



AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
MARCH 19, 2024
WORK SESSION MINUTES

Members Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member
Staci Carroll	Council Member
Ernie John	Council Member * <i>electronically</i>

Members Absent

Tim Holley	Council Member
------------	----------------

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Assistant City Administrator
Stephanie Finau	Deputy Recorder
Patrick O'Brien	Development Services Director
Sam Kelly	Public Works Director
Al Scott	Assistant Public Works Director
Anna Montoya	Finance Officer
Cherylyn Egner	Legal Counsel
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief
Cameron Paul	Police Chief

Also present: Ben Hunter (Engineer)

The American Fork City Council held a work session on Tuesday, March 19, 2024, in the American Fork City Administration Conference Room, located at 51 E. Main Street, commencing at 4:00 p.m.

WORK SESSION

1. Discussion on the fiscal year 2025 water, sewer, storm drain, and sanitation funds.

Ms. Montoya went over the utility funds (enterprise funds) based on utility bills, which is where the revenues come from.

CULINARY WATER

Revenues

- No rate increase – growth only (pending rate study)
- CDBG grant - Phase 11 - \$350,000.

Ms. Montoya stated that there are no rate increases and that there is a rate study going on right now. If there are rate increases, it will come back to the Council. The budget includes an increase for growth only.

Expenditures

- Personnel – increase 5.1%.
- Operations – increase \$183,09 or 5.1%.
 - ✓ Depreciation increase
 - ✓ Water assessments (CUP) increasing.
 - ✓ Administrative charges – overhead costs – increasing.

She reported that there isn't a lot of change when it comes to expenses other than the capital decreasing because the water line project is being finished up. The operations increase is 5% due to the depreciation increase of CUP and fees are expected to increase as well as administrative charges. She mentioned that there is depreciation and administrative charges increased through each utility fund.

- Capital Projects
 - ✓ 36" waterline replacement complete in FY2024
 - ✓ Continue 100 E Waterline Replacement 500 N to 700 N & Pacific Drive to 300 N
 - ✓ New projects – Water main replacement State St (in conjunction w/UDOT betterment 500 E to PG; Boley well repairs)
- Debt service – decrease for waterline bonds per debt service schedule (offset by transfer from impact fees)

Ms. Montoya stated there is a new project expected for the water main replacement in conjunction with the UDOT betterment, from 500 East to Pleasant Grove city limits.

Mr. Bunker added that they need to come up with a user rate for the pressurized irrigation study, which is currently a flat fee. The metering project is almost complete, and the city will be close to having all the meters read on a monthly basis once the irrigation system comes online. He stated that the rate study needed to be done to understand what the charges will be for the volume of water that people are using versus the flat fee. He commented that if residents use what they should be using the fee would be approximately the same amount but if they are overusing irrigation water then it will be calculated how much it costs and it will be built into the fee.

Discussion was held amongst staff and the Council in regard to irrigation and culinary water depending on size of yard and amount of people in the home.

Ms. Montoya continued in detail with the culinary budget, discussing the history of culinary since 2018 and the revenues in culinary versus similar expenditures. She stated that the jump in revenue was the bond proceeds for the water main projects that were done and still in the process of it. She added as they got funding early then the phases of the different projects carried over and dragged a bit behind this year which shows a dip in 2024 revenues because the bond proceeds are done but the projects are continuing and should wrap up this year.

Ms. Montoya stated she's anticipating a decrease across the board in impact fee revenue, based on permits and development. She commented that it was reduced by 20% for each different impact fee and category. She anticipated by 2025 the TOD well will be about \$1 million, and she wasn't sure if it was design or construction. Mr. Bunker commented that it was for the property design and get acquisition reports.

PRESSURIZED IRRIGATION

Revenues

- No rate increases (pending rate study)
- PI Grant from Dept of Water Resources \$6.6 million received in prior year.

Ms. Montoya stated that the decrease in the state grant for PI metering in which that money has been received and will not continue in the next year. As far as personnel and operating it is expected to grow 5% in capital. The PI metering project is closing out so there will be a decrease in capital.

Council Member Taylor asked when will the charging start for PI. Mr. Bunker replied that the intent is to give residents enough time to see how much they've used versus the flat fee. He stated that it would be late 2024 or into 2025 before charging for PI. Mayor Frost stated that it will likely be a year from now. Ms. Montoya commented that it would be unlikely to see an increase regardless of if it was implemented next season.

The Council discussed PI meters, water consumption and water conservation.

Expenditures

- Personnel – increase 4.9%.
- Operations – increase \$99,876 to 4.9%.
 - ✓ Increase in depreciation & admin charges.
- Capital Projects – decreases \$6,544,585 or 99.2%.
 - ✓ New Project – filter screens
 - ✓ Finish PI metering project FY2024.

- Debt Service – increase \$8,500 or 0.3% per debt service schedule.

Ms. Montoya stated that impact fees for PI decreased 20% based on permits and developments. Capital was decreased again \$1 million for the Recycled Water project, just waiting on TSSD for that and it will cover the city's portion of that design and it is a placeholder.

SEWER

Revenues

- TSSD rate increase January 1, 2024

Ms. Montoya stated there were increases in January due to the TSSD increased rates at 16%. That was approved through the Council and are expecting a full year instead of half the year.

Expenditures

- Personnel – increase 4.0%.
- Operations – increase \$1,503,192 or 34.9%.
 - ✓ Increase in TSSD charges.
 - ✓ Increase in administrative charges.
- Capital Projects – decrease \$438,300 or 14.2%.
 - Vac truck purchased in PY.

Ms. Montoya went over the expenditures, noting the personnel increase and operations increase due to TSSD increased charges.

Council Member Carroll commented the percentage difference in the charges for services does not equate to our operating pump and asked if there is an issue with it because it is not covering cost. Ms. Montoya replied that the revenue is larger than the operating cost since it has to cover some of the capital. She stated that it was an increase of \$1.2 million in revenue and \$1.5 million in operating costs. She stated that they are covering the difference. She added that there are some reserves to cover any excess that are needed to pay TSSD and monitor it closely.

Ms. Montoya stated that a backtracker was in the process to be purchased for FY2024, but it will not be the case for the next fiscal year. She added that there is a bit of a fund balance reserve, and the anticipated capital should be increasing soon to maintain and rehab most of the sewer lines and as they get into road projects. She commented that there are some reserves in sewer, but they anticipate spending that in the next several years.

She stated sewer impact fees are down 20% as well as capital. She mentioned the upsizing form 450 West at Pacific Drive project is pending because of the railroad, but still on the radar.

STORM DRAIN

Revenues

- Rate increase January 1, 2024

Ms. Montoya stated that based on the study done a few years ago, there is a 6% increase in revenue for the whole year instead of the half year for FY2024.

Expenditure

- Personnel increase 7.6%.
- Operations increased \$180,972 or 18.7%.
 - ✓ Increase in annual tree trimming and hauling along river.
 - ✓ Increase in administrative charges.
- Capital Projects
 - ✓ Projects finishes in PY (FY2024) – AF River Rehab, Debris Basin Outlet Structure Rehab, 2023 Runoff Repairs
 - ✓ Add \$350,000 for DOT betterment bridges at Greenwood/200 S & 400 N/400 E box culvert extensions.
 - ✓ Add \$1 million for storm water flooding rehabilitations.

Ms. Montoya mentioned the contributions from other governments were part of the Storm Drain Project and won't have that in the next fiscal year. Operations are increasing 18% with a big focus on the river, tree trimming and hauling along the river for the storm maintenance. Capital projects have been added for UDOT Betterments for purchase of Greenwood at 200 South and 400 North/400 East box culvert extensions. There is a placeholder for stormwater flooding, bridge repairs and \$1 million that came from the engineering department.

Mayor Frost asked if there are any additional charge rates changes in the Storm Rate Fund that have been pre-approved or that are forthcoming. Ms. Montoya replied they held off on the last one and there were three recommended increases. Two have been done and the third one is pending another analysis.

Mr. Bunker commented that we have a couple of new storm drain managers and wanted them on board to make sure we're complying with our MS-4 permits and making sure we have our program dialed in. He added that the state made the city increase the program and referred to Council Member Hunter and Council Member John were on that committee, prior to Council Member John being on the Council. He stated that they just want to make sure the program is up and running and understand what the efforts are we have to put into the program to see if our revenue is going to be able to handle that.

Ms. Montoya stated the impact fees are decreasing by 20% of the impact revenue and finished up in capital project, the bridge at Art Dye Park and there will not be there in the FY2025.

SANITATION

Revenues

- Charges for services
- Interest

Expenditures

- Operating

Ms. Montoya reported that this includes the Republic Services contract and North Point charges. It is not intended to generate revenue but to cover the city's costs for those contracts. She reported that there is no rate increase unless it comes before the Council, but the city's costs are increasing by 11%. She added if they want to absorb that there is about \$360,000 in reserves. She questioned if the council would rather make the incremental increase to cover the contract increase or just absorb that into the reserves. She added that she anticipates a 3.5 maximum increase for Republic and North Point is still pending, usually that comes later around the month of May.

Mr. Bunker asked Council Member John if he had received any word from North Pointe of any kind of report anticipated. Council Member John replied that it would be discussed at their next meeting.

Discussion was had amongst the Council and staff ensued regarding increasing charges and how often that will happen to inform residents.

2. Discussion on the crosswalk policy on collector roads.

Ben Hunter reported that this discussion is something that he and Eric Hyde, the Streets Superintendent, have been working on. Residents often request a crosswalk on their street, and he wanted to establish a policy for that as in when those requests come in, when would it be applicable and what the criteria would be used to evaluate whether a crosswalk would be a good application of where it is being put.

Council Member Carroll mentioned that people ask her about putting crosswalks everywhere and asked Mr. Hunter to address that.

Mr. Hunter commented that he had reached out to Hales Engineering who helped put the crosswalk policy together and had done specific cases studies/research that identified what challenges we may run into and to get some general feedback.

Using extreme examples, Mr. Hunter reported that if there were crosswalks on every block and a mid-block crossing, drivers get to the point that all these crosswalks are here for no reason and then they drive through them and not pay attention. He noted it was then a safety concern with drivers not paying attention. Mr. Hunter mentioned that for pedestrians, you don't want crosswalks spread apart so far and that they start jay walking across the street, which poses another safety concern. He stated that he would like the Council to address the situation, so they have better guidance and help residents and drivers be safe.

Mr. Hunter discussed the data collection requirements and criteria for warranting pedestrian sidewalk:

Data

- Number of pedestrians crossing the road, including children, elderly, and disabled on a typical weekday (typically a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday) from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Avoid collecting data on days with poor weather.
- Daily vehicle volumes (ADT)
- Posted speed limit of the crossing roadway that is being evaluated.
- Roadway geometry, including the number of lanes.
- Sight distance.
- The presence of any pedestrian generators, including, but not limited to, transit centers, parks, hospitals, libraries, and senior centers.
- Crash data within 250' of the study area, noting severe crashes and pedestrian-related crashes for the five most recent complete years.

Criteria for Crosswalk

- Controlled and Uncontrolled locations
 - Pedestrian volumes
 - Vehicular traffic
 - Spacing between other crosswalks
 - Pedestrian generators
 - Sight distance.
 - Safety concerns
- If there is a pattern of pedestrian-related crashes, a crosswalk should be considered with appropriate safety enhancements. If a crosswalk is not appropriate based on engineering judgement, alternative safety measures shall be implemented.
- If the criteria are not met for an existing crosswalk, the existing crosswalk may be removed.
- A school crossing is separate from a standard pedestrian crossing. When implementing school crosswalks, Part 7 of the Utah MUTCD shall be followed.

Mr. Hunter presented two workflow options. He stated the difference between the two is whether it's a controlled intersection or a non-controlled intersection. Controlled intersection meaning there is a stop sign or a traffic signal. He discussed what would be the best application and enhancements would be if there aren't any additional safety or capacity concerns due to the intersection or components of the roadway. He commented that if there is a high traffic volume then it would be a good application to be able to install a marked crosswalk. If it is within two blocks of a larger volume of the pedestrian generator then we will consider installing a marked crosswalk.

He reported that some of the challenges they run into when working on capital projects, there are crosswalks that have been installed and driver's think they are supposed to stop, but there is no stop sign. He added that crosswalks in areas where there may not be higher volumes and may not have larger traffic generators.

The Council and mayor discussed crosswalks on certain streets, pedestrians crossing at an intersection with no crosswalks, no stop signs, mid-block crosswalks and how it affects the safety of both drivers and pedestrians along with following criteria's:

Minimum Pedestrian Volume Criteria:

- 20 pedestrians/hour in any one hour or
- Average of 18 pedestrians/hour in any two hours or
- Average of 15 pedestrians/hour in any three hours
- School children, elderly or disable pedestrians count as double.

Types of Generators:

- Including transits centers, parks, hospitals, libraries, and senior centers.

Sight Distance Criteria:

- Sight distance is based on 85th percentile speed using the AASHTO Green book.

Pedestrian Safety Enhancements

Sometimes, a marked crosswalk alone may be insufficient. In these circumstances, additional countermeasures may be needed to improve the safety or visibility of pedestrians crossing a crosswalk. Contained in Table 1 are some guidelines for when specific enhancements may be used. These guidelines are based on a document published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) titled Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations and have been modified slightly.

These guidelines should be applied with engineering judgment as the suitability of each enhancement will vary from location to location. The countermeasures are listed below:

- ✓ High-visibility crosswalk markings, parking restrictions on crosswalk approach, adequate nighttime lighting levels, and crosswalk warning signs

- ✓ Advance Yield Here To (Stop Here For) Pedestrians sign and yield (stop) line.
- ✓ In-Street Pedestrian crossing sign
- ✓ Curb Extension
- ✓ Pedestrian refuge island
- ✓ Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacon (RRFB)
- ✓ Road Diet
- ✓ Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon

Mayor Frost stated in order to help out residents in regard to installed crosswalks, he asked Mr. Hunter if he'll actively search them out or wait for a resident to request or bring it up. Mr. Hunter replied that it could be a combination of both. He added that they tend to identify some areas according to either safety concerns or crashes if there are trouble areas as discussed in the Traffic Committee meetings with the police department and engineering staff or capital improvement projects.

Mr. Hunter commented that in establishing this policy, it is also a living document. He added that maybe there's some areas or some additional criteria where they would probably consider this in that evaluation also.

Mayor Frost asked what kind of decision making has been done in the past. Mr. Hunter replied that there has not been an established policy or guideline criteria to be able to help guide and determine whether a crosswalk is needed or not. Mr. Bunker commented that he would like to get the Council feedback on the issue and see if it makes sense and if the policy is something they will be comfortable with. He did state that he sees this as an administrative policy and not necessarily a City Council changing ordinance but would look to the Council for direction.

3. **Adjourn.**

Meeting adjourned at 5:17 pm.



Stephanie Finau
Deputy Recorder