reported on the increase in demand for services, the evolution of the type and
503 number of calls received, and plans for the future. He said in the past he could ask for a more
504 specialized position such as community liaison or a sex offender investigation detective which
505 were valuable pieces of the department. Chief Black spoke on the sex offender investigation
506 detective and how sensitive this type of crime was for both the victim and those that may have
507 been falsely accused. He spoke on the 12 hour shifts for patrol and how the complexity had
508 increased significantly including domestic violence cases. This including spending time with
509 victims to asses if it was a one time issue or a pattern of abuse.

510
511 Chief Black said the City was competitively hiring and focused on some recruitment/retention
512 issues including the length of the shifts, schedules, and diversity. He then mentioned the possible
513 annexation and how this would allow for better patrol services and service calls. Chief Black
514 suggested this would require two additional patrol officers and a detective over a three year
515 timeframe. He would also like to evolve from 12-hour shifts to 10-hour shifts.

516
517 Council Member Knowlton asked if the capacity increase was a net reduction in hours per week.
518 Chief Black replied the 12-hour shifts were based on an 80 hour pay period work week. This
519 meant they worked two 12-hour shifts, were off for two days, and then worked two 12-hour
520 shifts, and then every other weekend they worked two 12-hour shifts and then an 8-hour shift. He
521 explained the reduction would allow for four 10-hour shifts and then three days off.

522
523 Chief Black reported on virtual training which included the re-creation of scenario based
524 training. He said the change to a 10-hour shift would allow for better quality of life and mental
525 health.

526
527 Mayor Horrocks asked about the new retirement system. Chief Black responded the City paid
528 into the URS system to offset the way the new system was setup. He spoke on how he did not
529 actively recruit from other cities or in the system.

530
531 Council Member Van Langeveld spoke on the scope of what was expected of officers and her
532 concern for the wellbeing of the officers and the community. She asked if there was a specialized
533 assignment or training to address behavioral health. Chief Black replied in order for any officer
534 to advance in the department they had to complete and remain certified in crisis intervention
535 training. This covered substance abuse and mental health, which was helpful for officers in
536 dealing with the public and in their personal lives. He said there was also a peer leadership group
537 where officers could talk to other officers along with trainings.

538
539 Chief Black said the City also provided assistance and options through health insurance and EAP
540 employee assistance program. This included asking employees if they had a plan in place to deal
541 with the stresses of the job.

542

543 Council Member Van Langeveld asked about hiring a social worker for the police department for
544 a crisis situation or a victim's advocate. Chief Black replied that West Valley City had a fulltime
545 position like this and the City had a clinical psychologist on a contract-based position. He said
546 there was also a volunteer group, Mental Health for Heroes, who provided some services free of
547 charge.

548
549 Council Member Gordon asked if there were resources for community members as well. Council
550 Member Van Langeveld spoke on social worker services at local schools and if there was a need
551 for this in the department.

552
553 Chief Black commented these questions should be addressed through the Health and Wellness
554 Committee. He said the department did have a victim services coordinator who worked part time
555 to assist victims. Chief Black spoke on other resources that could adequately address issues
556 including school social workers, child and family services, Davis Behavioral Health, and the
557 Health and Wellness Committee.

558
559 Council Member Knowlton spoke on the request for an increase of three employees. He asked
560 about the current department full time employees and previous requests. Chief Black replied that
561 the department was authorized to have 25 sworn officers but had not made a request in the last
562 two years. In the last twelve years approximately ten officers had been added to the department.
563 He said this was more of a response to ensure that employees were taken care of.

564
565 Council Member Baskin asked if other departments offered 8-hour shifts. Chief Black responded
566 that 8-hour shifts caused issues with time off, call out and overtime, no overlapping shifts, and
567 only allowed for two days off to reach 40 hour weeks.

568
569 Council Member Van Langeveld questioned if the department could move to 10-hour shifts prior
570 to hiring the three new positions. Chief Black replied the hope was to add the first patrol officer
571 and then move to 10-hour shifts to avoid overtime. He clarified that the new hire would be added
572 in the fiscal year but would not be trained until the calendar year.

573
574 Council Member Gordon asked for clarification on the requested number of new hires. Chief
575 Black explained it would be three total hires including one detective position over the next three
576 years. He said the issue was that detectives were required to be on call for a week.

577
578 Council Member Baskin questioned on any given day how many officers were patrolling the
579 City. Chief Black said that they staffed for three at any given moment and also had a traffic
580 officer for backup. He explained that minimum staffing was two officers, which was not great
581 for a city spread over eight square miles.

582
583 Ken Leetham clarified the proposal was for one officer in upcoming fiscal year.

584

585 Chief Black spoke on the support of the department by the City Council and the difficult process
586 of keeping up with the market for officer retention. He said this assessment was based on an
587 evaluation of calls and also for the mental and emotional health of the officers.

588

589 **There was a recess from 12:00 p.m. to 12:45 p.m.**

590

591 6. PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED GOLF MAINTENANCE EMPLOYEE

592

593 This item was postponed until the April 5th City Council meeting.

594

595 7. CITY COUNCIL PRIORITIES FOR UPCOMING FISCAL YEAR

596

597 Council Member Van Langeveld asked if there was a policy or principal with City staff for
598 diversity, equity and inclusion while reviewing plans, projects, and hiring. Ken Leetham replied
599 that the U.S. Constitution and federal statutes required the City to follow equal employment and
600 other rules.

601

602 Mayor Horrocks commented that he was appreciative of staff and said that the budget was the
603 most important thing the City Council did. He recommended consideration should be given to a
604 property tax increase plan for future sustainability. Mayor Horrocks spoke on the salary for the
605 Council and staff was instructed to review what other cities were paying. His wish list included
606 the overpass for 1100 North, Hatch Park, and the Wetlands Park. He suggested the Foxboro
607 Wetlands Park was the place to start. Ken Leetham replied the City did have funding for the
608 Wetlands and were waiting for permitting.

609

610 Council Member Knowlton mentioned Highway 89 beautification, meeting with Bountiful City
611 to discuss zoning, active transportation connections, and the decrepit museum in Bountiful. He
612 asked about coordinating a council to council meeting with Bountiful. He then mentioned the
613 need for a master plan in the 2600 South 1100 North business district. He also spoke on the need
614 to continue with the downtown form based code as well as an overall assessment and potential
615 update of the general plan.

616

617 Council Member Baskin spoke on solutions for the Wood Museum including abatement with a
618 potential lien. She said a resident that lived adjacent to the museum had approached her about
619 this issue and how garbage was being dumped on the property. This issue needed to be addressed
620 with Bountiful. She then said the odor issues at the Wasatch Resource Recovery Plant needed to
621 be resolved.

622

623 Mayor Horrocks said the facility was a problem and they had addressed some of the issues but
624 there was still an odor. He said the latest proposal was to hire a resident to monitor the odor
625 occurrences.

626

627 Council Member Gordon commented they had been given a six month window to fix the issue
628 before penalties were issued and this window had since passed. She said this should be an
629 agenda item for discussion.

630
631 Council Member Baskin mentioned the Center Street underpass needed to be cleaned up and
632 maintained. She also recommended working with Erin Mendenhall on the camp located on
633 Victory Road off Beck Street.

634
635 Mayor Horrocks said he had a meeting with the Salt Lake City Council representative this week
636 and would mention the issues on Beck Street/Victory Road.

637
638 Council Member Baskin reported she would be appointing Camille Thorpe to the Parks, Trails,
639 Arts and Recreation Advisory Board. She commented on the idea of the Parks Department as a
640 separate department from Public Works and it should be a discussion.

641
642 Council Member Baskin commented on the recent legislative session and her observations of the
643 years. She said every president of the senate was a developer and something should be done. She
644 suggested building a coalition of the willing that would not be told what to do with their land or
645 city code. She said land use was a city's decision and the only way to solve these issues were to
646 band together and address the legislature.

647
648 Council Member Porter reported on completing the trail section on Wild Rose to Bonneville.
649 Council Member Knowlton agreed it was a priority to complete projects that had already been
650 approved.

651
652 Paul Ottoson spoke on the uncompleted portion of the trail and said there was 400 feet in the
653 City with the remainder in Salt Lake City. He said it was slowly moving forward.

654
655 Council Member Porter mentioned researching the springs at Tunnel Springs Park. He also
656 suggested fixing up the fishing pond.

657
658 Council Member Gordon asked if this was the year to begin construction on a dog park or Hatch
659 Park. She asked what could be done to obtain a library or community center at Hatch Park even
660 without the Recreation District's participation. She also asked about ensuring funding for the
661 1100 North bridge project as well as focusing on more important projects and not completing
662 projects just because grants had been awarded. She asked about funds for scholarships for the
663 Youth City Council (YCC) and acknowledged the City Easter event currently was funded with
664 the YCC budget and wondered if this could be done differently.

665
666 Council Member Gordon mentioned UTA and the lack of service in the City. She suggested
667 discussing the City's needs and then meeting with UTA. Ken Leetham commented UTA
668 representatives were scheduled to attend the work session on April 5th.

669

670 Council Member Van Langeveld said consideration should be given to lower wage jobs and if
671 there should be an additional increase outside of COLA. She also mentioned a discussion item
672 related to stipends and said the Planning Commission and the Parks and Arts Board were the
673 only two boards that received compensation. She liked the idea of a trail in every City park and
674 said there were several locations that would be low cost to install including two in Foxboro. She
675 asked for an overview of every park to determine what parks would be appropriate for the
676 addition of a trail. She also mentioned a policy for homelessness.

677

678 Council Knowlton suggested the City Council could assist with some of these requests and
679 projects as well.

680

681 Council Member Porter recommended a budget for the Health and Wellness Committee.

682

683 Ken Leetham said staff would begin working on the Council's priority list.

684

685 8. ADJOURN

686

687 Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 1:43 p.m.

688

689 *The foregoing was approved by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday April*
690 *19, 2022 by unanimous vote of all members present.*

691

692

693

694 _____
Brian J. Horrocks, Mayor

_____ *Wendy Page, City Recorder*

1 CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
2 CITY COUNCIL MEETING-WORK SESSION
3 APRIL 19, 2022

4
5 **DRAFT**
6

7 Mayor Horrocks welcomed those present at 6:00 p.m.
8

9 PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
10 Council Member Lisa Watts Baskin
11 Council Member Natalie Gordon
12 Council Member Ted Knowlton
13 Council Member Stan Porter
14 Council Member Alisa Van Langeveld
15

16 STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; Paul Ottoson, City Engineer; Jon Rueckert,
17 Assistant Public Works Director; Heidi Voordecker, Finance Director; Craig Black, Police
18 Chief; Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Tyler Abegglen, Golf Course General Manager; Sherrie
19 Pace, Community Development Director; Wendy Page, City Recorder.
20

21 OTHERS PRESENT: Katie Williams, Kevin Kilpatrick, UDOT; Lorene Kamalu, Davis County
22 Commissioner.
23

24 1. PRESENTATION FROM UDOT REGARDING THE I-15 ENVIRONMENTAL
25 IMPACT STATEMENT STUDY; FARMINGTON TO SALT LAKE CITY
26

27 Kevin Kilpatrick, UDOT consultant, reported they would cover the purpose of the I-15
28 environmental impact statement (EIS) study, what was known so far, and opportunities for
29 feedback. He spoke on the purpose of the study with a focus on Utah's Quality of Life
30 Framework which included better mobility, good health, connected communities, and a strong
31 economy. The study area encompassed US-89 in Farmington along I-15 to the 400 South I-80
32 area in Salt Lake City. Mr. Kilpatrick reviewed the study process starting with National
33 Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) overview and early scoping, to the purpose and needs
34 scoping, to alternatives development, preparation of draft EIS, the release of the draft EIS,
35 preparation of the final EIS, release of the final EIS and recording the decision, and concluding
36 with recommended funding, planning, and construction. The first phase of the study was the
37 NEPA overview and early scoping included the initial coordination with stakeholders, the second
38 and current phase was the purpose and need plus scoping which included filing notice of the
39 intent to begin the NEPA process, public outreach and a 30-day public comment period, and
40 solidifying the study area and project limits. The third phase of alternatives development
41 included developing screening criteria and preliminary alternatives, public engagement and
42 outreach with a 30-day comment period. The fourth phase was preparing the draft EIS with
43 ongoing stakeholder engagement. The fifth phase would consist of releasing the draft EIS along

44 with a public hearing and a 45-day public comment period. The sixth phase was the preparation
45 of the final EIS through revision and responses to the public comments on the draft EIS. The
46 final phase was the release of the final EIS with public notification of the final recorded decision.
47 Each phase would include coordination with local government and ongoing stakeholder
48 communication.

49
50 Kevin Kilpatrick spoke on what was already known which included aging infrastructure,
51 increased travel times, safety, and limited connections. He compared a projection of travel times
52 showing that a trip that took 19 minutes in 2019 would take 66 minutes in 2050 if the project
53 were not done. A part of the project would include looking at interchange needs such as capacity,
54 modifications, and change to access. Other aspects of the project were safety with a review of
55 issues such as narrow or substandard shoulders and sharp curves. Mr. Kilpatrick showed images
56 of the total number of crashes on I-15 both north and southbound Farmington to Salt Lake from
57 2018 to 2020.

58
59 Kevin Kilpatrick spoke on limited connections for pedestrians and bikes. He said staff had
60 performed walk audits in different areas including the 500 South dual diverging interchange
61 (DDI).

62
63 Council Member Baskin spoke on recent wrong way traffic and how the DDIs were confusing.
64 She asked about painting the routes or better indications for drivers on the correct direction.

65
66 Council Member Baskin asked how the study was being funded and the cost. Kevin Kilpatrick
67 replied that it was currently being funded with State funds at around \$8 to \$10 million. He said
68 the cost included right of way design, engineering, traffic bottling, etc.

69
70 Katie Williams, UDOT consultant, reported on stakeholder engagement including a public
71 comment period which would run from April 11th to May 13th. This included feedback on the
72 purpose and needs statement, screening criteria, and what was currently great or the challenges
73 on I-15. She spoke on the draft purpose and needs statement which addressed the reasons for the
74 study. Ms. Williams then read the current draft purpose and needs statement “To improve safety,
75 replace aging infrastructure, provide better mobility for all travel modes, strengthen the state and
76 local economy, and better connection communities along I-15 from Farmington to Salt Lake
77 City.” The project purpose consisted of the following items which are organized by UDOT’s
78 Quality of Life Framework categories of Good Health, Connected Communities, Strong
79 Economy, and Better Mobility. She focused on the quality-of-life goals: good health and
80 connected communities. This included improving the safety and operations of I-15 mainline, I-15
81 interchanges, bicyclist and pedestrian crossings, and the supporting roadway network; being
82 consistent with planned land use, growth objectives, and transportation plans; and enhancing
83 access and connectivity to FrontRunner, connection to transit, regional trails, and across I-15.

84

85 Council Member Knowlton mentioned the quality-of-life framework mentioned multi-modal
86 with the main component of crossing I-15. He asked if this was an I-15 project or a wider
87 corridor project. Katie Williams replied there was a focus on connections to regional trails, the
88 connections and improvements to pedestrian and multi-modal facilities, and reducing the barriers
89 to east/west connectivity.

90
91 Kevin Kilpatrick commented it was an I-15 and more project with the interstate as the main
92 focus but also looking at other issues such as connections or laying the groundwork for future
93 bridges, trails, etc.

94
95 Katie Williams spoke on the next goals of the purpose and need statement which were a strong
96 economy and better mobility. This included replacing aging infrastructure on I-15; enhancing the
97 economy by reducing travel delay on I-15; improving mobility and operations on I-15 mainline,
98 I-15 interchanges, the supporting roadway network, transit connections, and bicyclist and
99 pedestrian facilities to help accommodate projected 2050 travel demand. She mentioned there
100 were 35 bridges on the corridor with 9 bridges that were at the end-of-life expectancy. There
101 were also many bridges that would not accommodate additional widening.

102
103 Council Member Gordon arrived at 6:22 p.m.

104
105 Katie Williams reported on the screening criteria which was to develop concepts to be evaluated,
106 purpose and need, and environmental impacts and cost. The approved concepts would then be
107 combined into alternatives followed by conducting preliminary engineering and providing the
108 detailed alternatives evaluation in the draft EIS. She said some of the sample screening criteria
109 could be if the alternative met the safety standards, site distance, operational standards, or the
110 reduction of conflict between motorized and nonmotorized. She reported there were several ways
111 for the public to submit comments which included at the project website, via email, by mail, or
112 phone. The ending date for the study was 2024.

113
114 Council Member Knowlton asked how the decision was made on the purpose and need
115 statement. Kevin Kilpatrick replied his team wrote it, then UDOT provided further review, a
116 contract attorney then evaluated the draft prior to public review.

117
118 Ken Leetham commented it seemed like the purpose statement tracked the statutory purposes
119 and authorizations that UDOT was under by State Code. He said it matched the legislative
120 purposes for why UDOT did projects.

121
122 Mayor Horrocks asked about a realistic start and finish date. Kevin Kilpatrick replied that
123 funding for construction would not be available before 2026. He said once the EIS was
124 completed it would take 9-12 months to hire contractors and it would be a two to three year
125 project.

126

127 Council Member Van Langeveld spoke on the criteria items of connected communities and good
128 health. She said she valued those items and mentioned aesthetics, such as an interchange with
129 concrete work or landscaping, was also important. Kevin Kilpatrick responded that while it was
130 not part of the purpose and needs, UDOT had an aesthetics policy that was required for projects.

131
132 Lorene Kamalu, Davis County Commissioner, mentioned the on/off ramps were the entrance to a
133 city and she was not impressed with the appearance of the interchange to her city.

134
135 Council Member Van Langeveld asked if cities made the decision on what the corridor or
136 interchanges looked like.

137 Mayor Horrocks responded the cities were approached and asked how much they could
138 contribute. Kevin Kilpatrick said the cities would provide a budget and what they wanted in
139 terms of signage, landscaping, etc. and what they were willing to pay beyond the project funding.

140
141 Ken Leetham said Woods Cross and the City participated in the landscaping of the 2600 South
142 interchange as well as around the new bridge over I-215 and Redwood Road.

143
144 Ken Leetham mentioned it was important for the City to have comments/concerns on the record
145 for the public comment period. He said there would be draft comments for approval at the next
146 City Council meeting.

147
148 Mayor Horrocks said Representative Ballard had expressed her thoughts. He said UDOT had
149 planned to remove the Center Street exit as it was not an on-ramp as well.

150
151 Council Member Porter mentioned years ago there was a design to put a connection between I-
152 15 and Legacy Parkway which would solve the problem. He said this connection was a good
153 idea but never came to fruition. Kevin Kilpatrick replied Representative Ballard had proposed a
154 new access to I-15 and I-215 south of Center Street.

155
156 The Council discussed previously proposed Legacy Parkway ramps which would have allowed
157 for better usage of Legacy in the event of traffic issues on I-15.

158
159 Katie Williams said any issues the Council experienced including traffic congestion in certain
160 areas could be part of the public comments as well.

161
162 2. GOLF DEPARTMENT UPDATE

163
164 Tyler Abegglen reported on the hiring of the new maintenance employee and how this would
165 really help. He said there were currently 6.5 full time employees, 15-20 seasonal employees, and
166 1 part time employee. This included Brent Moyes, Head Golf Pro; Allen Cox, Assistant Golf
167 Pro; the pro shop staff; cart staff; Weston Kimber, Superintendent; Nick Bosen, Assistant
168 Superintendent; Jordan Jensen, Assistant Superintendent; and maintenance staff.

169

170 Mr. Abegglen provided an update on the rounds and revenue and projected that the rounds would
171 be around 67,000 to 68,000 9-hole rounds for fiscal year 2022. He showed a graph of the fiscal
172 year-round totals for the last seven years with 70,890 rounds in FY21 and 45,426 so far in FY22.
173 Fiscal year 2022 was comparable to FY16-FY2020 or the five-year average with two months left
174 in FY2022.

175

176 Tyler Abegglen compared the revenue by fiscal year from 2000 to 2022 as well as a five-year
177 average. Revenues for FY22 were \$1,292,297 (minus May and June) compared to \$1,859,840 in
178 FY21 with the five-year average revenues at \$1,166,643. He said FY22 was currently ahead of
179 FY21 when comparing year to date and estimated that FY22 would end at \$1,926,789 in
180 revenues. Mr. Abegglen shared the merchandise sales history from FY08-FY22 with \$199,463 in
181 revenues for FY22 (minus May and June) compared to \$214,460 in FY21. He projected that
182 merchandise sales for FY22 would be just under \$300,000. He said there were a lot of good
183 things coming to the golf course including the golf simulators and the remodeled building.

184

185 Tyler Abegglen spoke on current projects including the transition to half head sprinklers, the
186 transition to native grass, wildflower planting, leveling tee boxes on #3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18,
187 expanding the tee boxes on #3, 4, 8, 15, GPS mapping of the irrigation, and turf mats on the
188 driving range. He spoke on an idea from Council Member Van Langeveld to offer three free
189 rounds to the 5th and 6th grade students in the City similar to the Ski Utah program. This
190 Eaglewood Golf Course school voucher program would include punch cards valid for green fees
191 only on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays which would expire at the end of the year. This
192 program would encourage juniors to come to Eaglewood and introduce programs and a low-cost
193 entry to golf.

194

195 Tyler Abegglen provided a construction update and showed a rendering of the clubhouse
196 building exterior. He showed images of the recently remodeled buildings including the snack
197 shack and restrooms. Other construction included the golf simulator room, the kitchen, the pro
198 shop, and decking. The construction schedule included deck demolition on April 18th, the
199 exterior demo on April 25th, roof demo on April 25th, lobby entrance demo on May 15th, pro shop
200 demo from June-July, and event center demo on October 1st. The opening dates included the
201 snack shack on April 27th, George's Grill on June 1st, roof completion on June 1st, the golf
202 simulators on June 15th, the outdoor deck on July 10th, the building exterior on August 15th, the
203 pro shop on September 1st, and the event center on November 15th. The landscaping updates
204 would be put on hold until 2023 due to the drought and watering restrictions. A drought tolerant
205 and low water use plan would be put in place this year. He said the event center demo was
206 pushed to October so as not to interfere with events during the spring and summer.

207

208 3. ADJOURN

209

210 Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m. to begin the regular session.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING-REGULAR SESSION
APRIL 19, 2022

DRAFT

Mayor Horrocks called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. Winston Ji offered the invocation and Spencer Marx led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Mayor Brian Horrocks
Council Member Lisa Watts Baskin
Council Member Natalie Gordon
Council Member Ted Knowlton
Council Member Stan Porter
Council Member Alisa Van Langeveld

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; Paul Ottoson, City Engineer; Jon Rueckert, Assistant Public Works Director; Heidi Voordecker, Finance Director; Craig Black, Police Chief; Todd Godfrey, City Attorney; Tyler Abegglen, Golf Course General Manager; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Wendy Page, City Recorder.

OTHERS PRESENT: Rulon Crosby, Matthew Damsky, Spencer Marx, Winston Ji, Landon Ballard, Peyton Otis, Brynne Burgese, Sterling Page, Maddyson Toro, Makenzie Brinton, Vanessa Ramos-Sky, Tony Smith, Chad Campbell, Michelle Campbell, Dee Lalliss, Brian Myers, residents; Taylor Spendlove, Brighton Development; Graham Hunter, Zach DeLange, Hayden Poulton, Charlie Spencer, Cole Anderson, Jon Howe, Mason Bendinger, Will Campbell, Hunter Jackson, Josh Margetts, Woods Cross Boys Varsity team and coaches; Lorene Kamalu, Davis County Commissioner.

1. CITIZEN COMMENT

Rulon Crosby, 510 Lacey Way, said he had lived on Lacey Way since 1978. He explained he bought property adjacent to his home in 1979 and the only access to the property was from a dirt road up behind the water tank. This road was used to bring materials to the top portion of his lot during and after construction of his home. Mr. Crosby commented he used the road freely for over 20 years until the City placed rocks across the trail near the water tank and also put a lock on the gate. He now had no access to the top portion of his property. Rulon Crosby asked for a key to the gate and felt he was entitled to a prescriptive easement as he had used that access for years. He said the row of rocks blocked access to the City's property as well and would make it difficult in the event of a fire or maintenance of the storm drain. Mr. Crosby asked if he needed to request this be a future City Council agenda item.

253 Ken Leetham commented on the letter received by Mr. Crosby and said the best route would be
254 to ask the City attorney if there was a prescriptive easement over the property.

255
256 Todd Godfrey said he would review the information and communicate with Mr. Crosby.

257
258 Mayor Horrocks asked if the City had an interest in retaining the rocks and if they were designed
259 to prevent access. Ken Leetham responded the City did not want the public on the property. He
260 said if Mr. Crosby had a right and legal access to the property the City would not deny him that.

261
262 Paul Ottoson said years ago there was not a fence and a property owner cut down several trees on
263 the City's property for a better view of the valley. The City then placed a fence and a gate around
264 the property to prevent further damage.

265
266 Rulon Crosby commented in the 1970s the roadway provided access and jeep trails, but this was
267 no longer the case. He said two years ago he asked the City Council for the ability to purchase a
268 20' strip of property on a lot he had for sale. This request was not granted at that time and access
269 was still prohibited to the public.

270
271 Council Member Baskin spoke on Mr. Crosby's inquiry about whether an agenda item to address
272 his access was necessary. She said the City attorney would review the legal question of
273 prescriptive easement. She also said if Mr. Crosby wanted formal action taken, he may want to
274 be placed on the agenda to request the easement and she offered her assistance.

275
276 Matthew Damsky, 175 East Ridgeline Way, commented he was a truck driver and worked at the
277 FedEx ground facility in the City. He spoke on Hatch Park and the road restricted route signage
278 on Center Street. Mr. Damsky explained he tried to help a lost truck driver and was told by
279 police that while it was a road restricted route they could not issue tickets. He spoke on other
280 large truck issues related to this road including destruction of infrastructure.

281
282 Ken Leetham commented that Center Street was a truck restricted route but whether that meant
283 the City issued or should be issuing tickets was a question for staff to review.

284
285 **2. PUBLIC RECOGNITION OF THE WOODS CROSS HIGH SCHOOL BOYS**
286 **BASKETBALL TEAM**

287
288 Mayor Horrocks welcomed the Woods Cross High School boys basketball team. He said Woods
289 Cross High played in the 5A State championship game and presented certificates of recognition
290 to the team members present including Graham Hunter, Zach DeLange, Charlie Spencer, Hayden
291 Poulton, Cole Anderson, Jon Howe, Mason Bendinger, Will Campbell, and Hunter Jackson.

292
293
294

295 3. YOUTH CITY COUNCIL UPDATE

296

297 Council Member Gordon commented she was thrilled with this year's Youth City Council
298 (YCC). She introduced Peyton Otis the YCC City Manager who was a sophomore at Bountiful
299 High School.

300

301 Peyton Otis reported on the youth conference at the Utah State campus in Logan. She spoke on
302 what they learned including leadership, working with others, and building from where you stood.
303 Peyton said fourteen youth were able to attend the conference this year with a hope that more
304 could attend in the future.

305

306 Landon Ballard, YCC Publicity Chair, reported on the activities of the YCC and how this
307 allowed them to bond as a council and increased attendance at future activities. He spoke on
308 some of the activities including at Cross E Ranch and food trucks at Camelot. Landon spoke on
309 the budget for and growth of the YCC. This included not having a membership fee and
310 discontinuing scholarships.

311

312 Council Member Gordon clarified the Youth City Council had decided to stop granting
313 scholarships from the budget.

314

315 Brynne Burgese, Service Chair, spoke on service activities including the Bountiful Food Pantry
316 and mobile truck. She said the YCC distributed food once a month to the Camelot residents and
317 it was a wonderful experience.

318

319 Makenzie Brinton, Activities Chair, reported on the activities the YCC had enjoyed this year
320 including Cross E Ranch, bowling, arts/crafts, and other bonding activities. She said they wanted
321 to continue the relationship with the Woods Cross and Bountiful YCCs.

322

323 Spencer Marx, YCC Mayor, spoke on the service projects and the desire of the YCC to do more
324 service. He said the YCC did not attend the leadership conference last year and used the funds to
325 make hygiene kits for refuges. He then said the YCC determined that the funds normally used for
326 scholarships would be used for service projects so those who needed it the most would be
327 benefited.

328

329 Council Member Gordon said the City was fortunate to have wonderful youth in the community
330 that wanted to get together and serve others. She said they were able to provide 40 kits and each
331 one provided a month's worth of supplies for one family. Council Member Gordon said the YCC
332 had plans for a community service project on the 5th Tuesday of the month as well as a large
333 legacy service project for the year.

334

335 Mayor Horrocks mentioned the YCC sponsored the City's Easter egg hunt and how a resident
336 had approached him with the desire for his son to be involved.

337 Council Member Baskin commented it would be a great idea if the YCC could receive the
338 matching jackets and shirts that had been mentioned. She asked if this was in the budget. Council
339 Member Gordon replied they hoped to budget for this in the upcoming year.

340
341 Council Member Gordon said due to the expanded membership that they would expand the
342 leadership positions as well with a mayor, city manager, city recorder, and four council members
343 in charge of activities, leadership, service, and publicity.

344
345 4. DISCUSSION WITH DAVIS COUNTY COMMISSIONER LORENE KAMALU
346

347 Lorene Kamalu, Davis County Commissioner, said she was a planning commissioner with
348 Kaysville for several years which gave her a great start in government and an appreciation for
349 planning. She spoke on the Davis County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council which was
350 established in 2019 and said Chief Black was a founding member and great contributor.
351 Commissioner Kamalu mentioned an upcoming library services meeting to be held for the south
352 part of the county. This would include a study on the Bountiful library and include information
353 on all seven libraries in the county as well as library user information.

354
355 Council Member Knowlton asked if this report was on areas of Commissioner Kamalu's focus.
356 Commissioner Kamalu replied this would be a report on a variety of items including her focus
357 and items that affected the entire county.

358
359 Commissioner Kamalu provided a report on public safety dispatch and the potential
360 consolidation of the county for better efficiency. She spoke on another item of importance which
361 was the Memorial Courthouse renovation completion with an open house on June 9th and 10th.
362 Commissioner Kamalu reported on the renovation of the Legacy Event Center and the
363 installation of the cement floor to allow for events and sports competitions. This building was
364 used during the pandemic for drive through elections and as a vaccination clinic.

365
366 Council Member Gordon thanked Commissioner Kamalu for her service and asked how the City
367 could better support the Children's Justice Center and Davis Behavioral Health. Commissioner
368 Kamalu spoke on serious needs during the pandemic related to mental health and the services
369 that the Children's Justice Center, Safe Harbor, and Davis Behavioral Health provided to the
370 community. She asked for support of these non-profits.

371
372 5. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A PLAT AMENDMENT TO
373 VILLAGE STATION AT EAGLEWOOD SUBDIVISION, LOT 8, VACATING A
374 PORTION OF RIGHT OF WAY ON ORCHARD DRIVE FOR ON STREET PARKING
375

376 Sherrie Pace reported this was a consideration of the plat amendment to vacate a portion of the
377 public right of way for Village Station Building 4. She provided the modified development plan
378 as well as a current aerial of the property which showed the current construction of Buildings 1

379 and 2 as well as the locations for Buildings 3 and 4. The property at 445 South Orchard would
380 have 25 diagonal on-street parking stalls on Orchard Drive. The parking stalls were to be on
381 private property and outside the City owned right of way but inadvertently when Village Station
382 was approved seven of the stalls were located within the right of way. This plat amendment
383 would vacate the public right of way where the seven stalls were situated so that all the on-street
384 parking adjacent to the property were owned and maintained in the same way. This plat
385 amendment was requested by City staff and was recommended for approval by the Planning
386 Commission.

387

388 **Mayor Horrocks opened the public hearing at 8:11 p.m. There were no public comments**
389 **and he closed the public hearing at 8:12 p.m.**

390

391 **Council Member Baskin moved that the City Council approve the plat amendment of**
392 **Village Station at Eaglewood Subdivision, which would now be lot 11, vacating a portion of**
393 **Orchard Drive right of way containing street adjacent parking with the following**
394 **condition:**

395

396 **1) Completion of engineering redlines, if any.**

397

398 **Council Member Porter seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Council**
399 **Members Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.**

400

401 **6. CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR VILLAGE STATION AT**
402 **EAGLEWOOD, BUILDING 4 LOCATED AT 445 SOUTH ORCHARD DRIVE,**
403 **BRIGHTON UTAH, APPLICANT**

404

405 Sherrie Pace reported the City and developer entered into an agreement amending the Eaglewood
406 Village development agreement on August 6, 2019. She showed the original site plan with
407 parking in the front and said this was slightly modified so the building fronted the street with the
408 parking in the back. The architecture would be like the rest of the Village Station buildings with
409 the same brick and architectural style. The proposed development met all the architectural and
410 parking requirements with 160 parking spaces for the building. The Planning Commission
411 reviewed and provided a favorable recommendation with a request that the developer work with
412 staff on any revisions to eliminate sod for water conservation. The development agreement
413 required the entire development site, not just this parcel, must have a minimum of 25%
414 landscaping unless the UDOT parcel along Highway 89 was landscaped which would reduce the
415 required landscaping to 20%. The UDOT parcel had been or was being landscaped and therefore
416 the required site landscaping was reduced to 20%. The landscaping for Building 4 would have
417 approximately 25% or 27,462 square feet of landscaping after site improvements were made.
418 The entire development site appeared to exceed the 20% landscaping requirement but
419 confirmation by the landscape architect or design engineer was needed.

420

421 Council Member Baskin asked for clarification on the parking requirements that were presented
422 in a grid on the staff report. Sherrie Pace clarified the parking requirements per unit with a total
423 of 25 garage spaces, 69 carport spaces, and 66 surfaces spaces for a total of 160 spaces.

424
425 Paul Ottoson clarified that all engineering redlines had been completed.

426
427 **Council Member Van Langeveld moved that the City Council approve the requested site**
428 **plan for Village Station at Eaglewood, Building 4, with one condition:**

429
430 **1) Correction of engineering redlines, if any.**

431
432 **Council Member Porter seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Council**
433 **Members Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.**

434
435 7. CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR VILLAGE STATION AT
436 EAGLEWOOD, BUILDING 5 LOCATED AT 314 SOUTH ORCHARD DRIVE,
437 BRIGHTON UTAH, APPLICANT

438
439 Sherrie Pace reported due to an increase in construction costs the Eaglewood Plaza office
440 building had been delayed but construction would begin this summer. She said the development
441 agreement contained a clause that a building permit may not be issued for Building 5 until
442 construction had begun on the Eaglewood Plaza office building. She showed the previously
443 approved layout for buildings 5, 6, and 7 and the proposed layout combining buildings 6 and 7
444 with retail and office on the lower levels.

445
446 Ms. Pace shared the layout of Building 5 and explained Village Station and Eaglewood Plaza had
447 a joint use and cross access agreement. This agreement stated how the parking was to be shared
448 during certain days and hours, parking lot maintenance, repair, and replacement. Per this
449 agreement the developer would be required to provide 158 parking spaces for residential use.
450 She provided a shared parking percentages table which outlined the parking space ratios and
451 shared parking percentages by use and times. She said the number of required parking spaces
452 provided were 118 for residential, 104 for office, and 2 for commercial for a total of 224 spaces.
453 Each residential unit was assigned one covered parking space.

454
455 The proposed landscaping consisted of xeriscaping with some existing sod along Highway 89.
456 The development agreement required that the entire development site must have a minimum of
457 25% landscaping unless the UDOT parcel along Highway 89 was landscaped which reduced the
458 requirement to 20%. This lot consisting of Building 5 would have approximately 19% or 16,631
459 square feet of landscaping after site improvements.

460

461 Sherrie Pace shared a rendering of the proposed architecture and layout of the buildings
462 including the clubhouse. The Planning Commission made a favorable recommendation with four
463 conditions.

464
465 Council Member Baskin asked regarding the clubhouse. Taylor Spendlove, Brighton Utah, spoke
466 on the amenities with a clubhouse and oversized swimming pool in Building 1, Building 2 would
467 consist of a gym and game room, and Building 5 would also have a clubhouse.

468
469 Council Member Knowlton questioned the number of parking spaces based on the City's parking
470 requirements and how much Brighton would have provided otherwise. Mr. Spendlove replied
471 staff had provided a requirement that met the needs. He said they had looked at adding more
472 units and parking stalls but had a certain threshold of providing at least one stall per unit. Mr.
473 Spendlove felt the required parking ratios made sense including the shared parking concept.

474
475 **Council Member Knowlton moved the City Council approve the requested site plan for**
476 **Village Station at Eaglewood, Building 5, with the following conditions:**

- 477
478 **1) Building permit may not be issued for Building 5 until such time that construction**
479 **has begun on the Eaglewood Plaza Office Building;**
480 **2) A minimum of one covered space shall be assigned to each of the 94 residential**
481 **units;**
482 **3) A sidewalk connection between the southern parking lot and main entrance must be**
483 **installed per planner redlines; and**
484 **4) Correction of engineering redlines, if any.**

485
486 **Council Member Baskin seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Council**
487 **Members Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.**

488
489 **8. CONSIDERATION OF IRRIGATION FOR EAGLEWOOD GOLF COURSE AND**
490 **OTHER CITY-OWNED PROPERTIES FOR THE 2022 IRRIGATION SEASON**
491

492 Tyler Abegglen reported recommendations from the Golf Committee on a strategic water
493 conservation plan at the golf course. The conservation strategy and protocols consisted of the
494 following measures: reduction of 60% of water use from a normal average year, 160-acre feet of
495 use for the golf course, 92% reduction for the greens, 90% reduction for the tees, 60% reduction
496 for the fairways, and 0% reduction for the rough and native grasses. He said there may be extra
497 costs to better help the golf course conserve water use moving forward including wetting agent
498 applications and new irrigation controllers. Mr. Abegglen said the biggest concern was the
499 greens and the cost to resod or reseed with high drought years. He reviewed a map that showed
500 areas on and around the golf course which would be receiving a water reduction to 0%. These
501 areas would not be irrigated throughout the summer with the installation of the half circle heads
502 to avoid irrigating the native grasses.

503

504 Council Member Knowlton asked for further clarification of the areas that would receive a 0%
505 reduction. Tyler Abegglen clarified the areas that would no longer be irrigated included the
506 rough and native areas. He said the biggest worry was traffic on the dormant grass which would
507 then become dirt and explained those areas would be roped off.

508

509 Mayor Horrocks asked about humate, which was one of the proposed measures for better water
510 absorption. Tyler Abegglen replied it was a fertilizer/organic material that would be used on the
511 rough and fairways to help hold the moisture in the ground longer. He mentioned a wetting agent
512 would also be used for water absorption.

513

514 Tyler Abegglen spoke on other measures including higher cutting heights, a water measuring
515 probe, and the new irrigation controllers. He showed an image of what the course might look like
516 with the native grass. Mr. Abegglen compared the older irrigation controller to the new
517 replacement controllers and said they would be paid off much sooner than anticipated.

518

519 Council Member Knowlton asked if this was the strategy for a drought year or a long-term plan.
520 Tyler Abegglen replied it was both a short- and long-term plan. He said the new controllers
521 would make a big difference on water conservation.

522

523 Ken Leetham said if there was not such a severe water restriction the greens would not be as dry
524 and the City would water the course more if possible. Tyler Abegglen felt 205-acre feet of water
525 was attainable in a good year.

526

527 Jon Rueckert reported staff reviewed the park areas that were maintained by the City and
528 prepared a plan for cutbacks/conservation. These areas were prioritized into three categories of A
529 with a 20% reduction, B with a 30-50%, and C with a 50-70% reduction. Legacy Park and
530 Tunnel Springs were categorized as A since each had newer grass. Most of the other areas were
531 categorized as C or 50-70% reduction. He mentioned that Weber Basin Water was utilized for
532 Hatch Park which had a 60% reduction already in place.

533

534 Council Member Porter asked about the potential to use the runoff water at Hatch Park. Jon
535 Rueckert said he was unsure if there were water rights issues that could prevent this.

536

537 Council Member Baskin spoke on meeting with staff related to the Arbor Day event and the need
538 to keep existing trees alive. She suggested assigning City trees to volunteers who would water
539 them during the summer.

540

541 Mayor Horrocks asked if half of the funds donated by Chevron for the trees could be used now
542 with the other half to be used in the fall. Ken Leetham replied affirmatively and said trees could
543 be purchased throughout the year.

544

545 Council Member Knowlton questioned if there were areas in the City where grass was not
546 needed and did not need to be watered. He asked if landscaping could be changed in some areas
547 for better water conservancy. Jon Rueckert replied landscaping could be changed or even
548 replaced with artificial turf moving forward.

549
550 Council Member Van Langeveld asked if any golf courses utilized artificial turf. She asked about
551 a breakeven point with artificial turf and water costs. Tyler Abegglen replied some courses used
552 artificial turf for tee boxes but said the cost of artificial was significant. He also said artificial turf
553 took away the feel and use of the course.

554
555 Mayor Horrocks commented he played at a golf course with artificial turf in the driving range.
556 He said true golfers would not be in favor of the change.

557
558 Council Member Knowlton spoke on replacing grass in spaces that would not be used by golfers
559 or park patrons. He said there were organic materials that would still look good. Tyler Abegglen
560 replied staff would look at gravel and xeriscape. He warned the City might receive complaints
561 about the appearance of some areas of the course.

562
563 Council Member Baskin said the Golf Committee, who were avid golfers, voted to approve the
564 proposed plan as a recommendation to the City Council and were in favor of the ideas.

565
566 Council Member Gordon suggested reviewing parks to see which areas were being used and
567 those areas that could be converted to wildflowers or xeriscape. She mentioned prioritizing the
568 areas that were most valuable.

569
570 Council Member Van Langeveld mentioned some of the areas of turf could be replaced with
571 paved or gravel trails to ensure there were trails in all of the City parks.

572
573 Ken Leetham said he appreciated the ideas and acknowledged the City Council would probably
574 receive calls from residents about the City's watering practices. He felt over time the City needed
575 to make more progress on the long-range plan for watering open spaces as this issue would be
576 around for a long time. Mr. Leetham cautioned if the Council wanted to make a motion on the
577 proposed conservation plan, it be general enough that some changes could be made if necessary.

578
579 Council Member Baskin suggested taking action on Areas A and B that had been identified by
580 staff at a certain percentage that had to be retained because they were playing fields, entryway
581 areas, or areas with old trees. She said Area C which contained Hatch Park could be somewhat
582 neglected as this park was planned for renovations.

583
584 **Council Member Baskin moved to agree the prioritized Areas of A and B with A being**
585 **Tunnel Springs and Legacy Parks and B being Highway 89 and City Hall at the percentage**
586 **reductions as recommended by Public Works and the Parks Departments. Council**

587 **Member Gordon seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Council Members**
588 **Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.**

589
590 Mayor Horrocks asked how the water issues would be addressed in the new phase of the
591 Eaglewood development. Paul Ottoson replied there were no landscaping restrictions in the plat;
592 however, in the Geotech report there was a recommendation not to put too much water on the
593 hillside due to a prior landslide. The developer was encouraged to work with the homeowners on
594 this issue and the building permit application would also require a landscaping plan.

595
596 **Council Member Baskin moved to approve the golf course conservation strategy plan with**
597 **reductions in water and various treatments for the fairways and greens, etc. as presented**
598 **by staff, Tyler Abegglen. Council Member Knowlton seconded the motion. The motion was**
599 **approved by Council Members Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.**

600
601 Council Member Van Langeveld asked if the City Council was required to approve the plans that
602 were presented.

603
604 Council Member Baskin said by approving the proposed water conservancy plans it would help
605 when residents called with concerns about over or under watering at the golf course and other
606 public open spaces.

607
608 9. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION 2022-15R: AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF
609 AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH WEBER BASIN
610 WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT FOR THE 21003 WBWCD-NSL WHOLESAL
611 CULINARY AND RAW WATER PIPELINES REPLACEMENT PROJECT ON MAIN
612 STREET BETWEEN CENTER STREET AND US89

613
614 Paul Ottoson reported the City was approached last year by Weber Basin Water Conservancy
615 District (WBWCD) regarding their water lines in the City streets. They requested to extend their
616 lines for Big West Oil and the Chevron refineries. He showed a street aerial of where the two
617 new water lines would be placed along Center Street to Highway 89. This would correspond with
618 a City water line install and street reconstruction project on Main Street. In September 2021 the
619 City Council approved an interlocal agreement between WBWCD and the City to complete the
620 water line install. The WBWCD project would go out to bid this year and they would already be
621 paying for a portion of the Main Street reconstruction.

622
623 Paul Ottoson said this amendment of the original agreement specified that WBWCD would be
624 responsible to pay for 67% of all items in the water line trench. This included the asphalt, road
625 base, geosynthetic fabric, granular backfill, and sand bedding. The City would pay for the
626 remaining 33% of all trench related items. It was expected the trench width would be about 14
627 feet wide for all three trenches. City staff did not believe that Amendment No. 1 had any
628 additional financial impacts on the project and the proposed changes would simply clarify the

629 specific duties and responsibilities of each party for their portion of the work. He calculated
630 because WBWCD had two out of the three lines they would trench at 14 feet wide that WBWCD
631 would pay two thirds or 67% and 9.5 feet per trench.

632
633 Other minor items included WBWCD using the City-owned vacant lot south of City Hall for
634 staging and the use of ten parking spaces at City Hall for their vehicles.

635
636 Council Member Baskin asked about the additional lines for Big West Oil and Chevron. Paul
637 Ottoson replied the refineries had an agreement with WBWCD and the existing lines were no
638 longer sufficient. He said it was increasing the capacity but not the volume.

639
640 **Council Member Porter moved the City Council approve Resolution No. 2022-15R: a**
641 **resolution authorizing execution of Amendment No. 1 to the Interlocal Agreement with**
642 **Weber Basin Water Conservancy District for the 21003 WBWCD-NSL Wholesale Culinary**
643 **& Raw Water Pipelines Replacement project on Main Street between Center Street and US**
644 **89. Council Member Baskin seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Council**
645 **Members Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.**

646
647 10. APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

648
649 The City Council minutes of April 5, 2022 were reviewed and approved.

650
651 **Council Member Gordon moved to approve the City Council minutes of April 5, 2022 as**
652 **written. Council Member Porter seconded the motion. The motion was approved by**
653 **Council Members Baskin, Gordon, Knowlton, Porter, and Van Langeveld.**

654
655 11. ACTION ITEMS

656
657 The action items list was reviewed. Completed items were removed from the list.

658
659 Council Member Knowlton suggested adding the request from UDOT for comments to the list.

660
661 Council Member Baskin asked about adding an item for volunteers to water City trees.

662
663 Council Member Knowlton requested an item to revisit the City's landscaping plan in the fall.

664
665 Council Member Baskin proposed amending the General Plan to address landscaping issues.

666
667 Council Member Van Langeveld asked about curb painting/parking on 900 North in Foxboro.
668 Ken Leetham replied staff had determined to paint the curbs red near intersections that currently
669 conflicted with the clear vision areas.

670

671 Paul Ottoson commented staff would be going out this week to determine those areas.

672

673 Council Member Van Langeveld suggested those areas with a red curb could have a designated
674 bike lane.

675

676 12. COUNCIL REPORTS

677

678 Council Member Baskin reported Arbor Day was set for 9 a.m. at Legacy Park on April 30th. She
679 said they would plant five Austrian pines, three elms, and three Canadian red choke cherries for a
680 total of eleven trees. Chevron had offered to provide \$15,000 and volunteers for the Arbor Day
681 event.

682

683 Ken Leetham clarified a portion of Chevron's donation would be used for this Arbor Day 2022
684 for the purpose of purchasing trees and any remaining donated funds would be used at a later
685 date.

686

687 Council Member Gordon reported the Youth City Council (YCC) were excited to forego
688 scholarships with the desire to provide more service. She asked that additional funding for the
689 YCC be considered when reviewing the budget. She then said her appointment to the Arts and
690 Parks Committee would be reviewed at the next Council meeting.

691

692 Council Member Van Langeveld reported the Health and Wellness Committee met and elected a
693 Chair, Corey Markisich, and a Vice Chair, Janet Welsh. She said the Committee was sponsoring
694 the Circle of Parenting workshop that started last week. She noted Davis Behavioral Health
695 provided the training and food for the six-week course.

696

697 Council Member Porter reported on the community garden and asked for some direction. Sherrie
698 Pace replied Ali Avery was now in charge of the garden. She said all but three of the plots had
699 been rented this year.

700

701 13. CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

702

703 Todd Godfrey had nothing to report.

704

705 14. MAYOR'S REPORT

706

707 Mayor Horrocks spoke on the potential to adopt the celebration of Juneteenth on June 19th. He
708 suggested replacing this with the observation of Columbus Day. Council Member Gordon said
709 some of her neighbors had previously mentioned how important Juneteenth and corresponding
710 events would be to them. She suggested looking into adopting this holiday.

711

712 Ken Leetham clarified the City offices did not close for Columbus Day.

713
714 Council Member Gordon explained Juneteenth was a celebration of emancipation of slavery and
715 June 19th was when the news reached Texas.

716
717 Ken Leetham said the State had adopted it as an official holiday. He suggested celebrating June
718 19th in a more meaningful way rather than just giving employees the day off.

719
720 Council Member Van Langeveld suggested the food trucks would be at Legacy Park and a
721 nearby pavilion could be used for a talk or something similar to celebrate the event.

722
723 Mayor Horrocks spoke on the Easter egg event and how there was dog waste everywhere. He
724 said Woods Cross did not allow dogs in their parks due to this issue.

725
726 15. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

727
728 Ken Leetham reported he and Mayor Horrocks had met with Woods Cross' City Manager and
729 Mayor and discussed the potential dog park. He suggested Woods Cross and the City could share
730 the costs 50/50 at \$20,000 each. This cost would include fencing. The location would be north of
731 Legacy Park's west field and the trailhead. There was a two-acre detention pond owned by
732 UDOT and the City was authorized to use the area in perpetuity as a dog park. The City would
733 need to clean and maintain the area as a detention basin. The agreement would be between the
734 City, UDOT, and Woods Cross.

735
736 Mayor Horrocks commented Woods Cross had budget concerns and would take the plan to their
737 City Council for review. They suggested contracting out the cleaning and maintenance.

738
739 Ken Leetham said they also spoke with Woods Cross on the 1100 North bridge design. Woods
740 Cross was not interested in sharing the cost as they would prefer the bridge to be on 500 South.
741 Mr. Leetham shared that he and the Mayor then updated Woods Cross on the progress including
742 the bid award for phases 1 and 2 of the design. He and the Mayor invited Woods Cross to
743 participate in the project so that they would not be left out of the planning and design phases.

744
745 Ken Leetham mentioned the other item that involved Woods Cross was the opportunity to apply
746 for transportation funds from Davis County for the third quarter sales tax. The proposed project
747 was a lighted intersection at 400 West and 1100 North. He said the City would like to submit a
748 letter of intent to pursue funding of the project. Woods Cross was invited to share in the cost as a
749 co-applicant on the request.

750
751 Ken Leetham shared the talking points that would be given to the public on water conservation.

752
753 Ken Leetham spoke on the dinner reservations for the St. George conference and asked for
754 feedback from the Council.

755 16. ADJOURN

756

757 Mayor Horrocks adjourned the meeting at 9:34 p.m.

758

759 *The foregoing was approved by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday, May*
760 *3, 2022 by unanimous vote of all members present.*

761

762

763

764 _____
Brian J. Horrocks, Mayor

_____ *Wendy Page, City Recorder*

Action Items for May 3, 2022

Item	Staff	Description
<u>New</u>		
1	Ken, Todd, David	(4-19-22) Staff to work with Rulon Crosby (510 Lacey Way) on prescriptive easement issue.
2	Craig	(4-19-22) Staff to review truck restricted route on Center Street including whether tickets should be issued.
3	Paul	(4-19-22) Staff to look into using runoff water with a pump at Hatch Park and determine if there are water rights issues that would prohibit this.
4	David, Paul	(4-19-22) Staff to look at alternate ways to water City trees including a program to have residents volunteer to water a tree once a week during the summer. YCC or Senior Lunch Bunch. <i>Staff will prepare a report on the feasibility of this type of program. (4/27/22)</i>
5	David, Sherrie	(4-19-22) Staff to revisit the City's conservation landscaping plan in the fall. Also potentially amend the General Plan to address alternative landscaping (drought tolerant) in the City.
6	Ken	(4-19-22) Staff to look at a Juneteenth celebration on June 19 th in correspondence with the food trucks. Review what other cities are doing to celebrate.
7	David, Paul	(4-19-22) Staff to report back on red curb areas in Foxboro (potential to add bike lanes in the future to areas with red curbs).
8	Ken	(4-19-22) Staff to follow-up with Woods Cross on the dog park and then report back to the Council. <i>Staff has made the request to the City and is waiting for a response from Woods Cross. (4/27/22)</i>
<u>Current</u>		
1	Ken/Linda	(4-5-22) Staff to work with UTA on notifying the public of the changes that would occur in August (including discontinuation of Foxboro routes/removal of signage)
2	Sherrie	(4-5-22) Research resolutions to the parking issues on Buckingham Drive including speaking with Coventry HOA on garage parking requirements <i>Sherrie is contacting HOA (04/11/2022)</i>
3	Sherrie	(4-5-22) Agenda item to discuss the draft purpose and needs related to I-15 EIS study <i>UDOT to present to Council on April 19, 2022 work session. Staff preparing draft response from City Council to be reviewed considered May 3, 2022. (4/21/2022)</i>
4	Ken	(4-5-22) Provide Council with the number of gallons the City conserved last year following Weber Basin's conservancy guidelines <i>City staff will be discussing water conservation in the April 19, 2022 Council meeting (4/14/22)</i>
5	Wendy	(3/15/22) Coordinate with Jordan River Commission to provide an update at a future Council meeting. <i>Staff emailed Director on a time for Council work meeting agenda (4/12/22)</i>
6	Ken/Linda	(3/15/22) Health and Wellness Committee items: review of unsheltered population particularly along the Jordan River, newsletter or additional to address fraud particularly of the elderly. <i>Staff will work on articles for May newsletter (4/12/22)</i>
7	Ken	(3/15/22) Employee training related to phishing, fraud, malware/ransomware, etc. <i>Ken to arrange this training with ETS. Some phishing training has been done with City Hall staff (4/12/22)</i>
8	Sherrie/Ken	(3/15/22) Review cemetery possibilities including land in (or outside of) the City. <i>Sherrie to schedule meeting with Planner to discuss options (4/12/22)</i>
9	Sherrie	(3-1-22) Staff to review disproportionate and other fees related to businesses like gas stations (cost of local consent licenses and State liquor sales license). <i>Staff will be discussing this item with the Council during a Community Development Department Update tentatively scheduled for May 3, 2022 (4/14/22)</i>
10	Ken	(3-1-22) Council Member Porter requested a closed session to discuss the security camera systems in the City parks. <i>This item will be scheduled for an upcoming City Council meeting, tentatively May 3, 2022 (4/12/22)</i>

11	Ken	(1-18-22) Prepare and present plans for the remainder of the TIF collection periods for Redwood Road and Highway 89 CDA project areas. <i>Staff will prepare a report for this item together with detailed financial estimates for the two project areas. (Updated 1/20/22)</i>
12	Ken	(1-4-22) Options for emergency preparedness training for staff including windstorms, landslides, etc. <i>Staff is exploring solutions with Davis County (4/12/22)</i>
13	Tyler, Ken	(9-7-21) Council Member Porter asked about golf course damage that occurs at Gary Way near the golf course and adopting official policy related to this. <i>Was reviewed by the City Council on the 11/6/21 CC meeting. Staff is continuing to work on a solution.</i>
14	Sherrie, Paul	(7-20-21) Staff to evaluate current codes related to permissible improvements in public park strips. Staff to also perform a legal review of whether or not a land owner can replace the grass in the park strips adjacent to their property. <i>Under the current code park strips must be landscaped within 12 months of occupancy and may include trees, a combination of lawn, other perennial ground cover, flowering annuals and perennials, specimen shrubs, and inorganic material. Staff recommends that 50% of the park strip be vegetative and that rocks mulch be of 1"-minus size, but this is not currently within the code.</i>
15	Paul	(5-18-21) Staff to research solutions for maintaining commuter trail along the frontage road to SLC.
16	Sherrie	(2-16-21) Assignment to amend the Park and Recreation Element of the City's General Plan so that it includes Hatch Park, Tunnel Springs Expansion and Capital Projects and repairs. <i>An RFP is being prepared to complete the amendment.</i>
17	Ken	(2-16-21) Staff to prepare policy (or review current policy) related to tree removal particularly when related to sidewalk damage. <i>Staff is working on a follow-up report to the City Council.</i>
18	Ken, Linda	(2-16-21) CM Porter asked for recognition/formalization of the City's History Committee on a future agenda. <i>Staff reviewing history committees of other cities and will draft resolution. Staff has hired a History Intern (Tanner Christensen) for 4 months to organize historical pics, assist in the update of the 50th Anniversary Jubilee Document, and story map. (Updated 3/8/22)</i>
19	David, Ken	(3-1-22) Review the park reservation cleaning deposit next year to see if it was effective in relation to damage/cleaning-Staff to provide a study by the end of 2022. <i>Staff to report back to Council in November following the 2022 season. (4/12/22)</i>



CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, Utah 84054
(801) 335-8700
(801) 335-8719 Fax

Brian Horrocks
Mayor

Ken Leetham
City Manager

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Ken Leetham, City Manager

DATE: May 3, 2022

SUBJECT: Parks, Trails, Arts, and Recreation Advisory Board Appointment

RECOMMENDATION

Council Member Gordon recommends the appointment of Jeff Scroger for Seat 2 on the Parks, Trails, Arts and Recreation Advisory Board to fill the remaining term for Ron Gordon ending 1/1/2024.

BACKGROUND

The Parks, Trails, Arts and Recreation Advisory Board was established by Ordinance and amended over the years with the latest amendment in 2020. The ordinance established the membership of the Board which comprises seven regular members. Each member of the governing body of the City shall have one appointment ratified by the City Council which has a term of two years. Councilmember Gordon is recommending the appointment of Jeff Scroger for Seat 2 to fill the remaining term for Ron Gordon ending 1/1/2024.

PROPOSED MOTION

I move the City Council approve Council Member Gordon's appointment of Jeff Scroger to the Parks, Trails, Arts & Recreation Advisory Board.



NORTH SALT LAKE ENGINEERING

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, Utah
84054
(801) 335-8723
Paulo@nslcity.org

BRIAN J. HORROCKS
Mayor

PAUL OTTOSON, PE
City Engineer

MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Mayor & City Council
From: Paul Ottoson, City Engineer
Date: May 3, 2022
Subject: Frontage Road, 75 East, 125, East, 175 East and 190 East Street Reconstruction

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends awarding the Frontage Road, 75 East, 125 East, 175 East and 190 East Street Reconstruction project to Staker Parson for the price of \$321,350.

BACKGROUND

This project is being done in conjunction with city water line projects. Public works crews have already started construction on the Frontage Road water line which should be completed soon. They will then move to the 75 East water line project. Each water line project should take about one month to complete, so the goal is to have all the water line projects completed by August.

Bid documents state the contractor must do the street reconstruction in two phases, as we do not want to wait until August to begin asphaltting. The contractor will be required to perform the street reconstruction on the Frontage Road and 75 East no more than two weeks after city crews have finished the water line on 75 East. The contractor will then be required to mobilize a second time, again within two weeks of the final water line completion.

Residents will have access to their homes at all times except when work is being done directly in front of their driveways.

The City received three bids and they are shown below:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Price</u>
Staker Parson	\$321,350.00
Post Asphalt	\$331,450.00
Black Forest Paving	\$345,775.00

The budget for this project is \$431,000. A portion of this street reconstruction project funding will come out the water budget

POSSIBLE MOTION

I recommend the City Council award the Frontage Road, 75 East, 125 East, 175 East and 190 East Street Reconstruction project to Staker Parson for the price of \$321,350.



CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, Utah 84054
(801) 335-8700
(801) 335-8719 Fax

Brian Horrocks
Mayor

Heidi Voordeckers
Finance Director

MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Mayor & City Council

From: Heidi Voordeckers, Finance Director

Date: May 3, 2022

Subject: Consideration of Resolution No. 2022-14R: A Resolution Adjusting the User Fees and Charges for Culinary Water, Secondary Water, and Storm Water effective June 1, 2022

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of Resolution No. 2022-14R: A Resolution Adjusting the User Fees and Charges for Culinary Water, Secondary Water, and Storm Water effective June 1, 2022

BACKGROUND

On March 2, 2021, City Council approved resolution 2021-09R authorizing an agreement for consulting services with Bowen, Collins & Associates. The purpose of this agreement was to update the City's infrastructure plan as well as evaluating the capacities and growth needs of culinary water, secondary water and storm water source, supply, storage and distribution. Specific focus was placed on incorporating water conservation strategies and fee structures that encourage the efficient use of water supplies, while planning on future capital needs.

The results of the North Salt Lake Water & Storm Rate Study were presented to the City Council at the March 26, 2022 budget retreat. Along with addressing conservation efforts, the proposed fee structure focuses on creating equity by aligning user fees with cost of providing services, using the following strategies related to culinary and secondary water rates:

- Remove "allowance" in base rate and normalize the rate for all residential users. The new rate structure will include a base rate determined by meter size plus usage for each 1,000 gallons, rather than include the first 5,000-10,000 of usage. The base rate will be the same for all residential users of the same meter size, regardless of location, and have been aligned with industry standards (AWWA) for equivalency.

- New Tier Structures. A redistribution of the middle tiers and addition of a new tier with the intent of promoting and rewarding conservation efforts among all users.
- Residential usage rates normalized. Usage rates for residential locations above 350 E. set at a rate 20% higher than residential locations below 350 E. to account for the cost of service delivery (annual electricity costs in the water fund). In addition, usage rates for secondary water services have been set at rates equal to 75% of culinary rates to provide an incentive for use of secondary where available.
- Non-residential rates normalized. Usage rates for non-residential users adjusted based on the weighted average cost of water for residential users to promote consistency and equity. Along the same lines, the fees for city water services have been aligned to match other non-residential users.

The new rate structure specifically examined the impact of 2020 water usage combined with the proposed rate adjustments to generate the future revenue necessary to support anticipated growth within the City. The proposed fee structure outlined above and included in the attached resolutions is designed to generate an additional 10%, or approximately \$370,000, in annual water revenues in FY 2022-23. With a series of graduated annual increases through 2027, the new rate structure is intended to support approximately \$2.4 million per year in water infrastructure improvements, or 1.33% of the total water system (assuming a 75-year useful life) per year. The impact on customer bills for light, average, and heavy users is reflected in the attached, Table 3-3 of the North Salt Lake Water & Storm Rate Study.

In addition to the above analysis on water rate structure, Bowen, Collins & Associates recommends no changes to the rate structure for storm water fees, which is currently based on industry standards for equivalent surface unit (ESU). A modest increase of \$1.00 per ESU is included in the attached resolution in order to support approximately \$1.1 million per year in water infrastructure improvements, or 1.0% of the total storm water system (assuming a 100-year useful life) per year.

POSSIBLE MOTION

I move the City Council approve Resolution No. 2022-14-R: A Resolution Adjusting the User Fees and Charges for Culinary Water, Secondary Water, and Storm Water effective June 1, 2022.

Table 3-3
Impact on Customer's Bills of 2022 Proposed Rates for Light, Average, and Heavy Water Users

Size	0.5x Average Use (\$/month)			Average Use Revenue (\$/month)			2x Average Use (\$/month)		
	Existing	Proposed	Proposed /Existing	Existing	Proposed	Proposed /Existing	Existing	Proposed	Proposed /Existing
Culinary									
3/4" Above 350 E	\$28.75	\$30.22	105%	\$36.71	\$42.41	116%	\$59.11	\$73.48	124%
1" Above 350 E	\$48.80	\$53.29	109%	\$72.02	\$86.16	120%	\$141.38	\$176.43	125%
3/4" Below 350 E	\$26.84	\$27.37	102%	\$30.88	\$35.74	116%	\$43.33	\$55.43	128%
3/4" Commercial	\$28.03	\$34.96	125%	\$38.64	\$49.91	129%	\$66.36	\$79.83	120%
1" Commercial	\$52.48	\$62.85	120%	\$83.02	\$95.70	115%	\$147.11	\$161.40	110%
1 1/2"	\$118.35	\$131.96	111%	\$182.02	\$196.92	108%	\$309.35	\$326.83	106%
2"	\$185.68	\$200.18	108%	\$284.85	\$301.35	106%	\$483.17	\$503.71	104%
3"	\$146.65	\$179.00	122%	\$146.65	\$179.00	122%	\$146.65	\$179.00	122%
4"	\$235.70	\$286.26	121%	\$280.05	\$331.52	118%	\$368.73	\$422.03	114%
6"	\$952.54	\$993.62	104%	\$1,403.99	\$1,454.23	104%	\$2,306.89	\$2,375.47	103%
10"	\$2,408.96	\$2,583.49	107%	\$3,236.65	\$3,427.99	106%	\$4,892.03	\$5,116.97	105%
3/4" with access to secondary	\$17.28	\$24.17	140%	\$18.17	\$28.45	157%	\$23.97	\$39.58	165%
Secondary									
3/4"	\$16.56	\$11.42	69%	\$21.67	\$18.91	87%	\$39.82	\$40.08	101%
3/4" Culinary & Secondary	\$33.84	\$35.58	105%	\$39.84	\$47.36	119%	\$63.79	\$79.66	125%
Foxborough Hypothetical Culinary Only	\$30.31	\$30.93	102%	\$39.12	\$44.62	114%	\$67.46	\$83.60	124%

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-14R

A RESOLUTION ADJUSTING THE USER FEES AND CHARGES FOR CULINARY WATER, SECONDARY WATER, AND STORM WATER OF THE CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE COMPREHENSIVE FEE SCHEDULE

WHEREAS, in 2021, the City of North Salt Lake (“*the City*”) contracted with Bowen, Collins & Associates to evaluate and update the City’s culinary water, secondary water, and storm water infrastructure plan; and

WHEREAS, the study was intended to incorporate conservation strategies and fee structures that encourage efficient use of water supplies while addressing the long term capital needs of these systems; and

WHEREAS, the study reviewed the projected revenues, expenditures, and cash balances in the Culinary Water, Secondary Water, and Storm Water Funds in relation to the long term capital needs of the funds and concluded an adjustment to base rates, usage rates, and usage tiers is necessary to promote equity across users, maintain the financial position of these funds and support long term infrastructure needs.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF NORTH SALT LAKE:

Section 1. Rate Changes. The following revisions to the fee schedule are hereby adopted by the City:

1. The monthly utility rates for Culinary and Secondary Water be amended as outlined in the attached Exhibit A.
2. The monthly utility rates for Storm Water Rates be increased by \$1.00 per month, as follows:

Usage	Current	Recommended
1+ ESU’s	\$6.00 Per ESU	\$7.00 Per ESU

Section 2. Effective Date. This Resolution hereby adopted is effective May 3, 2022 and the new rates and usage tiers in this resolution are effective June 1, 2022.

Adopted this 3rd day of May, 2022.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE

By:

BRIAN J. HORROCKS

Mayor

ATTEST:

WENDY PAGE

City Recorder

City Council Vote as Recorded:

Council Member Watts Baskin _____

Council Member Gordon _____

Council Member Knowlton _____

Council Member Porter _____

Council Member Van Langeveld _____

EXHIBIT A

NORTH SALT LAKE CITY - FY 2023-24 WATER FUND UTILITY RATES

CURRENT RATES AND TIERS

RECOMMENDED RATES AND TIERS

DESCRIPTION BY SERVICE AREA/METER SIZE	CURRENT RATES AND TIERS						RECOMMENDED RATES AND TIERS						
	TIER 1	TIER 2	TIER 3	TIER 4	TIER 1	TIER 2	TIER 3	TIER 4	TIER 5				
RESIDENTIAL - NO SECONDARY	Gallons Included in Base						Gallons Included in Base						
<u>CULINARY</u>	Base Rate	10,000-30,000	30,001-75,000	30,001-75,000	100,000+	Base Rate	0-8,000	8,001-30,000	30,001-60,000	60,001-100,000	100,000+		
3/4" RESID BELOW 350e	\$25.90	10,000	\$1.27	\$1.59	\$2.52	\$3.42	\$20.00	-	\$1.25	\$1.56	\$2.06	\$3.13	\$4.00
3/4" RESID ABOVE 350e	25.90	8,000	1.59	1.88	2.98	4.11	20.00	-	1.50	1.87	2.47	3.76	4.80
1" RESID ABOVE 350e	36.36	8,000	1.59	1.88	2.98	4.11	30.00	-	1.50	1.87	2.47	3.76	4.80
RESIDENTIAL - SECONDARY	Included in Base						Included in Base						
<u>CULINARY</u>	Base Rate	6,001-10,000	10,001-20,000	20,001-40,000	40,001-70,000	70,001+	Base Rate	0-8,000	8,001-12,000	12,001-20,000	20,001+		
3/4" RESID FOXBORO	\$17.28	6,000	\$1.01	\$1.65	\$3.28		\$20.00	-	\$1.25	\$1.56	\$2.06	\$4.00	
3/4" RESID BELOW 350e	\$25.90	8,000	\$1.01	\$1.65	\$3.28		20.00	-	1.25	1.56	2.06	4.00	
3/4" RESID ABOVE 350e	-	8,000	-	-	-		20.00	-	1.50	1.87	2.47	4.80	
<u>SECONDARY</u>	Base Rate	10,001-20,000	20,001-40,000	40,001-70,000	70,001+		Base Rate	0-22,000	22,001-52,000	52,001-92,000	92,000+		
RESID IRRIG BELOW 350e	\$14.55	10,000	\$1.02	\$1.16	\$2.43		\$5.00	-	\$1.40	\$1.85	\$2.82	\$3.60	
RESID SEPARATE OUTDOOR ABOVE 350e			up to 45,000	46,001-70,000	70,001+		Base Rate	0-22,000	22,001-52,000	52,001-92,000	92,000+		
RESIDENTIAL PI ABOVE 350e			1.81	2.87	3.92		5.00	-	\$1.68	\$2.22	\$3.38	\$4.32	
			1.81	2.87	3.92		5.00	-	\$1.68	\$2.22	\$3.38	\$4.32	
COMMERCIAL	Included in Base						Included in Base						
<u>CULINARY</u>	Base Rate	10,000-30,000	30,001-75,000	75,001-100,000	100,000+		Base Rate	0-8,000	8,001-30,000	30,001+60,000	60,001+100,000	100,000+	
3/4" METER COMMERCIAL	\$25.90	10,000	\$1.97	\$1.97	\$1.97	\$1.97	\$20.00	-	\$2.01	\$2.01	\$2.01	\$2.01	\$2.01
1" METER COMMERCIAL	36.39	10,000	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	30.00	-	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
1 1/2" METER/BYP COMM	72.74	10,000	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	67.00	-	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
2" METER COMMERCIAL	104.58	10,000	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	99.00	-	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
4" METER COMMERCIAL	209.42	10,000	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	241.00	-	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
3" METER COMMERCIAL	155.62	10,000	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	178.96	-	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
6" METER COMMERCIAL	520.79	10,000	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	533.00	-	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
8" METER COMMERCIAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,196.00	-	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
10" METER COMMERCIAL	1,744.73	10,000	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1,739.00	-	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
OUTSIDE ONLY- Classify as other commercial - by meter by size	Variable- depending on meter size		1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	Variable- depending on meter size		2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
HOMES UNDER CONSTRUCTION			1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97			2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01

EXHIBIT A

NORTH SALT LAKE CITY - FY 2023-24 WATER FUND UTILITY RATES

CURRENT RATES AND TIERS

RECOMMENDED RATES AND TIERS

DESCRIPTION BY SERVICE AREA/METER SIZE							CURRENT RATES AND TIERS					RECOMMENDED RATES AND TIERS					
							TIER 1	TIER 2	TIER 3	TIER 4	TIER 1	TIER 2	TIER 3	TIER 4	TIER 5		
							Included				Included in						
							Base Rate	in Base	5,000+		Base Rate	Base	0 - 8,000	8,001-30,000	30,001+60,000	60,001+100,000	100,000 +
MULTIFAMILY																	
WATER APARTMENTS							16.50	5,000	1.59		12.00	-	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
CITY METERS																	
135 WATER-GOLF- SECONDARY							\$104.58	10,000	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.59	Same as Commercial Recommended Rates				
150 CITY WATER USAGE 3/4in METER							25.90	10,000	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	Same as Commercial Recommended Rates				
151 CITY METER USAGE/1in METER							36.39	10,000	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.59	Same as Commercial Recommended Rates				
152 CITY METER 1 1/2 in USAGE							72.74	10,000	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.59	Same as Commercial Recommended Rates				
153 CITY METER USAGE 2 in METER							104.58	10,000	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.59	Same as Commercial Recommended Rates				



CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, Utah 84054
(801) 335-8700
(801) 335-8719 Fax

Brian Horrocks
Mayor

Ken Leetham
City Manager

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Ken Leetham, City Manager

DATE: May 3, 2022

SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution 2022-16R: A resolution adopting the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2023 and setting a public hearing date.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend approval of Resolution 2022-16R: A resolution adopting the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2023 and setting a public hearing date.

BACKGROUND

The attached documents contain a resolution which adopts the Tentative Budget for the upcoming fiscal year and sets a public hearing date for public input on the Tentative Budget. As a reminder, approval of this resolution does not approve the final budget, but only approves the Tentative Budget as the proposed document available for public inspection and the subject of the public hearing. The final budget will be approved after the public hearing together with any amendments that the City Council wishes to make. The proposed public hearing date is June 7, 2022 and the final budget is required to be adopted not later than June 22 of every year.

This item also includes a cover letter after the resolution which describes the principal changes and proposals that are new in the upcoming fiscal year and summary pages, by fund, of the Tentative Budget.

PROPOSED MOTION

I move that the City Council approve Resolution 2022-16R: A resolution adopting the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2023 and setting a public hearing date.

RESOLUTION NO. 2022-16R

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TENTATIVE BUDGET FOR
CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR
BEGINNING JULY 1, 2022 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2023 AND SETTING A
PUBLIC HEARING DATE**

WHEREAS, the City Manager of North Salt Lake has prepared a tentative budget (the “Tentative Budget”) for the City of North Salt Lake as required by Utah State Law; and

WHEREAS, the Tentative Budget, together with supporting schedules and data, will be available for public inspection in the office of the City Recorder as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the City Council as Governing Body will consider formal adoption of the Tentative Budget in a public hearing to be held June 7, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds the Tentative Budget for the City of North Salt Lake for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2022 and ending June 30, 2023, as set forth in the attached Exhibit A, should be tentatively adopted as required by Section 10-6-111(3) of the Uniform Fiscal Procedures Act for Utah Cities.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Governing Body of the City of North Salt Lake, Utah, as follows:

PART I:

1. The Tentative Budget for the City of North Salt Lake in the amount of \$36,805,095 is hereby tentatively adopted for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2022 and ending June 30, 2023, as set forth in the attached Exhibit A.
2. The Governing Body directs that a public hearing to consider adoption of the Tentative Budget shall be held June 7, 2022 and that notice thereof shall be published according to State Code.

PART II:

This resolution shall take effect immediately. Passed and approved by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake, this 3rd day of May 2022.

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE

By:

BRIAN J. HORROCKS

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Council Vote as Recorded:

WENDY PAGE
City Recorder

Council Member Watts Baskin _____
Council Member Gordon _____
Council Member Knowlton _____
Council Member Porter _____
Council Member Van Langeveld _____



CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, Utah 84054
(801) 335-8700
(801) 335-8719 Fax

Brian Horrocks
Mayor

Ken Leetham
City Manager

May 3, 2022

RE: Fiscal Year 2023 Tentative Budget

Honorable Mayor and City Council,

I am pleased to submit to you the Fiscal Year 2023 Tentative Budget for your consideration. Every year, the City faces new challenges, some predictable and others unexpected. The City enters the upcoming fiscal year in a strong cash position, but with a need to expend public funds on needed infrastructure replacement and strong levels of service. The end of calendar year 2021 and the beginning of 2022 is characterized by national and local inflation, high cost of living indices, wage and salary growth and a State economy that is aggressively recovering after adjusting to COVID and its attendant unpredictability.

The City of North Salt Lake has maintained a healthy and strong financial position for many years due to current and past City Council's wise use of City resources. We continue to have strong and diverse revenue streams and healthy fund balances. The City is continuing its exciting transformation along our main corridors, but especially within the Town Center neighborhoods along US89. Tax Increment revenues have been generated and are being used to attract high quality development and to pay for enhanced services and aesthetics within these areas.

The proposed Tentative Fiscal Year 2023 Budget continues to follow directives of the City Council of North Salt Lake by proposing infrastructure replacement and expansion in parks and open spaces, culinary and secondary water facilities, and roadways. These directives are based upon comprehensive and detailed master planning and looking forward to address the impacts of aging infrastructure. The City Council has appropriately adopted methodologies to protect the public's investments in its facilities and operations and this tentative budget continues to implement those same methodologies.

Revenue Projections

Taxes – The proposed Tentative Budget estimates slight increases in our sales and property tax revenue sources. This is due to the fact that sales tax in Utah continues to be very robust and has not decreased as projected during the pandemic. In addition, the City continues to add real property assessed valuation to its tax rolls which also results in increases in actual property tax revenue. These projections have been made by reviewing sales tax data provided by the State and making detailed assumptions about the remainder of the 2022 fiscal year.

Development-Related Revenues – The City has had very strong development-related revenues in the current fiscal year. In the upcoming Fiscal Year 2023, we are projecting decreasing revenues in development, however, these projections are sometimes unpredictable and development along the Wasatch Front continues to be very robust. Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director, prepares revenue projections through a detailed process of communicating with every developer and builder

whose projects are included in the revenue projections. The Town Center continues to have very strong residential growth and the City's two single family developments, The Ridge and The Cove, are also expected to have strong permitting activity in the upcoming fiscal year.

Expenditure Proposals

The proposed Tentative Budget contains four new full-time positions as follows: two in the Parks Division, one new police officer and one new employee in the Golf Maintenance Division. These new employees will be extremely helpful in maintaining and advancing the City's levels of service in these critical services. These positions in all cases are due to either growth of the City or changes in a difficult labor market which affects the City's ability to successfully hire seasonal and part-time employees.

There are also some operational cost increases in the Tentative Budget. First, there is a proposed 7% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) proposed. This percentage is based upon our review of Wasatch Front economic data published by Zion's Bank, the Utah Retirement System and the Federal Bureau of Labor and Statistics, Western Region.

The City's costs to provide health insurance to its employees has also increased this year by 6.86%. The City's benefits offering to its employees is proposed to be identical to the health insurance benefits in the current fiscal year. The City's consistent use of PEHP and our relatively stable workforce have combined to keep premium increases low.

The South Davis Metro Fire District (SDMFD) is increasing the City's assessment this year by a proposed 7.9%. The District is recommending a 6.5% increase as a COLA for its employees and is adding one more management position to assist in operations. This is a reasonable increase in the assessment since the District, as a region, is still experiencing moderate to rapid growth.

Major Investments in Public Infrastructure

The Proposed Tentative Budget also maintains the Governing Body's significant investment in road repair and maintenance with a proposed expenditure for this activity of \$487,300. This level of expenditure is needed in order to resurface and prepare roadways for reconstruction that are aging and deteriorating over time. The City will also be spending approximately \$1,645,250 on various levels of road reconstruction for several roadways that are on the City's Road Capital Projects Plan.

Fee Increases

There is a need to increase user fees for water service, storm drain and solid waste. Due to ongoing drought in the western United States and more particularly, in our Utah region, water for culinary and secondary use is now more limited. It is expected that this trend of water scarcity may continue and so the State and its Water Districts are aggressively pursuing water conservation strategies. The City of North Salt Lake also encourages water conservation through its existing rate structure. However, the City recently completed a comprehensive update of its water master plan and water rates. It is recommended that the City improve its rate structure to accomplish even more conservation and in order to fund a more aggressive water infrastructure replacement strategy. The new water rates, due to be implemented in June, 2022, will contain new base charges, new rate tiers and charges, and a more equitable distribution of fees and charges throughout the City. Put simply, the new rates will encourage and reward water conservation and discourage overwatering of lawns and yards. This is one of the first steps in a multi-year methodology that the City and the Wasatch Front Region will go through in order

to maintain and conserve precious water resources.

The City's comprehensive master planning effort also upgraded the Storm Drain Master Plan. Out of that study, it is recommended this year that City's storm drain fees also increase by at least \$1 per household for the purpose of infrastructure replacement. Though the revised plan has not yet been adopted, the FY23 Tentative Budget contains the increase.

The City's fees for Solid Waste will also be increasing due to contract increases by the City's solid waste hauler ACE. These increases also track the Wasatch Front Consumer Price Index (CPI) and are mostly due to increases in fuel costs.

This transmittal letter, together with the budget summaries and attached information, constitutes the Proposed Fiscal Year 2023 Tentative Budget. Resolution Number 2021-16R adopts the Fiscal Year 2023 Tentative Budget and sets a public hearing date of June 7, 2022. Adoption of this resolution is not the final adoption of the City's FY 2023 budget document. The adoption of the final budget must occur prior to June 22, 2022 for the upcoming fiscal year.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Ken Leetham". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Ken Leetham
City Manager

	Fund	Total Budget	(Use)/Cont to Fund Balance
10	General Fund	\$ 16,501,500	\$ (849,000)
25	Redevelopment Agency	2,080,200	(2,748,400)
27	Housing Fund	163,700	163,700
28	Local Building Authority	190,300	29,600
32	Debt Service	590,100	32,000
40	Capital Project Fund	1,380,200	1,097,800
41	Park Capital Fund	859,900	532,700
43	Public Safety Fund	111,600	1,000
44	Road Capital Fund	2,608,600	476,050
51	Water Fund	6,151,565	(769,265)
53	Storm Water Fund	1,772,950	(290,450)
54	Solid Waste Fund	1,476,680	(9,280)
55	Golf Fund	2,051,000	(26,000)
61	Fleet Fund	866,800	242,200
		<u>\$ 36,805,095</u>	<u>\$ (2,117,345)</u>

GENERAL FUND - 10
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Taxes:				
Property	\$ 3,026,300	\$ 2,983,000	\$ 3,056,200	\$ 3,076,200
Sales and use	5,480,800	5,646,000	6,028,900	6,390,600
Franchise	1,891,500	1,829,600	1,928,000	1,958,100
Licenses and permits	230,100	225,000	231,000	232,000
Intergovernmental revenues	3,179,100	2,500,400	2,591,800	2,625,900
Charges for services	1,018,000	833,600	723,500	818,800
Fines and forfeitures	243,100	300,000	300,000	350,000
Interest	16,600	60,000	15,000	15,000
Miscellaneous	48,400	48,000	52,000	52,000
Total Revenues	15,133,900	14,425,600	14,926,400	15,518,600
Expenditures				
General government:				
Legislative	652,000	338,700	236,700	278,200
Administrative	1,039,000	1,101,400	1,064,500	1,081,700
Buildings	97,100	79,400	95,000	127,000
Judicial	323,500	351,100	343,900	386,500
Total general government	2,111,600	1,870,600	1,740,100	1,873,400
Public safety:				
Police department	4,294,300	5,438,600	5,319,800	5,347,200
New sworn officer-1 FTE/vehicle	-	-	-	182,000
Fire department	1,400,900	1,542,900	1,542,900	1,738,100
Total public safety	5,695,200	6,981,500	6,862,700	7,267,300
Public works:				
Streets department	1,217,500	1,700,500	1,694,500	1,874,300
Engineering	194,700	249,100	256,900	267,400
Total public works	1,412,200	1,949,600	1,951,400	2,141,700
Community Development				
Planning and zoning	410,300	445,400	466,200	541,500
Building inspection	219,100	299,000	275,900	272,700
Total community development	629,400	744,400	742,100	814,200
Parks				
New Parks Positions - 2 FTE's	837,500	1,044,600	1,033,800	1,182,000
-	-	-	-	124,000
Total Expenditures	\$10,685,900	\$ 12,590,700	\$ 12,330,100	\$ 13,402,600
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures	\$ 4,448,000	\$ 1,834,900	\$ 2,596,300	\$ 2,116,000
Other Financing Sources (Uses)				
Transfer in - RDA	75,000	85,000	100,450	103,900
Transfer out - capital fund	(1,300,000)	(1,158,700)	(1,158,700)	(1,239,600)
Transfer out - road fund restricted cash	(1,045,000)	(1,041,000)	(1,231,400)	(1,154,300)
Transfer out - road fund unrestricted cash	(1,700,000)	(705,000)	(705,000)	(705,000)
Sale of capital assets	-	5,000	21,000	5,000
Contributions	7,000	-	25,000	25,000
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	(3,963,000)	(2,814,700)	(2,948,650)	(2,965,000)
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ 485,000	\$ (979,800)	\$ (352,350)	\$ (849,000)
Fund Balance, Beginning	2,853,800	3,338,800	3,338,800	2,986,450
Fund Balance, Ending	\$ 3,338,800	\$ 2,359,000	\$ 2,986,450	\$ 2,137,450

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY - 25
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Taxes	\$ 1,799,600	\$ 1,941,500	\$ 2,008,700	\$ 2,078,200
Interest	2,000	1,600	2,000	2,000
Total Revenues	1,801,600	1,943,100	2,010,700	2,080,200
Expenditures				
Community	\$ 1,186,900	\$ 1,377,700	\$ 1,573,100	\$ 787,200
Principal	-	305,000	305,000	285,000
Interest	-	147,200	135,600	89,800
Parks, recreation and public property	-	3,500,000	100,000	3,400,000
Total Expenditures	1,186,900	5,329,900	2,113,700	4,562,000
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures	614,700	(3,386,800)	(103,000)	(2,481,800)
Other Financing Sources (Uses)				
Proceeds from borrowing	-	3,567,300	3,567,300	-
Transfer out	(279,500)	(239,000)	(256,200)	(266,600)
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	(279,500)	3,328,300	3,311,100	(266,600)
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ 335,200	\$ (58,500)	\$ 3,208,100	\$ (2,748,400)
Fund Balance, Beginning	417,900	753,100	753,100	3,961,200
Fund Balance, Ending	\$ 753,100	\$ 694,600	\$ 3,961,200	\$ 1,212,800

HOUSING FUND - 27
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	<u>Actual FY 2021</u>	<u>Budget FY 2022</u>	<u>Projected FY 2022</u>	<u>Recommended Budget FY 2023</u>
Revenues				
Intergovernmental- grants	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Interest	900	3,300	1,000	1,000
Total Revenues	<u>25,900</u>	<u>3,300</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Expenditures				
Community development	22,500	27,500	27,500	-
Total Expenditures	<u>22,500</u>	<u>27,500</u>	<u>27,500</u>	<u>-</u>
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures	<u>3,400</u>	<u>(24,200)</u>	<u>(26,500)</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Other Financing Sources (Uses)				
Transfer in	105,100	154,000	155,750	162,700
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	<u>105,100</u>	<u>154,000</u>	<u>155,750</u>	<u>162,700</u>
Net Change in Fund Balance	<u>\$ 108,500</u>	<u>\$ 129,800</u>	<u>\$ 129,250</u>	<u>\$ 163,700</u>
Fund Balance, Beginning	<u>197,100</u>	<u>305,600</u>	<u>305,600</u>	<u>434,850</u>
Fund Balance, Ending	<u>\$ 305,600</u>	<u>\$ 435,400</u>	<u>\$ 434,850</u>	<u>\$ 598,550</u>

LOCAL BUILDING AUTHORITY - 28
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Rent	\$ 76,800	\$ 77,300	\$ 89,800	\$ 89,800
Interest	300	500	500	500
Total Revenues	77,100	77,800	90,300	90,300
Expenditures				
Property rental	27,500	35,300	38,500	38,500
Parks, recreation and public property	-	-	374,600	-
Debt service:				
Principal	96,000	98,000	98,000	101,000
Interest	23,900	21,500	18,100	21,200
Total Expenditures	\$ 147,400	\$ 154,800	\$ 529,200	\$ 160,700
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures	\$ (70,300)	\$ (77,000)	\$ (438,900)	\$ (70,400)
Other Financing Sources (Uses)				
Transfer in	130,000	130,000	505,000	100,000
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	130,000	130,000	505,000	100,000
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ 59,700	\$ 53,000	\$ 66,100	\$ 29,600
Fund Balance, Beginning	25,200	84,900	84,900	151,000
Fund Balance, Ending	\$ 84,900	\$ 137,900	\$ 151,000	\$ 180,600

DEBT SERVICE - 32
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Sales taxes - RAP	\$ 544,300	\$ 524,200	\$566,100	\$ 588,700
Interest	2,000	5,000	1,400	1,400
Total Revenues	<u>546,300</u>	<u>529,200</u>	<u>567,500</u>	<u>590,100</u>
Expenditures				
Principal	217,000	220,000	220,000	222,000
Interest	44,000	41,000	40,100	36,100
Total Expenditures	<u>\$ 261,000</u>	<u>\$ 261,000</u>	<u>\$260,100</u>	<u>\$ 258,100</u>
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures	<u>\$ 285,300</u>	<u>\$ 268,200</u>	<u>\$307,400</u>	<u>\$ 332,000</u>
Other Financing Sources (Uses)				
Transfer out-	<u>(100,000)</u>	<u>(360,000)</u>	<u>(360,000)</u>	<u>(300,000)</u>
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	<u>(100,000)</u>	<u>(360,000)</u>	<u>(360,000)</u>	<u>(300,000)</u>
Net Change in Fund Balance	<u>\$ 185,300</u>	<u>\$ (91,800)</u>	<u>\$ (52,600)</u>	<u>\$ 32,000</u>
Fund Balance, Beginning	<u>339,000</u>	<u>524,300</u>	<u>524,300</u>	<u>471,700</u>
Fund Balance, Ending	<u>\$ 524,300</u>	<u>\$ 432,500</u>	<u>\$471,700</u>	<u>\$ 503,700</u>

CAPITAL PROJECT FUND - 40
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Interest	\$ 23,600	\$ 48,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 30,000
Total Revenues	<u>23,600</u>	<u>48,000</u>	<u>20,000</u>	<u>30,000</u>
Expenditures				
General government - projects	1,800	408,400	126,000	282,400
Total Expenditures	<u>\$ 1,800</u>	<u>\$ 408,400</u>	<u>\$ 126,000</u>	<u>\$ 282,400</u>
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures	<u>\$ 21,800</u>	<u>\$ (360,400)</u>	<u>\$ (106,000)</u>	<u>\$ (252,400)</u>
Other Financing Sources (Uses)				
Transfer in-	1,346,800	1,258,700	1,277,900	1,350,200
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	<u>1,346,800</u>	<u>1,258,700</u>	<u>1,277,900</u>	<u>1,350,200</u>
Net Change in Fund Balance	<u>\$ 1,368,600</u>	<u>\$ 898,300</u>	<u>\$ 1,171,900</u>	<u>\$ 1,097,800</u>
Fund Balance, Beginning	<u>4,496,400</u>	<u>5,865,000</u>	<u>5,865,000</u>	<u>7,036,900</u>
Fund Balance, Ending	<u>\$ 5,865,000</u>	<u>\$ 6,763,300</u>	<u>\$ 7,036,900</u>	<u>\$ 8,134,700</u>

PARK CAPITAL FUND - 41
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Impact fees	\$ 736,400	\$ 533,800	\$ 616,600	\$ 557,000
Interest	4,800	3,500	2,900	2,900
Total Revenues	<u>741,200</u>	<u>537,300</u>	<u>619,500</u>	<u>559,900</u>
Expenditures				
Parks and recreation	50,900	883,800	973,300	227,200
Total Expenditures	<u>\$ 50,900</u>	<u>\$ 883,800</u>	<u>\$ 973,300</u>	<u>\$ 227,200</u>
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures	<u>\$ 690,300</u>	<u>\$ (346,500)</u>	<u>\$ (353,800)</u>	<u>\$ 332,700</u>
Other Financing Sources (Uses)				
Transfer in	100,000	360,000	360,000	300,000
Transfer out	(130,000)	(130,000)	(505,000)	(100,000)
Sale of capital assets	68,900	-	-	-
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	<u>38,900</u>	<u>230,000</u>	<u>(145,000)</u>	<u>200,000</u>
Net Change in Fund Balance	<u>\$ 729,200</u>	<u>\$ (116,500)</u>	<u>\$ (498,800)</u>	<u>\$ 532,700</u>
Fund Balance, Beginning	<u>1,210,970</u>	<u>1,940,200</u>	<u>1,940,200</u>	<u>1,441,400</u>
Fund Balance, Ending	<u>\$ 1,940,200</u>	<u>\$ 1,823,700</u>	<u>\$ 1,441,400</u>	<u>\$ 1,974,100</u>

PARK CAPITAL FUND
CAPITAL PROJECT SCHEDULE
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES

FISCAL YEAR		Other Unrestricted	Restricted Cash - Impact Fee	Total
FY 2022	BEGINNING CASH	\$ 583,710	\$ 1,384,120	1,967,830
	REVENUES			
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE	-	616,600	616,600
	INTEREST REVENUE	500	2,400	2,900
	TRANSFER IN RAP TAX DEBT SERVICE FUND	360,000	-	360,000
		<u>360,500</u>	<u>619,000</u>	<u>979,500</u>
	PROJECT			
	WILD ROSE PARK IRRIGATION PUMPS	\$ 25,875	\$ -	\$ 25,875
	TUNNEL SPRINGS TENNIS COURT REPLACEMENT	31,050	-	31,050
	MATHIS PARK PLAYGROUND REPLACEMENT	31,050	-	31,050
	PALMQUIST PARK PLAYGROUND REPLACEMENT	77,625	-	77,625
	OLDHAM PARK PLAYGROUND REPLACEMENT	31,050	-	31,050
	CALEB PARK PLAYGROUND REPLACEMENT	31,050	-	31,050
	BUCKINGHAM PARK PLAYGROUND REPLACEMENT	31,050	-	31,050
	BOSTON PARK PLAYGROUND REPLACEMENT	31,050	-	31,050
	CAMBRIA PARK PLAYGROUND REPLACEMENT	31,050	-	31,050
	GARY PUMPHOUSE IRRIGATION	3,155	-	3,155
	PALMQUIST PARK IRRIGATION REPLACEMENT	64,696	-	64,696
	DEER HOLLOW PARK ASPHALT REPLACEMENT	20,907	-	20,907
	TRAILS DEVELOPMENT	-	23,700	23,700
	HATCH PARK DESIGN	-	35,000	35,000
	TRANSFER OUT LOCAL BUILDING AUTHORITY	-	505,000	505,000
		<u>409,608</u>	<u>563,700</u>	<u>973,308</u>
	ENDING CASH	\$ 534,602	\$ 1,439,420	\$ 1,974,022
FY 2023	BEGINNING CASH	\$ 534,602	\$ 1,439,420	\$ 1,974,022
	REVENUES			
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE	-	557,000	557,000
	INTEREST REVENUE	500	2,400	2,900
	TRANSFER IN RAP TAX DEBT SERVICE FUND	300,000	-	300,000
		<u>300,500</u>	<u>559,400</u>	<u>859,900</u>
	PROJECT			
	IRRIGATION PUMPS LEGACY REGIONAL PARK	74,985	-	74,985
	CENTER STREET NORTH SIDE IRRIGATION REPLACEMENT	14,698	-	14,698
	GREGERSON DETENTION BASIN IRRIGATION REPLACEMENT	37,482	-	37,482
	TRANSFER OUT LOCAL BUILDING AUTHORITY	-	100,000	100,000
		<u>127,165</u>	<u>100,000</u>	<u>227,165</u>
	ENDING CASH	\$ 707,937	\$ 1,898,820	\$ 2,606,757
FY 2024	BEGINNING CASH	\$ 707,937	\$ 1,898,820	\$ 2,606,757
	REVENUES			
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE	-	250,000	250,000
	INTEREST REVENUE	1,500	2,000	3,500
	TRANSFER IN RAP TAX DEBT SERVICE FUND	283,200	-	283,200
		<u>284,700</u>	<u>252,000</u>	<u>536,700</u>
	PROJECT			
	REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT	400,000	-	400,000
	TRANSFER OUT LOCAL BUILDING AUTHORITY	-	130,000	130,000
		<u>400,000</u>	<u>130,000</u>	<u>530,000</u>
	ENDING CASH	\$ 592,637	\$ 2,020,820	\$ 2,613,457

FY 2025	BEGINNING CASH	\$	592,637	\$	2,020,820	\$	2,613,457
	REVENUES						
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE		-		200,000		200,000
	INTEREST REVENUE		1,500		2,000		3,500
	TRANSFER IN RAP TAX DEBT SERVICE FUND		300,400		-		300,400
			<u>301,900</u>		<u>202,000</u>		<u>503,900</u>
	PROJECT						
	REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT		400,000		-		400,000
	TRANSFER OUT LOCAL BUILDING AUTHORITY		-		130,000		130,000
			<u>400,000</u>		<u>130,000</u>		<u>530,000</u>
	ENDING CASH	\$	494,537	\$	2,092,820	\$	2,587,357
<hr/>							
FY 2026	BEGINNING CASH	\$	494,537	\$	2,092,820	\$	2,587,357
	REVENUES						
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE		-		150,000		150,000
	INTEREST REVENUE		1,500		2,000		3,500
	TRANSFER IN RAP TAX DEBT SERVICE FUND		315,100		-		315,100
			<u>316,600</u>		<u>152,000</u>		<u>468,600</u>
	PROJECT						
	REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT		400,000		-		400,000
	TRANSFER OUT LOCAL BUILDING AUTHORITY		-		130,000		130,000
			<u>400,000</u>		<u>130,000</u>		<u>530,000</u>
	ENDING CASH	\$	411,137	\$	2,114,820	\$	2,525,957

PUBLIC SAFETY FUND - 43
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Impact fees	\$ 127,400	\$ 114,000	\$ 119,200	\$ 110,600
Interest	1,100	600	1,000	1,000
Total Revenues	<u>128,500</u>	<u>114,600</u>	<u>120,200</u>	<u>111,600</u>
Other Financing Sources (Uses)				
Transfer out-	<u>(46,800)</u>	<u>(100,000)</u>	<u>(119,200)</u>	<u>(110,600)</u>
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	<u>(46,800)</u>	<u>(100,000)</u>	<u>(119,200)</u>	<u>(110,600)</u>
Net Change in Fund Balance	<u>\$ 81,700</u>	<u>\$ 14,600</u>	<u>\$ 1,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,000</u>
Fund Balance, Beginning	<u>139,800</u>	<u>221,500</u>	<u>221,500</u>	<u>222,500</u>
Fund Balance, Ending	<u>\$ 221,500</u>	<u>\$ 236,100</u>	<u>\$ 222,500</u>	<u>\$ 223,500</u>

ROAD CAPITAL FUND - 44
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Impact fees	\$ 582,600	\$ 482,000	\$ 532,000	\$ 461,600
Intergovernmental- grants	173,800	5,515,500	5,605,100	276,200
Interest	10,200	32,000	11,500	11,500
Total Revenues	<u>766,600</u>	<u>6,029,500</u>	<u>6,148,600</u>	<u>749,300</u>
Expenditures				
Highways and streets - projects	966,300	11,503,300	11,421,400	2,132,550
Total Expenditures	<u>\$ 966,300</u>	<u>\$ 11,503,300</u>	<u>\$ 11,421,400</u>	<u>\$ 2,132,550</u>
Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures	<u>\$ (199,700)</u>	<u>\$ (5,473,800)</u>	<u>\$ (5,272,800)</u>	<u>\$ (1,383,250)</u>
Other Financing Sources (Uses)				
Transfer-in restricted tax revenue	1,045,000	1,041,000	1,231,400	1,154,300
Transfer-in unrestricted	1,799,400	705,000	705,000	705,000
Total Other Financing Sources (Uses)	<u>2,844,400</u>	<u>1,746,000</u>	<u>1,936,400</u>	<u>1,859,300</u>
Net Change in Fund Balance	<u>\$ 2,644,700</u>	<u>\$ (3,727,800)</u>	<u>\$ (3,336,400)</u>	<u>\$ 476,050</u>
Fund Balance, Beginning	<u>2,854,450</u>	<u>5,499,150</u>	<u>5,499,150</u>	<u>2,162,750</u>
Fund Balance, Ending	<u>\$ 5,499,150</u>	<u>\$ 1,771,350</u>	<u>\$ 2,162,750</u>	<u>\$ 2,638,800</u>

FISCAL YEAR	ROAD CAPITAL PROJECTS	BEGINNING UNRESTRICTED CASH	TRANS TAX REVENUE	CROAD TAX REVENUE	RESTRICTED CASH- IMPACT FEE	ONE TIME GRANTS	TOTAL
FY 2022	BEGINNING CASH	\$ 2,312,524	\$ 772,339	\$ 115,223	\$ 2,673,000	\$ -	\$ 5,873,086
	REVENUES						
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE	-	-	-	532,000	-	532,000
	GRANTS & CONTRIBUTIONS	-	-	-	-	5,605,067	5,605,067
	INTEREST REVENUE	-	4,500	-	7,000	-	11,500
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - TRANSPORTATION TAX	-	511,376	604,804	-	-	1,116,180
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - UNRESTRICTED CASH	705,000	-	-	-	-	705,000
	TOTAL REVENUE	705,000	515,876	604,804	539,000	5,605,067	7,969,747
	PROJECTS						
	ANNUAL SEAL COAT C ROAD	-	176,573	263,427	-	-	440,000
	1100 NORTH BRIDGE	-	-	-	1,000,000	4,000,000	5,000,000
	EAGLEWOOD LOOP, ROCKWOOD, TANGLEWOOD	500,770	274,830	-	-	-	775,600
	MAIN STREET RECONSTRUCTION (Ctr to 350)	-	-	13,250	-	1,223,400	1,236,650
	FOXBORO DR RECON-ELEM SCHOOL- FOX HOLLOW RND-ABOUT	-	-	192,550	-	-	192,550
	EAGLERIDGE DR OVERLAY VISTA VIEW TO EDGEWOOD LOOP	-	-	5,000	-	-	5,000
	TREE PLANTING CTR STR	-	-	-	75,000	-	75,000
	BUS SHELTERS	-	-	16,100	-	64,700	80,800
	NSL CITY CENTER 25 EAST - REIMB	-	-	-	42,550	-	42,550
	REDWOOD ROAD TRAIL -WEST CONNECTIONS	85,540	-	-	-	290,167	375,707
	OVERLAY - CENTER STREET	-	-	14,200	-	-	14,200
	400 WEST STR RECONSTRUCTION	-	-	7,500	-	-	7,500
	AUDIO PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
	1100 NORTH WIDENING @ RR CROSSING	-	-	-	220,800	-	220,800
	EAGLERIDGE DR OVERLAY	-	500,000	-	-	-	500,000
	LACEY WAY (MARIA, GARY,NANCY)	300,000	-	208,000	-	-	508,000
	EAGLEWOOD DR(ORCH- EAGLERIDGE)	1,466,000	-	-	-	-	1,466,000
	75 E,125 E & 175 E RECONSTRUCT	263,000	-	-	-	-	263,000
	190 EAST RECONSTRUCT	22,000	-	-	-	-	22,000
	ORCHARD DR SIDEWALK (3800 S)	13,200	-	-	-	26,800	40,000
	NORTH FRONTAGE ROAD (WILSON)	146,000	-	-	-	-	146,000
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,796,510	951,403	720,027	1,348,350	5,605,067	11,421,357
	ENDING CASH	\$ 221,014	\$ 336,812	\$ -	\$ 1,863,650	\$ -	\$ 2,421,477
FY 2023	BEGINNING CASH	\$ 221,014	\$ 336,812	\$ -	\$ 1,863,650	\$ -	\$ 2,421,477
	REVENUES						
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE	-	-	-	461,600	-	461,600
	GRANTS & CONTRIBUTIONS	-	-	-	-	276,200	276,200
	INTEREST REVENUE	-	4,500	-	7,000	-	11,500
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - TRANSPORTATION TAX	-	526,718	630,613	-	-	1,157,331
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - UNRESTRICTED CASH	705,000	-	-	-	-	705,000
	TOTAL REVENUE	705,000	531,218	630,613	468,600	276,200	2,611,631
	PROJECTS						
	ANNUAL STREET PRESERVATION	-	403,550	83,750	-	-	487,300
	MAIN STREET RECONSTRUCTION US 89 TO CTR	150,000	-	-	-	-	150,000
	MTN VIEW, SKYVIEW, WILDFLOWER, SEGO LILY	-	146,000	-	-	-	146,000
	CYNTHIA WAY AND DORTHEA WAY	-	-	416,250	-	-	416,250
	475 N & CLOVERDALE	-	205,000	-	-	-	205,000
	SIDER DR, 175 N, 550 E AND 575 E	205,800	-	-	-	-	205,800
	PARKWAY DR, CANYON LN, EAGLE PASS	5,387	-	130,613	-	-	136,000
	MAIN ST EAST SIDE SIDEWALK (I-15 OVERPASS TO PACIFIC)	-	-	-	110,000	276,200	386,200
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	361,187	754,550	630,613	110,000	276,200	2,132,550
	ENDING CASH	\$ 564,827	\$ 113,480	\$ -	\$ 2,222,250	\$ -	\$ 2,900,557
FY 2024	BEGINNING CASH	\$ 564,827	\$ 113,480	\$ -	\$ 2,222,250	\$ -	\$ 2,900,557
	REVENUES						
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE	-	-	-	250,000	-	250,000
	GRANTS & CONTRIBUTIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - TRANSPORTATION TAX	-	420,000	541,000	-	-	961,000
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - UNRESTRICTED CASH	800,000	-	-	-	-	800,000
	TOTAL REVENUE	800,000	420,000	541,000	250,000	-	2,011,000
	PROJECTS						
	ANNUAL STREET PRESERVATION PROJECTS	-	-	536,750	-	-	536,750
	ELK HOLLOW, ROSEWOOD, ELK HOLLOW CIR.	-	333,750	4,250	-	-	338,000
	COVENTRY, CONSTITUTION, FREEDOM DR, FREEDOM CIR & INDEPENDENCE	325,000	-	-	-	-	325,000
	GARY, DAVID, BERNICE & NANCY	320,000	-	-	-	-	320,000
	150 NORTH	103,000	-	-	-	-	103,000
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	748,000	333,750	541,000	-	-	1,622,750
	ENDING CASH	\$ 616,827	\$ 199,730	\$ -	\$ 2,472,250	\$ -	\$ 3,288,807

FISCAL YEAR	ROAD CAPITAL PROJECTS	BEGINNING UNRESTRICTED CASH	TRANS TAX REVENUE	CROAD TAX REVENUE	RESTRICTED CASH-IMPACT FEE	ONE TIME GRANTS	TOTAL
FY 2025	BEGINNING CASH	\$ 616,827	\$ 199,730	\$ -	\$ 2,472,250	\$ -	\$ 3,288,807
	REVENUES						
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE	-	-	-	250,000	-	250,000
	GRANTS & CONTRIBUTIONS	-	-	-	-	3,336,700	3,336,700
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - TRANSPORTATION TAX	-	432,600	557,230	-	-	989,830
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - UNRESTRICTED CASH	900,000	-	-	-	-	900,000
	TOTAL REVENUE	900,000	432,600	557,230	250,000	3,336,700	5,476,530
	PROJECTS						
	ANNUAL STREET PRESERVATION PROJECTS	-	-	532,900	-	-	532,900
	850 N, 900 N & MADSEN LANE & 950 N	-	263,670	24,330	-	-	288,000
	900 NORTH (REDWOOD TO 400 W)	467,000	-	-	-	-	467,000
	ELM AVE.	110,000	-	-	-	-	110,000
	300 NORTH (EAST OF US-89)	42,000	-	-	-	-	42,000
	WOODCREST, TANGLEWOOD N, SUNFLOWER CIR	212,000	-	-	-	-	212,000
	WINDSOR DR., WINDSOR CT. AND ASCOT DR.	51,677	103,323	-	-	-	155,000
	VISTA VIEW LANE (RIDGETOP TO E-RIDGE DR.)AND COUNTRY COURT	-	135,000	-	-	-	135,000
	FOXHILL , FOXHILL CIR, REGENCY, SABLE CIR, WOODVIEW & FAIRWAY	214,000	-	-	-	-	214,000
	MAIN STREET WIDENING (PACIFIC TO 1000 N)	-	-	-	267,500	3,336,700	3,604,200
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,096,677	501,993	557,230	267,500	3,336,700	5,760,100
	ENDING CASH	\$ 420,150	\$ 130,337	\$ -	\$ 2,454,750	\$ -	\$ 3,005,237

FISCAL YEAR	ROAD CAPITAL PROJECTS	BEGINNING UNRESTRICTED CASH	TRANS TAX REVENUE	CROAD TAX REVENUE	RESTRICTED CASH-IMPACT FEE	ONE TIME GRANTS	TOTAL
FY 2026	BEGINNING CASH	\$ 420,150	\$ 130,337	\$ -	\$ 2,454,750	\$ -	\$ 3,005,237
	REVENUES						
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE	-	-	-	250,000	-	250,000
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - TRANSPORTATION TAX	-	445,600	573,900	-	-	1,019,500
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - UNRESTRICTED CASH	1,000,000	-	-	-	-	1,000,000
	TOTAL REVENUE	1,000,000	445,600	573,900	250,000	-	2,269,500
	PROJECTS						
	ANNUAL STREET PRESERVATION PROJECTS	-	-	438,600	-	-	\$ 438,600
	400 EAST & 500 EAST(WILDCAT WAY)	15,513	292,187	61,300	-	-	369,000
	CUTLER (FOXOBORO TO800 N) & DURHAM (YORK TO STONEHENGE)	387,000	-	-	-	-	387,000
	OAKWOOD DR (OAKVIEW CT TO LACEY) & OAKVIEW CT.	203,000	-	-	-	-	203,000
	SCENIC HILLS OVERLAY(SCENIC HILLS CIR. TO VALLEY VIEW)	139,000	-	-	-	-	139,000
	MARIALANA & RAYGENE	-	200,000	-	-	-	200,000
	BUNKER HILL & LIBERTY	-	-	74,000	-	-	74,000
	MAPLE DR, 200 N, 50 W, 300 N, 175 N, 125 W	158,000	-	-	-	-	158,000
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	902,513	492,187	573,900	-	-	1,968,600
	ENDING CASH	\$ 517,637	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,704,750	\$ -	\$ 3,306,137

FISCAL YEAR	ROAD CAPITAL PROJECTS	BEGINNING UNRESTRICTED CASH	TRANS TAX REVENUE	CROAD TAX REVENUE	RESTRICTED CASH-IMPACT FEE	ONE TIME GRANTS	TOTAL
FY 2027	BEGINNING CASH	\$ 517,637	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,704,750	\$ -	\$ 3,222,387
	REVENUES						
	IMPACT FEE REVENUE	-	-	-	250,000	-	250,000
	GRANTS & CONTRIBUTIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - TRANSPORTATION TAX	-	459,000	591,100	-	-	1,050,100
	TRANSFER IN FROM GENERAL FUND - UNRESTRICTED CASH	900,000	-	-	-	-	900,000
	TOTAL REVENUE	900,000	459,000	591,100	250,000	-	2,200,100
	PROJECTS						
	ANNUAL STREET PRESERVATION PROJECTS	-	146,300	591,100	-	-	\$ 737,400
	ODELL LANE & 100 N.	206,000	-	-	-	-	206,000
	MAIN ST (350 N TO PACIFIC)	526,000	-	-	-	-	526,000
	OVERLAND DR (PACIFIC TO 1000 N), PACIFIC AVE & UNION AVE.	164,300	312,700	-	-	-	477,000
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	896,300	459,000	591,100	-	-	1,946,400
	ENDING CASH	\$ 521,337	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,954,750	\$ -	\$ 3,476,087

COMBINED FUND - 51 AND 52
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Operating Revenues				
Charges for services:				
Metered water sales	\$ 4,526,100	\$ 4,475,900	\$ 4,002,400	\$ 4,096,700
Connection fees	121,700	100,000	100,000	100,000
Miscellaneous	25,700	5,000	14,000	14,000
Total Operating Revenues	4,673,500	4,580,900	4,116,400	4,210,700
Operating Expenses				
Salaries and benefits	1,155,900	1,027,000	1,086,000	1,151,000
Administrative charge	60,700	363,800	363,800	378,000
Office expense and supplies	70,700	73,500	74,500	85,000
Equipment - supplies and maintenance	488,300	613,600	607,000	634,500
Buildings and grounds - supplies and maintenance	47,300	57,500	57,500	73,500
Special department supplies	184,300	150,000	150,000	195,000
Power purchases	391,700	430,000	430,000	450,000
Water purchases	917,600	997,100	935,000	1,010,000
Professional services	167,600	170,750	208,550	170,000
Miscellaneous	33,600	40,000	39,000	42,000
Total Operating Expenses	3,517,700	3,923,250	3,951,350	4,189,000
Operating Income (Loss)	1,155,800	657,650	165,050	21,700
Non-operating				
Capital-infrastructure	(1,222,200)	(5,806,088)	(4,695,890)	(1,659,665)
Capital Equipment	(16,600)	(35,000)	(39,000)	(90,000)
Debt service payments	(960,800)	(295,800)	(295,800)	(212,900)
Interest income	124,800	32,000	24,500	24,500
Impact fee revenues	1,465,100	1,220,950	1,064,800	1,147,000
Total Non-operating	(609,700)	(4,883,938)	(3,941,390)	(791,065)
Fund Balance - use of(-) cont to +	\$ 546,100	\$ (4,226,288)	\$ (3,776,340)	\$ (769,365)

FISCAL YEAR	WATER CAPITAL PROJECTS	GROWTH %	EXISTING %	ESTIMATE D COST	GROWTH	EXISTING
FY 2022	WATER STUDY	100%		\$ 89,900	\$ 89,900	\$ -
	WOODBRIAR - CONV TO 2ND		100%	7,620	-	7,620
	PRV VAULT & VALVE REPLACE		100%	139,000	-	139,000
	300 N WATER LINE REPLACEMENT		100%	250,000	-	250,000
	E-WOOD COVE SECONDARY PHASE 2	100%		444,300	444,300	-
	2ND WATER - E-WOOD LOOP S, ROCKWOOD & TANGLEWOOD	100%		906,000	906,000	-
	75 E, 125 E & 175 E WATER LINE REPLACEMENT		100%	525,000	-	525,000
	LACEY WAY WATER LINE REPLACEMENT - VALLEY VIEW TO GARY		100%	1,290,000	-	1,290,000
	PRV VAULT & VALVE REPLACE FY 2022		100%	500,000	-	500,000
	BIG WEST OIL FLOW CTR VALVE, METER		100%	200,000	-	200,000
	NORTH FRONTAGE ROAD - WILSON TO COBBLE CREEK		100%	55,000	-	55,000
	NSL CITY CENTER PHASE WATERLINE	100%		48,000	48,000	-
	MISC REHAB CUL WATER RESEVOIR		100%	37,670	-	37,670
	MISC INTERIOR PIPING RESEVOIRS	40%	60%	65,400	26,160	39,240
	TANK REPAIRS 2020		100%	138,000	-	138,000
				<u>\$ 4,695,890</u>	<u>\$ 1,514,360</u>	<u>\$ 3,181,530</u>
FY 2023	CNTR ST WATERLINE UPPERCROSS	100%		\$ 157,100	\$ 157,100	\$ -
	5200 PUMP BLDG #1 RETROFIT		100%	80,000	-	80,000
	EQUALIZATION 350 E AND MORTON		100%	205,065	-	205,065
	STEEL TANK BOOSTER PUMP		100%	40,000	-	40,000
	MAIN STREET WATERLINE US 89 TO CRT		100%	295,000	-	295,000
	475 N & CLOVERDALE WATER LINE REPLACEMENT		100%	342,500	-	342,500
	SECONDARY WATER - MTN VIEW, SKYVIEW, WILDFLOWER,	100%		390,000	390,000	-
	PRV VAULT REPLACEMENT FY 2022 Carry Over		100%	150,000	-	150,000
				<u>\$ 1,659,665</u>	<u>\$ 547,100</u>	<u>\$ 1,112,565</u>
FY 2024	150 NO, EXISTING 4" MAIN-FRWAY		100%	\$ 130,000	\$ -	\$ 130,000
	NORTH PARK VILLAGE CONDOS WATER LINE REPLACE		100%	540,000	-	540,000
	SECONDARY WATER - ELK HOLLOW & ROSEWOOD	100%		310,000	310,000	-
	GARY, DAVID & BERNICE WATER LINE REPLACE		100%	1,007,000	-	1,007,000
	COVENTRY, FREEDOM DR, INDEPENDENCE WATER LINE REPLACE		100%	850,000	-	850,000
	PRV VAULT & VALVE REPLACEMENT		100%	250,000	-	250,000
				<u>\$ 3,087,000</u>	<u>\$ 310,000</u>	<u>\$ 2,777,000</u>
FY 2025	850, 950 NO & MADSEN LN (500 E)		100%	\$ 365,000	\$ -	\$ 365,000
	900 N WATER LINE REPLACEMENT (AC PIPE)		100%	730,000	-	730,000
	SECONDARY WATER - WOODCREST, TANGLEWOOD, SUNFL	100%		430,000	430,000	-
	US-89 WATER LINE REPLACEMENT - 71 NORTH TO ODELL		100%	280,000	-	280,000
	PRV VAULT & VALVE REPLACEMENT		100%	150,000	-	150,000
				<u>\$ 1,955,000</u>	<u>\$ 430,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,525,000</u>
FY 2026	FRONTAGE ROAD WATER LINE		100%	\$ 625,000	\$ -	\$ 625,000
	LIBERTY & BUNKER HILL WATER LINE REPLACEMENT		100%	185,000	-	185,000
	RAYGENE & MARIALANA WATER LINE REPLACEMENT		100%	820,000	-	820,000
	MAPLE, 200 N,50 W, 300 N, 175 N & 125 W WATER LINE		100%	325,000	-	325,000
	PRV VAULT & VALVE REPLACEMENT		100%	250,000	-	250,000
				<u>\$ 2,205,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>\$ 2,205,000</u>
FY 2027	PACIFIC & OVERLAND (PACIFIC TO UNION) WATER LINE REPL.		100%	\$ 270,000	\$ -	\$ 270,000
	700 W (CENTER TO 200 N), 640 W & 60 N WATER LINE REPL.		100%	720,000	-	720,000
	200 NORTH (REDWOOD RD TO 400 W) WATER LINE REPLACE.		100%	660,000	-	660,000
				<u>\$ 1,650,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>\$ 1,650,000</u>

STORM WATER FUND - 53
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Charges for services:				
User Fees	\$ 796,600	\$ 770,000	\$ 790,000	\$ 924,300
Total Operating Revenues	796,600	770,000	790,000	924,300
Operating Expenses				
Salaries and benefits	271,900	304,400	313,500	323,500
Administrative charge	10,000	60,400	60,400	62,350
Office expense and supplies	12,400	18,400	14,900	18,500
Equipment - supplies and maintenance	189,000	178,100	179,100	183,600
Professional services	49,300	103,559	107,859	56,000
Miscellaneous	1,700	2,500	3,500	3,500
Total Operating Expenses	534,300	667,359	679,259	647,450
Operating Income (Loss)	262,300	102,641	110,741	276,850
Nonoperating Income (Expense)				
Capital-infrastructure	(456,721)	(481,100)	(481,100)	(690,000)
Capital Equipment		(35,000)	(35,000)	(382,600)
Developer reimbursement	(95,100)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(20,000)
Proceeds from borrowing - lease	-	-	-	240,600
Gain (loss) from sale of capital assets	-	-	-	97,000
Debt service payments	(46,300)	(46,000)	(46,000)	(32,900)
Build America bond interest subsidy	7,000	7,500	6,500	-
Interest income	4,800	24,000	3,200	100,200
Impact fee revenues	182,300	209,500	192,700	120,400
Total Non-operating	(404,021)	(421,100)	(459,700)	(567,300)
Fund Balance - use of(-) cont to +	\$ (141,721)	\$ (318,459)	\$ (348,959)	\$ (290,450)

FISCAL YEAR	STORM WATER CAPITAL PROJECTS	GROWTH %	EXISTING %	ESTIMATED COST	GROWTH	EXISTING
FY 2022	28 NO VALLEY VIEW DR DETENTION	100%		\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ -
	EAGLEWOOD VILLAGE DETENTION BASIN IMPROVEMENT	100%		60,000	60,000	
	986 EAST FAIRWAY PIPE REPLACEMENT HOLE 14		100%	178,000	-	178,000
	SEC, E-WOOD S, ROCKWOOD & TANGLEWOOD		100%	66,000	-	66,000
	WATER STUDY	100%		77,100	77,100	-
				<u>\$ 481,100</u>	<u>\$ 237,100</u>	<u>\$ 244,000</u>
FY 2023	SOUTH OF GARY WAY UPSIZE 7 HOLE #7 IMPROVEMENT		100%	\$ 690,000	\$ -	\$ 690,000
FY 2024	NEW PIPE ON COVENTRY DR & FREEDOM DR		100%	\$ 830,000	\$ -	\$ 830,000
FY 2025	HOLE #15 PIPE UPSIZE BY FOXHILL CIRCLE	100%		\$ 260,000	\$ 260,000	\$ -
	CONCRETE SILT BASIN AT 480 N CUTLER DR.	50%	50%	220,000	110,000	110,000
				<u>\$ 480,000</u>	<u>\$ 370,000</u>	<u>\$ 110,000</u>
FY 2026	REPLACE DITCH W/PIPE WEST OF 400 WEST		100%	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 500,000
FY 2027	PIPE IMPROVEMENT ON DAVID WAY CANYON		100%	\$ 430,000	\$ -	\$ 430,000

SOLID WASTE FUND - 54
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Operating Revenues				
Charges for services:				
User fees	\$ 1,274,000	\$ 1,351,000	\$ 1,370,000	\$ 1,465,900
Total Operating Revenues	<u>1,274,000</u>	<u>1,351,000</u>	<u>1,370,000</u>	<u>1,465,900</u>
Operating Expenses				
Salaries and benefits	92,400	81,500	84,000	96,000
Administrative charge	5,700	22,900	22,900	24,300
Office expense and supplies	21,300	18,500	19,500	19,500
Equipment - supplies and maintenance	29,600	78,000	78,000	65,000
Special department supplies	27,600	26,000	27,000	28,900
Professional services	3,700	4,000	4,000	4,000
Contracted services	1,110,300	1,134,000	1,163,400	1,238,980
Total Operating Expenses	<u>1,290,600</u>	<u>1,364,900</u>	<u>1,398,800</u>	<u>1,476,680</u>
Operating Income (Loss)	<u>(16,600)</u>	<u>(13,900)</u>	<u>(28,800)</u>	<u>(10,780)</u>
Nonoperating Income (Expense)				
Interest income	2,400	2,000	1,500	1,500
Total Nonoperating	<u>2,400</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>1,500</u>
Fund Balance - use of(-) cont to +	\$ (14,200)	\$ (11,900)	\$ (27,300)	\$ (9,280)

GOLF FUND - 55
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Revenues				
Charges for services:				
Admissions and lesson fees	\$ 1,123,600	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,004,800	\$ 960,000
Equipment and facility rents	598,900	545,000	558,500	665,000
Concession and merchandise sales	218,700	230,000	318,000	300,000
Total Operating Revenues	1,941,200	1,675,000	1,881,300	1,925,000
Operating Expenses				
Salaries and benefits	786,200	881,500	858,500	993,000
Administrative charge	5,700	50,900	50,900	53,300
Office expense and supplies	8,400	4,000	6,000	3,500
Equipment - supplies and maintenance	148,600	153,000	173,200	180,100
Buildings and grounds - supplies and maintenance	38,700	53,000	35,000	30,000
Power purchases	27,600	41,000	41,000	41,000
Water purchases	110,600	114,500	114,500	123,300
Professional services	52,900	65,000	68,000	65,000
Merchandise	129,200	120,000	160,000	165,000
Miscellaneous	46,000	69,500	66,200	66,000
Total Operating Expenses	1,353,900	1,552,400	1,573,300	1,720,200
Operating Income (Loss)	587,300	122,600	308,000	204,800
Nonoperating Income (Expense)		-		
Capital-Infrastructure & Equipment	(49,100)	(575,000)	(4,354,250)	(100,000)
Proceeds from borrowing - lease	-	4,334,100	4,334,100	100,000
Debt Service Payments	(53,000)	(129,200)	(179,200)	(128,500)
Interest expense	(10,000)	(43,200)	(75,500)	(102,300)
Total Non-operating	(112,100)	3,586,700	(274,850)	(230,800)
Fund Balance - use of(-) cont to +	\$ 475,200	\$ 3,709,300	\$ 33,150	\$ (26,000)

FISCAL YEAR 2023 VEHICLE REPLACEMENT REQUEST

DEPT	DESCRIPTION	TRADE/ SALE	NEW VEHICLE	PURCHASE	NET COST
Streets	F 150	\$ -	\$ 42,000	\$ -	\$ 42,000
Police	Interceptor Sedan 2014	-	52,500	-	52,500
Police	Interceptor Sedan 2014	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 52,500	\$ 47,500
Police	Interceptor SUV 2016	15,000	-	52,500	37,500
Police	Interceptor SUV 2017	16,000	-	52,500	36,500
Police	Interceptor SUV 2017	16,000	-	52,500	36,500
		\$ 52,000	\$ 94,500	\$ 210,000	\$ 252,500
Water	Flat Bed Truck F550	\$ -	\$ 90,000	\$ -	\$ 90,000
Storm	Vac Truck - Sweeper	\$ 97,000	\$ -	\$ 337,600	\$ 240,600

FLEET FUND - 61
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
ACTUAL, BUDGET, PROJECTED AND RECOMMENDED

	Actual FY 2021	Budget FY 2022	Projected FY 2022	Recommended Budget FY 2023
Operating Revenues				
Capital replacement charge	\$ 215,000	\$ 473,200	\$ 473,200	\$ 517,300
User Fees - interdepartmental	269,500	304,000	304,000	349,500
Intergovernmental- grants	108,700	-	-	-
Total Operating Revenues	593,200	777,200	777,200	866,800
Operating Expenses				
Salaries and benefits	236,200	259,000	263,500	294,000
Equipment - supplies and maintenance	42,800	46,000	46,000	55,500
Total Operating Expenses	279,000	305,000	309,500	349,500
Operating Income (Loss)	314,200	472,200	467,700	517,300
Nonoperating Income (Expense)				
Interest income	1,000	3,000	1,600	1,600
Gain (loss) from sale of capital assets	1,000	46,500	46,500	52,000
Interest expense	(7,700)	(4,300)	(4,300)	(1,200)
Debt Service Payments	(135,900)	(139,400)	(139,000)	(23,000)
Capital-Infrastructure & Equipment	(115,400)	(358,000)	(573,000)	(304,500)
Total Nonoperating Income (Expense)	(257,000)	(452,200)	(668,200)	(275,100)
Fund Balance - use of(-) cont to +	\$ 57,200	\$ 20,000	\$ (200,500)	\$ 242,200



CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE

10 East Center Street
North Salt Lake, Utah 84054
(801) 335-8700
(801) 335-8719 Fax

Brian Horrocks
Mayor

Ken Leetham
City Manager

May 3, 2022

RE: City of North Salt Lake Public Comment on the I-15 Environmental Impact Statement

Dear I-15 EIS Team,

The City of North Salt Lake is pleased to submit formal comments to UDOT on the I-15 Environmental Impact Statement Farmington to Salt Lake City project. This important improvement in the regional transportation system will benefit our City and many other important locations throughout Davis County. There are several transportation enhancements that we believe the EIS should include and consider.

2600 South/1100 North Grade Separation

The highest priority of the City is the separation of the roadway at 2600 South/1100 North from the Union Pacific and UTA Frontrunner train corridors. This proposed improvement is located a few hundred feet west of the interchange of I-15 and 2600 South as shown on the attached map. The City requests that this improvement be included in the I-15 reconstruction project.

The cities of North Salt Lake and Woods Cross, together with UDOT Region 1, previously funded a Feasibility Study which was adopted in 2019 and which recommended a bridge over the subject rail corridor as a means of separating the roadway from the rail lines. Since that time, the City of North Salt Lake awarded \$3,497,611 to Horrocks Engineers for Phases 1 and 2 of a four phase project that will result in the completion of the final environmental and design work needed in order to construct this project. UDOT is also a partner in this effort and has assigned Tiffany Pocock as the project manager for this work. In addition to the environmental and design work being done, the grade separation project is also in Phase 1 of the Regional Transportation Plan. The project in that plan is identified at R-D-77 with the title "2600 South/1100 North Overpass". The City has worked hard for many years to bring this project forward with the assistance of numerous partners such as the Utah Legislature, the Utah Department of Transportation, Wasatch Front Regional Council, and Davis County.

The grade separation project over the rail lines on 2600 South/1100 North is also consistent with the draft Purpose and Need Statement in the I-15 EIS project. The first words of that statement are: "To improve safety..." This location has been a dangerous road crossing and, though not a

frequent site of train/vehicle accidents, there have been many collisions, including a now-famous crash of a frontrunner train with a large FedEx tractor trailer that occurred in January, 2017. This location is also included in Davis School District's bus routes that transport students from two high schools, four junior high schools and five elementary schools. Separation of the roadway from the rail corridor will greatly improve the safety of this location and will prevent any further train/vehicle collisions.

In addition to safety concerns, the at-grade rail crossing also causes a significant amount of inconvenience, loss of time and a degradation in air quality in the immediate vicinity. The remainder of the Purpose and Need Statement pertains to the function and impacts of the project. It states, "...provide better mobility for all travel modes, strengthen the state and local economy and better connect communities along I-15...". A bridge at the subject location would absolutely be consistent with these purpose and need statements. Indeed, the existing at-grade crossing prohibits all modes of transportation other than motorized cars and trucks. It also creates a barrier for employment, trucking and commerce trips where destinations and communities are found on both sides of the rail corridor and the I-15 corridor. North Salt Lake and Woods Cross each have thriving industrial and business parks on the west side of the rail corridor with thousands of employees traveling daily to and from these locations. In addition, FedEx, Alberton's and L.W. Miller have significant trucking operations that utilize this corridor to access I-15 and would greatly benefit from grade separation on 2600 South/1100 North.

In North Salt Lake, there is no east/west minor collector street or above that doesn't have an at-grade rail crossing. This fact causes significant barriers, delays and frustration for North Salt Lake citizens and residents of surrounding communities that have a need to travers east and west through the area and cannot conveniently do so.

Access to I-15

The second major area of concern for the City is the lack of access to the I-15 corridor from North Salt Lake. The City has excellent and convenient access to south bound I-15 from the southern leg of US89 that travels through the City. We also have exits from both directions on the I-15 corridor into North Salt Lake. However, travelers seeking access to north bound I-15 do not have good access to enter the freeway in North Salt Lake.

There may be several feasible and reasonable solutions to obtaining north bound access, but we would like UDOT to seriously consider ways for citizens in North Salt Lake to conveniently and quickly get on the I-15 corridor north bound. As those access alternatives are created and considered, the City does not want to lose its I-15 south bound Center Street exit. This facility, though only one fourth of a full interchange is an important location for individuals and businesses to gain access into North Salt Lake, its neighborhoods and its non-residential industrial areas.

The City requests that UDOT please consider a north bound access point at or near Center Street to add to or compliment the existing off-ramp. We know that this is not the only way to provide north bound access, but it seems to be a possible and convenient method of improving access to I-15.

Aesthetics

The City appreciates its partnership with UDOT in recent years as it relates to local upgrades in landscaping and overall aesthetics, particularly at the recently renovated interchanges at 2600 South and I-15 and at Redwood Road and I-215. The City participated in the upgrade of landscaping and other aesthetic improvements in these locations and we wish to continue that practice with the upcoming I-15 reconstruction. It is hoped that the City will have the opportunity throughout the process to have input on the way physical improvements look and the amount of landscaping and other features that could improve the visual quality of the project.

These comments were approved by the City Council of the City of North Salt Lake on May 3, 2022 and represent the City's official comments made during the public comment period ending May 13, 2022.

Sincerely,

Brian J. Horrocks
Mayor