

1 **MINUTES OF THE SPRINGVILLE CITY WATER BOARD**

2
3 Tuesday, May 13, 2014

4 6:30 a.m.

5 110 South Main Street

6 Springville, Utah 84663



7
8
9 **ATTENDANCE**

10
11 Councilmember

12 Richard Child

Secretary

Marcie Clark

13
14 Board Members

15 Alton Beck

16 Nile Hatch - excused

17 Calvin Crandall

18 Rollin Hotchkiss

19 Rod Andrew

20 Bernell Hutchings

City Staff

Brad Stapley – Public Works Director

Shawn Barker – Water Superintendent

Jeff Anderson – City Engineer

21
22
23 The minutes from the April 22, 2014 meetings were reviewed. Mr. Beck made the motion to approve the minutes.
24 Mr. Hutchings seconded. All were in favor.

25
26 Chairman Hotchkiss welcomed Bernell Hutchings to the Water Board.

27
28 Chairman Hotchkiss welcomed Jeff Anderson, City Engineer. He is here to review the Pressurized Irrigation Impact
29 Fee Analyses. Mr. Hotchkiss presented a few questions to the board. First, why are we building a pressurized
30 irrigation system? Are there any savings to culinary water users as a result? If so, should those who benefit share in
31 the expense of the pressurized irrigation system? The second question he had begins with the statement: the impact
32 fees are very high. Are they based on the total number of potential users, or only those who have built homes to use
33 the system? Keep those in mind as we turn the time over to Mr. Anderson.

34
35 Mr. Anderson explained that the Impact Fee Analysis was put together by Lewis, Young, Robertson & Burningham.
36 They have done several analyses for many cities. They work closely with engineering consultants and staff; they do
37 mostly financial analyses. Mr. Anderson gave a brief background on the PI system and how Springville City started
38 looking for grant options around the year 2010. The City received the nine million dollar Water Conservation Grant
39 (207 money) from Central Utah Water shortly after that. To date, CUP has never given more than five million. It
40 was a 30/70 or 40/60 match and they let us use existing infrastructure. The City walked away with about \$900,000
41 out of pocket that was put up front to gain \$900,000,000 in grant money.

42
43 The City hired Lewis Young to analyze the impact fee. The original master plan done in 2006 weighed the different
44 options; full culinary/no PI, partial PI on the west side/partial culinary and then full pressurized irrigation system for
45 the entire city. They weighed it and looked at the city’s available water. Most of the city water that comes from
46 development comes from irrigation shares for surface water. As you move it into culinary uses, you take a pretty
47 good haircut from the state, roughly about 50%. Mr. Anderson explained how the state engineer deals with water
48 rights and shares, putting them into a pond and using them as an irrigation source. The most cost effective plan is to
49 keep PI in the west fields and keep the east side using culinary water.

50
51 Mr. Anderson referred to table 1:1 impact fee per ERC. We plan to have the pressurized irrigation operable in 2016.
52 The pond is under construction presently and going well. This year the city will put out a bid for a project to put in
53 all the pipes from the pond to the west fields. All existing homes in the west fields will be connected. Remaining
54 amounts to be funded through 2016 for Phase 1 is around \$712,000. The impact fee laws have changed recently.
55 They limit the time frame you can charge impact fees. There was discussion on the area of west fields that was
56 included in the impact fee study. Mr. Crandall asked about impact fees to areas that are outside the west field

August 12, 2014
Approved

1 boundary. Mr. Anderson stated that he does not believe we can charge them the impact fees or more. The plan is
2 updated every 3-5 years. Mr. Hotchkiss asked if the people who move out there first will have the highest impact fee.
3 Mr. Anderson explained that that is not the case. The nine million dollar grant reduced the impact fee.
4

5 Mr. Stapley explained that Springville City doesn't even have a water treatment plant. Those plants are very
6 expensive. Mr. Andrew asked if these fees are based on today's dollars, or build-out dollars. Mr. Anderson
7 explained that we cannot inflate the prices, so it's based on the time of construction. The City has to front some of
8 the money for the improvements and recoup the money as development happens. Mr. Crandall reiterated that it's the
9 best way to put your water to beneficial use. It's a catch 22; the more water that is put into secondary irrigation, the
10 less water that is treated and sold to residents. But if you don't use the water, you lose it, according to the State.
11

12 Mr. Hutchings stated that there are some that don't need secondary water because they are on wells and springs.
13

14 Mr. Hotchkiss asked if the City anticipates the impact fees coming down in the future. Mr. Stapley is not sure, but he
15 explained that the initial storm water impact fee was high to fund large scale projects, but the proposed fee is 71%
16 lower as those projects get completed. The City tries to piggy-back on other projects to reduce the cost.
17

18 Mr. Andrew asked about the bills for those that have PI verses those that don't. Mr. Anderson stated that the City
19 Council has yet to determine that. He hopes it will be comparable. The City will have to fund additional crews to
20 maintain that system. Mr. Andrew stated that he lives in Spanish Fork and he pays less for secondary than culinary
21 water. It wasn't that way when the system was first put in.
22

23 There was brief discussion on metering secondary water. Cl. Child mentioned his trip to Chicago a few years ago
24 with the Community Development Director, where he witnessed how they take water out of the Great Lakes and treat
25 it. They weren't metering culinary water until recently, but they realized they can't track leaks without meters.
26

27 Mr. Anderson explained how tricky these analyses can be. People will argue if the fees go up, stay the same or go
28 down. These fees will be challenged and the city attorney is getting prepared for that. The fees are based on square
29 footage of irrigable area at the time the home is built, not at development of the subdivision. The fees have to be
30 defensible.
31

32 Mr. Hotchkiss asked if residents have a choice not to have PI. Mr. Anderson stated they don't, but they can still hook
33 up to culinary and not use PI. There is currently not an inspection done when sprinklers are installed. We may have
34 to include language in the code that requires them to connect to PI. It's possible that the city will have to raise
35 culinary water rates in the future because we're selling less due to the increased PI use.
36

37 Mr. Anderson stated the fee will be assessed when the builder submits their site plan with hard scape and irrigable
38 area, roughly .14 per foot. That could change once they change their hardscape; when they put in an RV pad after
39 they've already built the home. This would not apply to existing homes, such as Mr. Hutchings, who has his own
40 water.
41

42 Mr. Beck made a motion to approve the Impact Fee for the Pressurized Irrigation System. Mr. Crandall seconded.
43 All were in favor.
44

45 Mr. Hotchkiss mentioned that we need to prepare for Plat A Irrigation discussion.
46

47 Mr. Stapley distributed a drawing of the new PI pond and Burt Springs area. The City will be meeting with the
48 Springville Irrigation Company this morning about water rights and water spilling over into the irrigation ditch. He
49 explained that the City owns about 51% of the shares in Springville Irrigation Company. Quite a few of those shares
50 are not used. The City believes the Irrigation Company is receiving more water than they should be getting. We
51 want to stop spilling drinking water into the ditch. The Irrigation Company won't lose their water. We're asking for
52 delivery of city shares of irrigation water to be able to use in the culinary system by not dumping culinary water into
53 ditch 1. Mr. Anderson explained that Burt Springs is our most cost effective sources. It's basically gravity flow to
54 that pump house, then we just have to push it 150 feet up the hill to the tank. It's a great source that flows year
55 round.
56

1 In the Burt Springs area, the City has 5.5 cubic feet per second (cfs) water right, the Irrigation Company has a 2 cfs
2 water right. It appears the Irrigation Company has been getting more than their right. The City is not using all of our
3 shares (51%) with the Irrigation Company. This is not going to go over well with them.
4

5 We'll meet again in June. We can address Plat A Irrigation at a later date. A field trip up to the PI pond would be
6 beneficial. We can plan to meet up at the pond. Ms. Clark will send out a reminder email.
7

8 Mr. Hutchings moved to adjourn. Mr. Andrew seconded. All were in favor.
9

10 *Adjourn* – This meeting adjourned at 7:30 a.m.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17