



ALPINE CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA

NOTICE is hereby given that the **CITY COUNCIL** of Alpine City, Utah will hold a Public Meeting on **Tuesday, October 10, 2017** at **6:30 pm** at Alpine City Hall, 20 North Main, Alpine, Utah as follows:

6:30 pm **City Council photo – City Hall**
7:00 pm **Regular Meeting**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER *Council Members may participate electronically by phone.

A. Roll Call:	Mayor Wimmer
B. Prayer:	Kimberly Bryant
C. Pledge of Allegiance:	By invitation

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of City Council Meeting of September 26, 2017

IV. REPORTS and PRESENTATIONS

V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. Public Hearing: Pressurized Irrigation Meters:** The City Council will receive public input on the installation of pressurized irrigation meters to aid water conservation.
- B. Proposal for Mountain Bike Team Use of Lambert Park:** The City Council will consider approving a schedule for the use of Lambert Park agreed to by various high school mountain biking teams.
- C. Resolution No. 2017-18, Light Duty Diesel Emission Testing:** The City Council will consider approving a resolution in support of emission testing in Utah County for light duty diesel vehicles.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

VII. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION: Discuss litigation, property acquisition or the professional character, conduct or competency of personnel.

ADJOURN

Mayor Sheldon Wimmer
October 6, 2017

THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN ALL CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS. If you need a special accommodation to participate, please call the City Recorder's Office at (801) 756-6347 x 4.
CERTIFICATE OF POSTING. The undersigned duly appointed recorder does hereby certify that the above agenda notice was on the bulletin board located inside City Hall at 20 North Main and sent by e-mail to The Daily Herald located in Provo, UT, a local newspaper circulated in Alpine, UT. This agenda is also available on our web site at www.alpinecity.org and on the Utah Public Meeting Notices website at www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html

PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING ETIQUETTE

Please remember all public meetings and public hearings are now recorded.

- All comments **must** be recognized by the Chairperson and addressed through the microphone.
- When speaking to the Planning Commission, please stand, speak slowly and clearly into the microphone, and state your name and address for the recorded record.
- Be respectful to others and refrain from disruptions during the meeting. Please refrain from conversation with others in the audience as the microphones are very sensitive and can pick up whispers in the back of the room.
- Keep comments constructive and not disruptive.
- Avoid verbal approval or dissatisfaction of the ongoing discussion (i.e., booing or applauding).
- Exhibits (photos, petitions, etc.) given to the City become the property of the City.
- Please silence all cellular phones, beepers, pagers or other noise making devices.
- Be considerate of others who wish to speak by limiting your comments to a reasonable length, and avoiding repetition of what has already been said. Individuals may be limited to two minutes and group representatives may be limited to five minutes.
- Refrain from congregating near the doors or in the lobby area outside the council room to talk as it can be very noisy and disruptive. If you must carry on conversation in this area, please be as quiet as possible. (The doors must remain open during a public meeting/hearing.)

Public Hearing vs. Public Meeting

If the meeting is a **public hearing**, the public may participate during that time and may present opinions and evidence for the issue for which the hearing is being held. In a public hearing there may be some restrictions on participation such as time limits.

Anyone can observe a **public meeting**, but there is no right to speak or be heard there - the public participates in presenting opinions and evidence at the pleasure of the body conducting the meeting.

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Alpine City Hall, 20 N. Main, Alpine, UT
September 26, 2017

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Mayor Sheldon Wimmer.

A. Roll Call: The following were present and constituted a quorum:

Mayor Sheldon Wimmer

Council Members: Troy Stout, Ramon Beck, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott

Staff: Shane Sorensen, Charmayne Warnock, David Church, Austin Roy

Others: Robert Field, Loraine Lott, Mike Mansfield, Kris Mansfield, Annette Flygare, Vickie Mueller, Steve Cosper, Gordon Willis, Sue Willis, Carla Merrill, Mike Russon, Cori Russon, Robert Adams, Teresa Adams, Judi Pickell, Renee Barry, JT, Sylvia Christiansen, Greg Hales, Paul Kroff, Penny Linford, Clay Linford, Bridgette Server, Jane Griener, John Nield, Juanita Nield, Jim Higgins, Will Jones, Jessica Smuin

B. Prayer: Roger Bennett

C. Pledge of Allegiance: Sheldon Wimmer

II. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Minutes of City Council meeting on September 12, 2107

MOTION: Lon Lott moved to approve the Consent Calendar with corrections to the minutes of September 12, 2017 as noted. Troy Stout seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 0. Lon Lott, Roger Bennett, Ramon Beck, Troy Stout voted aye. Motion passed. Kimberly Bryant was not present at the time of the motion.

IV. REPORTS and PRESENTATIONS: None

V. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. PUBLIC HEARING – Proposed Closure of the north end of Bald Mountain Drive. Mayor Sheldon Wimmer opened the hearing for public comment.

Mike and Kris Mansfield said they lived on Bald Mountain Drive. Kris Mansfield said they wanted to express some concerns they'd had for a long time about the safety and traffic on their road. There were people of all ages driving up and down the street at speeds that far exceed the speed limit. There were kids on four-wheelers than did not have a drivers license. The people were using the road to gain access to Lambert Park and the open space that was part of their subdivision, which had been turned into a motocross park. It wasn't just the noise but the dust was a nuisance making their front yard almost useless. But safety was their biggest concerns. They had grandkids visiting at their home and other families on the street had young children. It was a hazard for them. They had put up a plastic crossing guard on the road to alert people to slow down, and it had been mowed over numerous times and drug down the road. They had talked about putting a speed bump on the road.

Mike Mansfield said they were asking the City to install a crash gate at the end of the road which would allow residents on Bald Mountain to get through in an emergency.

There were no other comments and the hearing was closed.

B. Closure of Bald Mountain Drive: Mayor Wimmer opened the discussion to the City Council.

Troy Stout said he had met several times with neighbors who lived in that area. The firing range was always brought up as an issue, especially for this neighborhood because of their proximity to it. He said that after they closed off Lambert Park to motorized vehicles, the end of Bald Mountain Drive became the access. The neighbors said they

1 were seeing an increased number of people driving up there. He said he would like the City to control the areas they
2 could control.

3
4 Ramon Beck asked what would happen if they closed it and somebody who owned property in the county needed
5 access. David Church said that a city could close a public road but they still had to make provision for access for the
6 private property owners who used the road. He said Mayor Wimmer had spoken to property owners in the county.

7
8 Mayor Wimmer said he had talked to Mike Fitzgerald who was Ken Fitzgerald's son. They talked about putting
9 barriers on the stem roads on the Fitzgerald property that came off the end of Bald Mountain Drive. Mike Fitzgerald
10 had indicated he was willing for that to happen. He indicated he was also willing to see Bald Mountain closed off as
11 long as he had access to his property.

12
13 Troy Stout asked if they had the pricing on a gate. Shane Sorensen said a locking gate cost about \$500. A crash gate
14 would be more. He said residents in the area were concerned that if Bald Mountain Road was closed off on the south
15 for some reason, they needed some way to get through on the north. If they didn't have a key, they would need a
16 crash gate.

17
18 Sheldon Wimmer said he had met with the Forest Ranger and District Ranger who said they were not opposed to
19 closing the area to shooting. They were just opposed to doing it piecemeal across the Wasatch Front. They were
20 interested in identifying other areas along the Wasatch Front where there were issues with shooting. He said he
21 would talk to the other mayors at the next MAG meeting and see if they could get a consolidated effort to close
22 those boundaries.

23
24 Lon Lott said he'd gone up there and there was a nice car trail around each one of the barricades. It appeared they
25 only slowed them down enough to go around them. Someone had shot at fence posts and shot up the signs. Mayor
26 Wimmer noted that the angle shots indicated they were either standing in Lambert Park when they were shooting,
27 and standing on forest land and shooting into the park, both of which were illegal.

28
29 The Council looked at the map to identify possible areas to block. There was a question about whether or not Bald
30 Mountain would continue to the north as shown on the masterplan. David Church said it was shown as a planned
31 road but not as an open public road. If the unincorporated land along the master-planned road came into the city and
32 was developed, the road would most likely be extended.

33
34 The Council discuss putting a gate at the end of Bald Mountain Drive with barricades farther up. Firefighting
35 equipment would still need to get through.

36
37 **MOTION:** Troy Stout moved to appropriate funding for a gate for the road and Jersey barriers to close off other
38 areas with the exact location to be determined. Trail access would be maintained for horses or a bicycle, but would
39 not be wide enough to become a four-wheel access. Kimberly Bryant seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Troy Stout,
40 Ramon Beck, Roger Bennett, Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott voted aye. Motion passed.

41
42 Roger Bennett asked about the funding. Shane Sorensen said there was money in the general fund.

43
44 Mayor Wimmer asked Chief Brian Gwilliam if he would prefer to have a crash gate or a locking gate. Brian
45 Gwilliam said a locking gate would be fine but suggested that the lock have a combination rather than a key. It was
46 easier than hunting for a key in an emergency.

47
48 In response to a question about permanent closure, David Church said the action could always be undone by any
49 future city council.

50
51 Shane Sorensen said they would need signage at the gate.

52
53 **C. Oberee Development Agreement and Grove Drive– Paul Kroff:** Mr. Kroff said he wanted to discuss
54 a proposed amendment to the Oberee Annexation Development Agreement. The Agreement was recorded in June
55 2016 when the Oberee property was annexed into Alpine City.

Mr. Kroff said he was proposing to amend Sections 5.4 and 5.5 of the Annexation Agreement which dealt with the widening and reconstruction of Grove Drive, and the connection of Elk Ridge Lane to the proposed development. The amendment would eliminate the requirement of the developer to acquire the right-of-way on the east side of Grove Drive belonging to the Josh James, and the right-of-way for property on the west side of Grove Drive belonging to the Russon and Walz. The proposed amendment would also change the timing on when the development was connected to Elk Ridge Lane. The original Agreement required the developer to connect to Elk Ridge Lane prior to platting 30 lots. The amended agreement would require the connection to Elk Ridge Lane at 11 lots. Mr. Kroff said he had submitted a draft of the proposal to David Church.

Shane Sorensen identified on the map the areas on Grove Drive which were to be improved by the developer unless Elk Ridge Lane went through. He said the proposed change was that the developer would give money to the City for the areas of Grove Drive for which he was responsible, and the City would hold it for use when the improvements were made. The other change was that the connection to Elk Ridge Lane would be completed when 11 lots developed.

David Church said that in the recorded Annexation Agreement, the developer had the obligation to fund the acquisition of the right-of-way. The City would use eminent domain to acquire the property. The issue was whether or not, with the changes the developer was proposing, was it worth it to condemn property to widen the road. The law required a city to build the improvements within a certain time period following condemnation. He said Mr. Kroff was suggesting that improving Grove Drive would not be as important if he built Elk Ridge Lane first. The developer was not just proposing a simple reordering of events. The proposal would take away their obligation to fund the condemnation. He said the condemnation would be difficult and costly because the landowners were unwilling to provide the ROW. Secondly, if the ROW was condemned, the City would be required to build the road in a timely manner.

Paul Kroff said the necessary ROW on both sides of Grove Drive belonged the Russons and the James. The rest of the ROW was on Zolman's property which they would dedicate to the City.

Paul Kroff identified the 11 lots on the concept plan that would be developed prior to the connection of Elk Ridge Lane. If they could sell those lots, then they would have the money to build the connecting road.

Steve Cospers, Chairman of the Planning Commission, said they had quite a history with the proposed development on the Oberee property. They had approved a concept plan, then Paul Kroff came back with a culdesac option that was longer than the ordinance allowed so they weren't in favor of it. The Planning Commission was more in favor of constructing the connection to Elk Ridge Lane to take the pressure off Grove Drive.

Troy Stout said that if they allowed Elk Ridge Lane to go through, which would happen anyway, it would take the developer off the hook for the condemnation, and the City would get the same thing in the end.

David Church said that may or may not be true. Grove Drive would not be improved until the properties along it were developed. The City was not in the business of developing roads for developers. He asked the Council to consider if they were willing to pass a resolution authorizing a condemnation, and then authorize \$900,000 to construct the City's share of Grove Drive. If they were not willing to do that, they would want to consider making Elk Ridge Lane the main road and Grove Drive a secondary road, which wouldn't be widened until other property was developed.

Lon Lott asked if the property was in the urban wildland interface zone, which required a second access when the first home was built. Shane Sorensen said the eleven lots identified by Paul Kroff were not located in the urban wildland interface zone. If some lots were inside the zone, an exception was available that would have to be reviewed by the fire chief.

Troy Stout suggested that the residents of Alpine Cove might put pressure on the City to widen Grove Drive since they had been annexed.

Shane Sorensen said one thing they hadn't talked about was the impact of widening and reconstructing Grove Drive on the residents that used the road. There were a lot more residents who traveled down Grove Drive than down Fort

Canyon, and with the difficulties and inconveniences they'd experienced in Fort Canyon, he anticipated widening Grove Drive would be a real challenge.

MOTION: Roger Bennett moved to approve the amended Oberee Annexation Agreement as proposed. Ramon Beck seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Roger Bennett, Ramon Beck, Troy Stout, Lon Lott, Kimberly Bryant voted aye. Motion passed.

D. Road through Lambert Park: At their previous meeting, the City Council had reviewed three options for a secondary access road through Lambert Park, and then referred the issue to the Planning Commission for a recommendation. The Planning Commission reviewed the three options and recommended keeping the existing secondary access road that extended to Moyle Drive, and for the road to remain unpaved.

Steve Cosper said there was a five to two vote on the issue.

Troy Stout said that if they built a road along the border of Lambert Park and the National Forest, they could abandon the road that went to Moyle Drive. They could avoid paving the road that divided Lambert Park, and sacrificing the trails. He said he would like to see a road that impacted the park as little as possible. The road on the southwest side still dissected the park.

Kimberly Bryant said she felt the same way as Troy Stout. She said the developer of Box Elder South went to the County to get more density and got what they wanted. But it was not the responsibility of the City to build a road for them and tear up the park. The developer had played the County to get what they wanted and was now coming back to the City to build a road.

Lon Lott said he felt the upper road along the Forest Service boundary would be an even more visible dissection of the park because of the elevation, but safety was still an issue. There were people living up there and they needed a safe way in and out. He said the road to Moyle Drive looked like it needed to be graded again, especially if they had to get a fire truck up there.

Troy Stout said the people who bought lots up there knew what they were buying. He didn't think the City was obligated to pave the road.

Sheldon Wimmer suggested they consider a fourth possibility. There was an existing road in Lambert Park that came down to the LDS Stake Center. It would be for emergency access only. The road that came out onto Moyle Drive had a hump in it because there was a water main underneath it and a box culvert. He said he thought they should look at another option where a fire truck could get through. If the existing gravel road that came out by the stake center was used for secondary access, they could put up fences along it to keep traffic from spreading into the park, and put in a gate to provide maintenance access to the water tank and head gates. The road would have to be improved but would remain unpaved. It would allow emergency vehicles to get up there.

MOTION: Troy Stout moved to reject proposed options for a secondary access road through Lambert Park and leave Moyle Drive as the secondary access, and the road remain unpaved. Kimberly Bryant seconded. Ayes: 4 Nays: 1 Troy Stout, Kimberly Bryant, Ramon Beck, Lon Lott vote aye. Roger Bennett voted nay. He said he would prefer to see the road paved. Motion passed.

Troy Stout asked if a super majority vote was required to pave the secondary road to Moyle Drive.

David Church said the Moyle Drive secondary access obligation came from the Settlement Agreement in 1992 when the City approved the Box Elder subdivision. The road had been on the master plan as a regular road since 1992. When it was originally planned, the City Council didn't have the same vision for Lambert Park as they currently did. Mr. Church said people should not think that the secondary road was pushed onto them by the approval of Box Elder South. Paving the road had been an issue since the first resident moved into the Box Elder subdivision. He added that the Box Elder subdivision was located in Alpine City limits.

Mayor Wimmer said there was an actual road through Lambert Park that was used in 1887 to bring logs off the mountain. There were outflows from floods up on the mountain.

Jim Higgins said he lived on Alpine Boulevard and would like to speak to the issue of roads in Lambert Park. He said the Council was talking about only grading the secondary road but he wondered if there was a loophole which implied the developer could pave the road. He was told no. He asked if there had been an impact study on the roads that they were bringing to north Country Manor Drive. Mr. Higgins said he was concerned that if they did find another route, they may lessen the impact on Lambert Park, but they would potentially be running another two hundred cars down Alpine Boulevard. He said he had come talked to the Council a year ago about the traffic and speeding problems on Alpine Boulevard. He'd done his own study on the impact on Alpine Boulevard and had a ton of data which he gave to the developer. He said that if they were considering an option to funnel more traffic onto Alpine Boulevard, he was absolutely against it. He said he was against any road being built through Lambert Park. He said it felt like they were solving for someone else's issue.

Jessica Smuin on Moyle Drive said she wanted to explore the possibility of a conservation easement for Lambert Park. The Council spent so much time and resources on problems in Lambert Park so what about exploring a conservation easement for Lambert Park. Draper City just did it and it must be a viable thing.

Sheldon Wimmer said that a conservation issue was one of the things they could study as part of the Lambert Master Plan.

Troy Stout said a conservation easement was something worth exploring.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

Chief Brian Gwilliam said the recent house fire on 100 West was believed to have been started with an electrical cord in the garage. Propane tanks in the garage were probably responsible for the explosion. The woman who lived there was a crossing guard and a renter with no renters insurance, and she lost everything. The police department was helping out. He said it was fortunate that no one was injured.

Charmayne Warnock said it was time for a City Council photo and wanted to know when everyone would be present at a meeting so she could schedule a photographer. The Council agreed to have a photo taken at the next meeting on October 10th at 6:30 pm.

Shane Sorensen reported on the following:

- A company had come out pulled the pump on the Healey well. He would hopefully of a report on the damage at the next meeting.
- The bid for the overlay project would be awarded at the next meeting.
- A public hearing on PI metering was scheduled for the meeting of October 10th. The notice had gone out in the Newslane.
- Fort Canyon Road paving. He said the gas line going up the canyon was holding them up. October 16th was the tentative paving date. The lower phases of Three Falls subdivision would also be paved.
- Ten days ago, there was a significant storm in Alpine which had popped some storm drains. They would need to tear up part of Creekside Park to take care of some bends, which would alleviate some problems. They would repave that section of street. There were other areas that also needed to be addressed including the storm drain from 600 North to Fort Creek. He would be coming back with a multilocation storm drain project.

VII. COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

Kimberly Bryant said she had received calls from citizens in Fort Canyon wanting to hook onto the City's water system, and wanted to know what would be involved in that. David Church said it was like any other hookup. They needed to bring in water shares.

Shane Sorensen said there were two situations in Fort Canyon. Some people were on wells and had access to the water main. There were other residents on wells who did not have access. He asked Kimberly if she had the names

of the citizens so he could contact them. There could be a problem with a cross connection if the quality of their well water didn't meet City specs.

Ramon Beck clarified that they would not lose their well right if they hooked onto the system. He said he'd had another complaint about speeding on 200 North from Mr. Goodsell. Mayor Wimmer said they received complaints about speeding from all over Alpine. Perhaps they should look into hiring a policeman just to write speeding tickets in Alpine.

Ross Welch said he would like to respond to some misinformation. When the developer first brought Box Elder South to the City for approval, the City said no, they wanted it to be a park. They had a letter from the mayor telling them to seek development in the county, which they did. He said they were not playing the county against the City. He said Troy Stout had come to him and asked for options for a road in Lambert Park. He said they were not trying to carve up Lambert Park. The proposal for roads in the park was not their request. Mr. Welch said he would like to see the secondary access road paved as required by the urban wildland ordinance.

Troy Stout reported on the following:

- He said he had calls from residents in the Bald Mountain Drive area about flooding generated by the storm. Sheldon Wimmer said the City was aware of it and had been up to look at it. They had some ideas about what could be done. They were also working with NRCS to come up with solutions.
- He asked where they were on code enforcement on violations in public open spaces. Shane Sorensen the City Planner, Austin Roy, was brand new and there were many aspects to his job. As he came up to speed on the Planning Commission, he would begin other issues such as code enforcement. Open space enforcement was difficult. In one situation they had an Eagle Scout clean up some open space where neighborhood kids had built a fort and parents were upset that it was taken down. Troy Stout said he was more concerned about people landscaping onto public open space. There was a problem with water on trails because adjacent property owners had landscaped and sprinkled out into the open space.

Mayor Sheldon Wimmer reported on the Lone Peak Public Safety meeting. They had received the audit report from the State Auditor John Dougall. He provided a copy of the report to the Council. There were six findings in the report. Some of the items were already remedied. The first was that the Board could improve their oversight and be more proactive in setting policies, etc. over the fire department activities. It was recommended they adopt a Code of Ethics. Another finding was failure to retain adequate documentation on vehicles. There was no wrongdoing, it was just procedural. The third finding was inadequate control of credit cards and it was recommended they develop a policy, which had been done. The fourth item was lack of adequate policies over high risk areas. The Board had improved that. The fifth finding was increased risk by using credit cards versus purchase cards. The sixth item was automatic payroll deductions for the employee association. The recommendation was that they cease the payroll deductions. Also included in the report were allegations made against the department. They were investigated and the findings were included in the report. Mayor Wimmer said they would begin interviewing for the position of fire chief. They had 16 applicants and had reduced the number to six. One had withdrawn so they added another one. They would begin interviewing applicants in October.

Mayor Wimmer said he was working with the Division of Forestry and State Land on Firewise Community. More information would be provided at a future meeting.

VIII. EXECUTIVE SESSION: None held

MOTION: Kimberly Bryant moved to adjourn. Ramon Beck seconded. Ayes: 5 Nays: 0. Kimberly Bryant, Lon Lott, Roger Bennett, Ramon Beck, Troy Stout voted aye. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

SUBJECT: Public Hearing – Pressurized Irrigation Meters

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: October 10, 2017

PETITIONER: City Staff

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Receive public input on the installation of PI meters

APPLICABLE STATUTE OR ORDINANCE: N/A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

In 2014, Horrocks Engineers and City Staff presented information related to updating the City's Pressurized Irrigation Master Plan. Different scenarios were presented for supplying for the future irrigation needs of the City, including system improvements and cost estimates. The City Council voted for the option that included water conservation as part of the plan. There was discussion that installing meters on the PI system would help with the conservation required for this option.

At the January 10, 2017, City Council meeting, the City Council approved Resolution 2017-02 authorizing City Staff to apply for the WaterSmart grant from the Bureau of Reclamation to install individual meters on the pressurized irrigation system. The City applied for and was recently granted the maximum allowable grant of \$1M.

The City Council requested a public hearing to get public input on installation of the meters. City Staff will show a brief presentation prior to the public hearing being opened for comment.

<p>Recommended Action: Receive public comment on the installation of individual meters on the pressurized irrigation system.</p>

Alpine City

PRESSURIZED IRRIGATION METER PROJECT



HORROCKS
ENGINEERS

Pressurized Irrigation Meter Project

- Alpine City was awarded a \$1,000,000 grant from the Bureau of Reclamation for PI water metering.
- Total project cost projected to be \$2,500,000.
- Tentatively projected to be constructed over two summer construction seasons with the potential of compressing into one.
- Project includes
 - Installing a meter on each PI service connection in the City
 - Installing an automatic radio meter reading system



HORROCKS

ENGINEERS

PI Meter Benefits

- Water conservation enhancement
- Enhanced service, with conservation
- Real time data collection – available to user
- Leak detection
- Usage based billing, beyond normal landscape requirements
- System wide capital cost reduction, with conservation
- System wide operation and maintenance cost reduction, with and without conservation
- Mandated metering?



Water Conservation

- Saratoga Springs – 40% reduction
- WBWCD – 23% reduction
- Payson City – 15% reduction
- Conservation based billing
 - Designed for conservation goals
 - Base rate for optimum water requirements
 - Escalating overage rate
 - Cost for those who utilize only the optimum would remain the approximately the same
 - Users who want to use more will fund the necessary improvements to meet the demand



Saratoga Springs Residential Irrigation Calculator

My lot size	0.25	acres
My old base rate	\$26.18	per month
My new base rate	\$16.25	per month
My monthly water allotment	27.20	thousand gallons
Water Usage	25	thousand gallons
Tier 1 (up to 75% of allotment)	\$7.14	\$0.35 per 1,000 gallons
Tier 2 (75% to 100% of allotment)	\$4.60	\$1.00 per 1,000 gallons
Tier 3 (100% to 150% of allotment)	\$0.00	\$1.25 per 1,000 gallons
Tier 4 (150% to 200% of allotment)	\$0.00	\$2.00 per 1,000 gallons
Tier 5 (200% to 250% of allotment)	\$0.00	\$3.00 per 1,000 gallons
Tier 6 (above 250% of allotment)	\$0.00	\$3.80 per 1,000 gallons
Monthly Secondary Water Bill	\$27.99	
Monthly savings during winter months	\$9.93	

To find your lot size go to the County website below the link. Enter your address and then click on your lot to find your lot size to 1 decimal point.

Input your information into these cells



SARATOGA SPRINGS

Pressurized Irrigation Water Demand

- Pre-Pressurized Irrigation Usage – 3.3 gpm per acre
- Division of Drinking Water Standard – 3.39 gpm per acre
- Pressurized Irrigation Design – 7.2 gpm per acre
- 2012 Usage – 10.1 gpm per acre
- 2013 Usage – 8.8 gpm per acre
- 2017 Usage – ____ gpm per acre



Pressurized Irrigation Options

- Develop conservation plan and obtain 25% water savings
 - Public education
 - Water use scheduling
 - Metering and billing for usage
- Continue at full water usage and provide facilities to accommodate
 - New water sources
 - Booster pump facilities
 - New storage facilities
 - Increase water main sizes
 - Water Rights



(2014) Preliminary Buildout Cost Estimate with Conservation

Buildout Improvements with 25 Percent Conservation

Item	Description	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
1	Mobilization	1	LS	----	\$42,400.00
2	400 West Booster Expansion	1	Each	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
3	Lambert Booster	1	Each	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00
4	10 inch Upsize 400 West	1200	LF	\$115.00	\$138,000.00
5	12 Inch Bald Mountain Connection	3200	LF	\$100.00	\$320,000.00
6	12 Inch Pack Meadows Connection	1900	LF	\$100.00	\$190,000.00
Sub Total (Construction)					\$890,400.00
Contingencies		15%			\$133,560.00
Land		-	SF	\$3.75	\$0.00
Right of Way		-	SF	\$1.88	\$0.00
Total (Construction)					\$1,023,960.00
Design and Construction Engineering		15%			\$133,560.00
Administration, Legal, and Bond Counsel		1%			\$8,904.00
Total (Professional Services)					\$142,464.00
Grand Total					\$1,166,424.00

Feb 2014 CCI = 9681



HORROCKS
ENGINEERS

(2014) Preliminary Buildout Cost Estimate at Full Water Usage

Buildout Improvements to Maintain Full Water Usage

Item	Description	Quantity	Units	Unit Cost	Cost
1	Mobilization	1	LS	---	\$387,175.00
2	New Low Zone Concrete Storage Tank	1500000	Gallons	\$0.90	\$1,350,000.00
3	CUP Booster and Filter Station	1	Each	\$600,000.00	\$600,000.00
4	400 West Booster Expansion	1	Each	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00
5	Lambert Booster	1	Each	\$300,000.00	\$300,000.00
6	12 inch CUP Transmission Line	2800	LF	\$100.00	\$280,000.00
7	18 inch Upsize Healey to Ridge Drive	3500	LF	\$165.00	\$577,500.00
8	18 inch Dual Transmission Ridge to Tank	10000	LF	\$165.00	\$1,650,000.00
9	12 inch Upsize 400 West	3200	LF	\$130.00	\$416,000.00
10	New Low Zone Filter Station	1	Each	\$200,000.00	\$200,000.00
11	New Well (1000 gpm)	1	Each	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
12	12 Inch Bald Mountain Connection	4800	LF	\$100.00	\$480,000.00
13	12 Inch Pack Meadows Connection	1900	LF	\$100.00	\$190,000.00
14	Misc Waterline Up-size	5000	LF	\$110.00	\$550,000.00
Sub Total (Construction)					\$8,130,675.00
Contingencies					\$1,219,601.25
Land					\$75,000.00
Right of Way					\$78,750.00
Total (Construction)					\$9,504,026.25
Design and Construction Engineering					\$1,219,601.25
Administration, Legal, and Bond Counsel					\$81,306.75
Total (Professional Services)					\$1,300,908.00
Grand Total					\$10,804,934.25

Feb 2014 CCI = 9681



HORROCKS
ENGINEERS

ALPINE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

SUBJECT: Proposal for Mountain Bike Team Use of Lambert Park

FOR CONSIDERATION ON: October 10, 2017

PETITIONER: Councilman Stout/Councilman Lott

ACTION REQUESTED BY PETITIONER: Consider proposal for allowing mountain bike teams to use Lambert Park for training

APPLICABLE STATUTE OR ORDINANCE: N/A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Councilman Troy Stout and Councilman Lon Lott recently met with representatives from the local high school mountain bike teams to discuss their use of Lambert Park for training. Various items and issues were discussed. Following is the proposed schedule and other requirements for allowing them to use Lambert Park for training:

- Practice times would be Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday nights and Saturday mornings, with each practice being 2 hours.
- A Google doc will be created showing which teams is scheduled for each time slot.
- The teams will also provide service hours to help with maintenance and projects within the park. A Google doc will be created to track service hours.

Recommended Action: The City Council consider approval of the proposed plan for mountain bike teams to make use of Lambert park for training.

RESOLUTION NO. R2017-18

A RESOLUTION OF THE ALPINE CITY COUNCIL SUPPORTING EMISSION TESTING FOR LIGHT DUTY DIESEL VEHICLES IN UTAH COUNTY.

WHEREAS, the safety, health, and well-being of Alpine City residents is profoundly affected by air quality of Utah County; and

WHEREAS, Utah County still remains out of attainment with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for PM2.5, and vehicles are the main contributor to that pollution; and

WHEREAS, the 20,266 light duty diesel vehicles registered in Utah County, representing 5.6% of all vehicles in the County, are not currently subject to any emissions testing requirement, unlike such vehicles in all other populous counties along the Wasatch Front; and

WHEREAS, pollution from a failing diesel vehicles is four times that of a compliant diesel vehicle and seven or eight times that of an average gasoline vehicle, according to a recent Davis County/University of Utah study; and

WHEREAS, light duty vehicles tested in David County are eight to nine times more likely to fail emissions testing than comparable gas vehicles, and nearly six percent of new vehicles in Salt Lake County fail to meet emissions standards; and

WHEREAS, diesel vehicles built in 2008 or later, unlike those built earlier, have computerized on-board diagnostics that allow easy, inexpensive testing with minimal software upgrades at present vehicle testing facilities, and such testing is effective in reducing NOx and PM emissions; and

WHEREAS, all owners of gasoline-powered vehicles in the state pay for emissions testing to help reduce pollution, but Utah County owners of diesel vehicles or exempted from the cost, yet contribute more pollution per vehicles than do gasoline vehicles in NOx and PM2.5.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF ALPINE, UTAH to support expansion of the current vehicle inspection/maintenance (IM) program of Utah County to include testing for diesel vehicles under 14,000 lbs built in 2008 or later, together with simple visual inspection of light-duty diesel vehicles built before that time.

PASSED and APPROVED this 10th day of October 2017.

ALPINE CITY

Sheldon Wimmer, Mayor

ATTEST:

Charmayne G. Warnock, City Recorder

Diesel Emissions Testing Bill

This bill would require all counties within the PM_{2.5} non-attainment area to implement diesel emissions testing programs. Testing would be restricted to light and medium duty on-road vehicles (under 14,000 lbs). Agricultural and construction vehicles would be exempt. Counties will still be allowed to have more stringent standards.

Diesel exhaust contains pollutants such as NO_x, VOCs, and PM_{2.5}. Vehicles contribute nearly 50% of Utah's air pollution, and the state remains in serious violation of federal health standards.

Overview

- Diesel emission testing is currently implemented in all counties that require gasoline emissions testing except for Utah County.
- This legislation would **only apply to most light and medium duty vehicles, 14,000 lbs. or less**. Current exemptions for agricultural and vintage vehicles remain unchanged. Additional exemptions mirror the regulations of counties currently implementing diesel emissions testing.
- **This policy would have net positive benefits for air quality, which impacts public health and economic development.**



HEALTH CONCERNS

Short and long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} can:

- Decrease lung function
- Decrease immune system efficiency
- Cause cardiovascular & respiratory problems
- Increase cancer rates
- Increase mortality rates

Why Test Diesel Vehicles?

Light & medium-duty diesels are **approximately 8-9x more likely to fail emissions testing** than comparable gas vehicles.

The total PM_{2.5} emissions from a failing diesel vehicle are **quadruple** the PM_{2.5} pollution of a compliant diesels

In Jan 2017, Weber County instituted testing of light & medium-duty diesel vehicles. During the first month of testing, **14.2% of diesel vehicles failed, and 34% of these vehicles were 2008 and newer.**

Salt Lake County reported **nearly 6% of new diesel vehicles (2011-2016 model years) failed** to meet emissions standards.

SUPPORTED BY: Orem City Council, Provo Mayor, and Provo Municipal Council

FISCAL NOTE: Owners of diesel vehicles covered by the bill would be required to pay the emissions inspection fee currently paid by owners of gasoline vehicles, which averages \$25 per inspection. There could be a slight increase in revenue to inspection stations and counties.

Diesel Emissions Testing Bill

Effects of Diesel Emissions Testing in UTAH COUNTY:

(Data from Utah Division of Air Quality in Feb 2017)

- **Over 16,570 diesel vehicles are registered in Utah County**, representing 4.5% of daily miles driven
- Diesel emissions testing would **reduce air pollution by 170 tons/year**, representing the third largest source of avoided emissions in Utah County
- Current inspection and maintenance programs in Utah County have the capacity to implement diesel emissions testing (called OBDII testing) – they would **only require an update to existing software**
- **Cost of program is \$3000-\$3500 per ton of emissions reduced** – in comparison to other emission reduction programs, this is inexpensive and within acceptable cost per ton ranges. The average cost for point sources (industry) is \$25,000 per ton.

Diesel Vehicles in Utah Non-attainment Areas:

- All vehicles are responsible for **nearly 50% of air pollution emissions** in the seven-county non-attainment area (Utah, Salt Lake, Davis, Weber, Cache, Box Elder and Tooele)
- Together, **heavy- and light-duty DIESEL vehicles account for 64% of on-road fine particulate matter emissions (PM2.5)** and 47% of on-road nitrogen oxide emissions (NOx)
- **Light-duty DIESEL truck use** in the non-attainment area is **twice the national average**
- **Utah County is the only county within the non-attainment area that does not have a diesel emissions testing program.**

Questions? Please don't hesitate to contact us!

Jessica Reimer, Policy Associate, HEAL Utah

Jessica@healutah.org

801-502-3883

Michael Shea, Senior Policy Associate, HEAL Utah

Michael@healutah.org

801-706-1885

Diesel Emissions Testing Bill

General Description:

This bill amends requirements for emissions testing of motor vehicles.

Highlighted Provisions:

This bill:

- restricts the authority of a county to exempt a motor vehicle from an emissions test;
- amends exemptions to emissions testing; and
- makes technical changes.

Money Appropriated in this Bill:

None

Other Special Clauses:

Utah Code Sections Affected:

AMENDS:

41-1a-226, as last amended by Laws of Utah 2015, Chapter 400

41-6a-1642, as last amended by Laws of Utah 2015, Chapter 258

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the state of Utah:

Section 1. Section **41-1a-226** is amended to read:

41-1a-226. Vintage vehicle -- Signed statement -- Registration.

(1) The owner of a vintage vehicle who applies for registration under this part shall provide a signed statement that the vintage vehicle:

- (a) is owned and operated for the purposes described in Section 41-21-1; and
- (b) is safe to operate on the highways of this state as described in Section 41-21-4.

(2) The signed statement described in Subsection (1) is in lieu of:

- (a) a safety inspection, from which a vintage vehicle is exempt under Subsection 41-1a-205(3); and
- (b) an emissions inspection, from which a vintage vehicle is exempt under Subsection 41-6a-1642~~[(3)]~~(4).

Section 2. Section **41-6a-1642** is amended to read:

41-6a-1642. Emissions inspection -- County program.

(1) The legislative body of each county required under federal law to utilize a motor vehicle emissions inspection and maintenance program or in which an emissions inspection and maintenance program is necessary to attain or maintain any national ambient air quality standard shall require:

(a) a certificate of emissions inspection, a waiver, or other evidence the motor vehicle is exempt from emissions inspection and maintenance program requirements be presented:

- (i) as a condition of registration or renewal of registration; and
- (ii) at other times as the county legislative body may require to enforce inspection requirements for individual motor vehicles, except that the county legislative body may not routinely require a certificate of ~~[emission]~~ emissions inspection, or waiver of the certificate, more often than required under Subsection ~~[(6)]~~ (9); and

(b) compliance with this section for a motor vehicle registered or principally operated in the county and owned by or being used by a department, division, instrumentality, agency, or employee of:

- (i) the federal government;

(ii) the state and any of its agencies; or

(iii) a political subdivision of the state, including school districts.

57 (2) (a) The legislative body of a county identified in Subsection (1), in consultation
58 with the Air Quality Board created under Section 19-1-106, shall make regulations or
59 ordinances regarding:
60 (i) emissions standards;
61 (ii) test procedures;
62 (iii) inspections stations;
63 (iv) repair requirements and dollar limits for correction of deficiencies; and
64 (v) certificates of emissions inspections.
65 ~~[(b) The regulations or ordinances shall:]~~
66 (b) In accordance with Subsection (2)(a), a county legislative body:
67 (i) ~~[be made]~~ shall make regulations or ordinances to attain or maintain ambient air
68 quality standards in the county, consistent with the state implementation plan and federal
69 requirements;
70 (ii) may allow for a phase-in of the program by geographical area; and
71 (iii) ~~[be compliant]~~ shall comply with the analyzer design and certification
72 requirements contained in the state implementation plan prepared under Title 19, Chapter 2,
73 Air Conservation Act.
74 (c) The county legislative body and the Air Quality Board shall give preference to an
75 inspection and maintenance program that ~~[is]~~:
76 (i) is decentralized, to the extent the decentralized program will attain and maintain
77 ambient air quality standards and meet federal requirements;
78 (ii) is the most cost effective means to achieve and maintain the maximum benefit with
79 regard to ambient air quality standards and to meet federal air quality requirements as related to
80 vehicle emissions; and
81 (iii) ~~[providing]~~ provides a reasonable phase-out period for replacement of air pollution
82 emission testing equipment made obsolete by the program.
83 (d) The provisions of Subsection (2)(c)(iii) apply only to the extent the phase-out:
84 (i) may be accomplished in accordance with applicable federal requirements; and
85 (ii) does not otherwise interfere with the attainment and maintenance of ambient air
86 quality standards.
87 (3) Except for the statewide exemptions provided in Subsection (4) and except as
88 provided in Subsection (6), a legislative body of a county described in Subsection (1) may not
89 exempt a motor vehicle from an emissions inspection program.
90 ~~[(3)]~~ (4) The following vehicles are exempt from an emissions inspection program and
91 the provisions of this section:
92 (a) an implement of husbandry as defined in Section 41-1a-102;
93 (b) a motor vehicle that:
94 (i) meets the definition of a farm truck under Section 41-1a-102; and
95 (ii) has a gross vehicle weight rating of 12,001 pounds or more;
96 (c) a vintage vehicle as defined in Section 41-21-1;
97 (d) a custom vehicle as defined in Section 41-6a-1507; ~~[and]~~
98 (e) to the extent allowed under the current federally approved state implementation
99 plan, in accordance with the federal Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. Sec. 7401, et seq., a motor
100 vehicle that is less than two years old on January 1 based on the age of the vehicle as
101 determined by the model year identified by the manufacturer[-];
102 ~~[(4) (a) The legislative body of a county identified in Subsection (1) shall exempt]~~
103 (f) a pickup truck, as defined in Section 41-1a-102, with a gross vehicle weight rating
104 of 12,000 pounds or less [from the emission inspection requirements of this section], if the
105 registered owner of the pickup truck provides a signed statement to the legislative body stating
106 the truck is used:
107 (i) by the owner or operator of a farm located on property that qualifies as land in
108 agricultural use under Sections 59-2-502 and 59-2-503; and
109 (ii) exclusively for the following purposes in operating the farm:
110 (A) for the transportation of farm products, including livestock and its products,
111 poultry and its products, floricultural and horticultural products; and

112 (B) in the transportation of farm supplies, including tile, fence, and every other thing or
113 commodity used in agricultural, floricultural, horticultural, livestock, and poultry production
114 and maintenance[-];
115 (g) a motorcycle as defined in Section 41-1a-102;
116 (h) a motor vehicle powered solely by electric power; and

117 (i) a motor vehicle with a model year of 1967 or older.
118 ~~[(b)]~~ (5) The county shall ~~[provide]~~ issue to the registered owner who signs and
119 submits a signed statement under ~~[this section]~~ Subsection (4)(f) a certificate of exemption
120 from emission inspection requirements for purposes of registering the exempt vehicle.
121 (6) A legislative body of a county described in Subsection (1) may exempt from an
122 emissions inspection program a diesel powered motor vehicle with a:
123 (a) gross vehicle weight rating of more than 14,000 pounds; or
124 (b) model year 1997 or older.
125 (7) A legislative body of a county described in Subsection (1) shall require:
126 (a) a visual inspection of emissions equipment for a diesel-powered motor vehicle with
127 a gross vehicle weight rating of 14,000 pounds or less that was manufactured after 1997; and
128 (b) a computerized emissions inspection for a diesel-powered motor vehicle
129 manufactured after 2007 with a gross vehicle weight rating of 14,000 pounds or less.
130 ~~[(5)]~~ (8) (a) Subject to Subsection ~~[(5)]~~ (8)(c), the legislative body of each county
131 required under federal law to utilize a motor vehicle emissions inspection and maintenance
132 program or in which an emissions inspection and maintenance program is necessary to attain or
133 maintain any national ambient air quality standard may require each college or university
134 located in a county subject to this section to require its students and employees who park a
135 motor vehicle not registered in a county subject to this section to provide proof of compliance
136 with an emissions inspection accepted by the county legislative body if the motor vehicle is
137 parked on the college or university campus or property.
138 (b) College or university parking areas that are metered or for which payment is
139 required per use are not subject to the requirements of this Subsection ~~[(5)]~~ (8).
140 (c) The legislative body of a county shall make the reasons for implementing the
141 provisions of this Subsection ~~[(5)]~~ (8) part of the record at the time that the county legislative
142 body takes its official action to implement the provisions of this Subsection ~~[(5)]~~ (8).
143 ~~[(6)]~~ (9) (a) An emissions inspection station shall issue a certificate of emissions
144 inspection for each motor vehicle that meets the inspection and maintenance program
145 requirements established in rules made under Subsection (2).
146 (b) The frequency of the emissions inspection ~~[shall be]~~ is determined based on the age
147 of the vehicle as determined by model year and shall be required annually subject to the

148 provisions of Subsection ~~[(6)]~~ (9)(c).
149 (c) (i) To the extent allowed under the current federally approved state implementation
150 plan, in accordance with the federal Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. Sec. 7401 et seq., the legislative
151 body of a county identified in Subsection (1) shall only require the emissions inspection every
152 two years for each vehicle.
153 (ii) The provisions of Subsection ~~[(6)]~~ (9)(c)(i) apply only to a vehicle that is less than
154 six years old on January 1.
155 (iii) For a county required to implement a new vehicle emissions inspection and
156 maintenance program on or after December 1, 2012, under Subsection (1), but for which no
157 current federally approved state implementation plan exists, a vehicle shall be tested at a
158 frequency determined by the county legislative body, in consultation with the Air Quality
159 Board created under Section 19-1-106, that is necessary to comply with federal law or attain or
160 maintain any national ambient air quality standard.
161 (iv) If a county legislative body establishes or changes the frequency of a vehicle
162 emissions inspection and maintenance program under Subsection ~~[(6)]~~ (9)(c)(iii), the
163 establishment or change shall take effect on January 1 if the State Tax Commission receives
164 notice meeting the requirements of Subsection ~~[(6)]~~ (9)(c)(v) from the county prior to October
165 1.

166 (v) The notice described in Subsection ~~[(6)]~~ (9)(c)(iv) shall:
167 (A) state that the county will establish or change the frequency of the vehicle emissions
168 inspection and maintenance program under this section;
169 (B) include a copy of the ordinance establishing or changing the frequency; and
170 (C) if the county establishes or changes the frequency under this section, state how
171 frequently the emissions testing will be required.
172 (d) If an emissions inspection is only required every two years for a vehicle under
173 Subsection ~~[(6)]~~ (9)(c), the inspection shall be required for the vehicle in:
174 (i) odd-numbered years for vehicles with odd-numbered model years; or
175 (ii) in even-numbered years for vehicles with even-numbered model years.
176 ~~[(7)]~~ (10) The emissions inspection shall be required within the same time limit
177 applicable to a safety inspection under Section 41-1a-205.
178 ~~[(8)]~~ (11) (a) A county identified in Subsection (1) shall collect information about and
179 monitor the program.
180 (b) A county identified in Subsection (1) shall supply this information to an appropriate
181 legislative committee, as designated by the Legislative Management Committee, at times
182 determined by the designated committee to identify program needs, including funding needs.
183 ~~[(9)]~~ (12) If approved by the county legislative body, a county that had an established
184 emissions inspection fee as of January 1, 2002, may increase the established fee that an
185 emissions inspection station may charge by \$2.50 for each year that is exempted from
186 emissions inspections under Subsection ~~[(6)]~~ (9)(c) up to a \$7.50 increase.
187 ~~[(40)]~~ (13) (a) A county identified in Subsection (1) may impose a local emissions
188 compliance fee on each motor vehicle registration within the county in accordance with the
189 procedures and requirements of Section 41-1a-1223.
190 (b) A county that imposes a local emissions compliance fee shall use revenues
191 generated from the fee for the establishment and enforcement of an emissions inspection and
192 maintenance program in accordance with the requirements of this section.
193 Section 3. **Effective date.**
194 Undetermined at this time.