

**ELK RIDGE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
November 11, 2025**

TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING

This regularly scheduled meeting of the Elk Ridge City Council was scheduled for Tuesday, November 11, 2025, at 7:00 PM preceded by a work session at 6:00 pm. The meeting was held at the Elk Ridge City Hall, 80 East Park Drive, Elk Ridge, Utah. Notice of the time, place, and Agenda of this Meeting was provided to the Payson Chronicle, 145 E. Utah Ave, Payson, Utah, and to the members of the Governing Body on November 10, 2025.

ROLL CALL

Mayor: Robert Haddock

Council Members: Melanie Paxton, Tanya Willis, Jared Peterson, Cory Thompson, Charles Wixom

Council Members: Melanie Paxton, Tanya Wilkins, Jared Peterson, Cory
Others: Royce Swensen, *City Recorder*, Laura Oliver, *Deputy Recorder*

Public: Larry Lee, Teri Shelley, Jim Chase

Opening – Councilmember Paxton

Pledge – Councilmember Wixom

COUNCILMEMBER WIXOM MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA TIME FRAME

COUNCILMEMBER PAXTON SECONDED

VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0)

Approved

PLANNING COMMISSION UPDATE

There was no Planning Commission Update

WORK SESSION

IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS PRESENTATION: FRED PHILPOT LRB PUBLIC FINANCE ADVISORS VIA ELECTRONICALLY

Fred Philpot went through the impact fee analysis and the requirements for public noticing. After impact fees are approved and the public hearing is held after the 10 day noticing period, there is a 90 waiting period before the impact fees go into effect. They looked at the city boundary, population, the area within the city with infrastructure, and area that is unimproved. Impact fees are used for new growth, not for maintenance. They looked at existing facilities: for parks they looked at all of the land and improvements to determine an evaluation and determined the investment per capita. For water, they looked at existing source storage, distribution, and the level of service standards. For sewer they looked at existing pipes owned by the city, and the gallons of usage per day. For roads they looked at the existing road network, grading the roads - rating them from A-F. For future needs there are \$2.7 million needed for future investment in parks, \$2.4 million for water, but only a portion of that is growth related so of that \$2.4 million \$616,000 to \$620,000 is attributed to the demand. For sewer and roads there are no facilities identified for new growth within the capital facilities plan at this point. Councilmember Willis stated she disagrees with that point. There are roads that need safety improvement because of new growth and increased traffic which is solely contributed to by new growth in that area. Fred Philpot stated that isn't covered by impact fees. There are no impact fees on the roads, but based on the current plan, there are no new projects that are listed for demand. Essentially traffic can be serviced by the existing road network which would result in a change in the level of service and according to the capital improvement plan, it doesn't reduce the acceptable level of service. Councilmember Willis stated you used to be able to walk down roads when there were only a few cars on them and now that growth is happening, they are not

51 walkable. Fred Philpot stated if you disagree then you needed to go back and talk to staff about it and redo
52 those documents. Councilmember Willis asked what documents the council need to do, because we
53 strongly disagree. Mayor Haddock stated that would be the traffic plan, everything was rated.
54 Councilmember Willis stated everything on Canyon View down the 4 way stop is not safe and that is
55 purely due to growth that is happening and it is only going to get worse. Fred Philpot stated that is a
56 concern and his recommendation is that the planning documents need to be revisited. He is presenting the
57 information based on the current plan documents. Councilmember Willis stated the council has not
58 adopted that Capital Facilities Plan. Royce Swenson asked Fed Philpot if he can do that Capital Facilities
59 side of things? Fred Philpot said no, that needs to be done by a transportation engineer because they will be
60 utilizing the travel demand model to evaluate the road systems and also look at conditions assessment and
61 level of service. Mayor Haddock stated that it was done. Councilmember Willis asked if this whole report
62 is done on a Capital Facilities Plan that the council hasn't adopted yet? Fred Philpot stated the report was
63 done on the documents he was provided and assumed that is what was adopted. It doesn't fix councils' issue
64 which is council has an outdated Impact Fee Facilities Plan, your existing documents are such that you
65 cannot expend the impact fee funds. You need to get a new document, not adopting the plan doesn't fix the
66 problem. The city does not have the projects to expend those dollars on. Right now, the report is based on
67 the information they have. Councilmember Willis asked how can council adopt this if they haven't adopted
68 the Capital Facilities Plan that this is built to? Fred Philpot stated because this analysis is built on noted
69 facilities the fee is likely to go down relative to what the city currently assessed. He believes there is a
70 moratorium on road impact fees right now. Mayor Haddock stated yes, on roads and sewer. Fred Philpot
71 stated so that at least justified some level of an impact fee based on by in. That will give you time to
72 commission another study to evaluate roads and update the fee at that time or you can say no we are not
73 going to do anything relative to road impact fees or you can and keep the moratorium in place until you
74 complete all the studies. If you remove the moratorium and continue to assess the fees based on the prior
75 impact fee plan then you will most likely experience issues relative to challenges and expenditures to
76 impact fees because you are collecting it based on projects that may not develop. He cannot solve all the
77 issues tonight, he would need an additional Road Capital Improvement Plan, Master Plan, because that is
78 the feedback. As it stands there is not a comfort level with the existing document. Councilmember Wixom
79 asked how long do they have to revise the Capital Facilities Plan. Fred Philpot stated there isn't a defined
80 period, it really depends on your changes to assumption, changes to cost, changes to demand. If you start
81 seeing a big deviation between the plan and reality then that is a trigger to update it. If you're having trouble
82 expending funds from impact fee dollars then the documents need to be revised to bring those into
83 alignment. Every community is different, some have high growth and those triggers happen more
84 frequently, some happen at a slower pace. Most entities update the capital facilitated plan every 3-5 years.
85 Some cities do it every 2 years. Every project that pops up needs to be brought to the analysis. Fred Philpot
86 went through what the current impact fees are. Council needs to make sure the Capital Facilities plan
87 captures every project that is applicable. There have been multiple discussions on impact fees, more
88 specifically roads, it will take some time to go through and make modifications if needed. Council can
89 choose to do nothing and keep the moratorium in place and initiate those guidelines to see what happens
90 before council initiates the change to that policy. Councilmember Paxton asked in regards to those
91 suggestions should we, because of the amounts of the buy in, adopt it today. Fred Philpot stated the council
92 is not taking any action today. Councilmember Willis asked if council can adopt this without adopting the
93 Capital Facility Plan? Fred Philpot stated impact fees are a different process in referencing those documents
94 so it may serve council better to have the Capital Facility Plan adopted. In default the council would be
95 adopting those schedules as part of that Impact Fee Facility Plan and Impact Fee Analysis process but the
96 impact fee is separate from everything else. There is a specific process in adopting, associating and proving
97 the fee itself. With regards to that, adopting the smaller fee he would lean towards, yes, if he would change
98 to an unproven plan, the justifiable fee would be lower than what was assessed previously which is more
99 than zero because council is not collecting that fee now. The schedule would need to be adjusted to reflect

100 the lower fee. If council tries to access a fee then council has to show justification. If you try to default to
101 the previous plan, then there will likely be questions relative to the previous fee versus the impact fee
102 revenues and the information that has been discussed relative to the Capital Facility Plan and this
103 document. Councilmember Paxton asked if they were then 10 days out from adopting this. Fred Philpot
104 stated no. Council has not started the official notice process, this is purely a work session to give council an
105 idea of where they are at and solicit feedback and direction. Councilmember Wixom asked in regard to
106 water, with the aging system the city has, and the increased flow rate could the city assess an impact fee for
107 replacement. Fred Philpot stated impact fees cannot be assessed for repair and replacement or inefficiency
108 issues. That has to be dealt with through rates or the city has to identify alternative funding mechanisms to
109 address those issues after which the council can adjust the impact fee to account for that change but council
110 cannot use impact fees to pay for repair and replacement issues. Councilmember Wixom asked when a
111 developer comes in and the current lines are not large enough for the capacity, same for the sewer, can the
112 city require them to replace those lines. Fred Philpot said yes, but the distinction there is the developer is
113 not necessarily replacing the system, if the city is saying this development is causing an improvement while
114 expanding the system, then they can cover that, but if they are adding to an existing line that is old then the
115 developer can be part of that but impact fees cannot be used for that repair and replacement issue. But if
116 they are adding additional capacity into that improvement then impact fees can cover that. The city's
117 Capital Facilities Plan went through that exercise and stated the projects and the percentage based on the
118 distinction of repair and replacement versus added capacity and that is how these dollars were evaluated.
119 Councilmember Wixom asked if they should revisit the Capital Facility Plan, get better information of what
120 councils feel the needs are for the city before council finalizes the IFFP and IFA? Fred Philpot stated that
121 is an option. Right now, based on the moratorium, the city is not collecting anything for roads. Even though
122 this might not capture everything he would rather have something rather than nothing as far as the road
123 impact fee. So an option is, lets adopt, recognizing council needs to continue to study this and come back to
124 the public to adjust the impact fee further which may be an adjusted further if council includes the initial
125 capital improvements that were not considered in the previous study. This would give council a starting
126 point to remove the moratorium and then prepare for another impact fee revision. Councilmember Wixom
127 asked based upon the fees that have been recommended, would the city be collecting more or less in impact
128 fee? Fred Philpot stated the city would be collecting more in park and water impact fees and less in roads, if
129 council decides to adopt the sewer component would be higher.
130 Right now the city isn't collecting anything for roads. The immediate change would be potentially
131 removing the moratorium, but it is not going to achieve the collection rate the city had historically but there
132 are challenges relative to some of the elements. Council has to review that when looking at adjustments to
133 the Capital Facilities Plan. Royce Swensen stated the current Capital Facility Plan is from 2015.
134 Councilmember Peterson stated if council adopts this then the city is allowed to collect something rather
135 than collecting nothing and council needs the urgency to complete a Capital Facilities Plan. Currently the
136 city has a feasibility study out for a sewer plant. The city has been paying pass-through fees to Payson for
137 about \$7,000 -\$8,000, once the city has its own sewer plant can the city ask for some of that money back?
138 Fred Philpot stated that it depends on what agreements are in place. In regard to impact fees, if the city
139 starts a sewer plant facility, impact fees can clear that asset but the city needs to make sure fees are
140 proportional. The amount of the sewer plant that is used by existing residents is not impact fee eligible. It
141 can be included in the calculator of the impact fees but only for new development. Mayor Haddock asked if
142 it is possible to do a Capital Facilities Plan just on roads? Fred Stated yes, you can do a Capital
143 Improvement Master Plan for roads and do only the impact fee for roads. Councilmember Paxton asked if
144 Fred had a recommendation for someone to do the Capital Facilities Plan? Fred Philpot stated he worked
145 with Hales, they are great, WGC is good, Parametrics as well. Council will motion this to go to public
146 hearing when they ratify the election.
147

148 Mayor Haddock stated that Fire Chief Seth Waite has made changes to the map. Discussion ensued on what
149 the changes were and the ratings. Royce Swensen got the Fire Chief on the phone. Councilmember
150 Peterson asked about the red zone. The Fire Chief stated the current map is defined as what he considered
151 the WUI interface; the red part is natural vegetation that is not considered landscaping from that line south.
152 Councilmember Peterson asked about Haley's Lookout, is that section A with a rating of 6 and B and C
153 depending on individual lots? The Fire Chief confirmed that, but he did not have the map in front of him.
154 He tried to define it by the area and everything north of that is trying to justify it as a lower rating, because
155 the picture is all based upon canopy. He is trying to get confirmation on some things with the county.
156 Councilmember Willis stated there is an area with about 6 homes on Elk Ridge Drive by the golf course to
157 the north that back to the wildlands area that aren't in there. The Fire Chief stated he can revise the map
158 and move the line down around those if the council wants. Councilmember Willis has a couple places to
159 discuss when the Fire Chief gets back in town. Discussion ensued on deciphering what the number and
160 lines meant on the WUI map and will meet with the Fire Chief before they adopt the map.

161 **PUBLIC FORUM**

162 There was no public comment

163 **AGENDA ITEMS**

164 1. **SPENCER FOSTER: LOCAL OPTION SALES, MUNICIPAL ENERGY, AND TRANSIENT**
165 **ROOM TAXES DISCUSSION**

166 Mayor Haddock introduced Spencer Foster, *Local Administrative Advisory (LAA)*. Spencer Foster stated
167 he, along with Councilmember Paxton attended the ULCT Conference in October which discussed tax
168 revenue streams. There are many taxes in which cities can collect tax revenue. Elk Ridge is not collecting
169 tax revenue in certain revenue streams and wanted to go through some of these with the council and how
170 they can benefit the city. Elk Ridge is very reliant on property taxes and could become less reliant on
171 property taxes by utilizing sources such as taxes on nonresidents. There is a Local Option Sales and Use
172 Tax which is a 1% retail sales tax within the city limits. Amazon and any point of sales like Etsy sales
173 count as retail sales. Elk Ridge can collect 1% sales tax on any purchases made on Amazon, which goes
174 into the general fund. The city would have to work with the tax commission and Amazon after the tax is
175 implemented to get the addresses and zip code, so it doesn't go to Payson. Spencer has drafts of the codes.
176 The Utah Tax Commission has a list of all the city's retail businesses within the city. Transient Room Tax
177 is a 1% tax (per State Code) on short-term rentals like VRBO and Airbnb. The city needs to check the city
178 code to see if this is allowed. These funds go into the general fund. There is a Municipal Energy Tax
179 which the city may already collect, this tax is up to 6% on electricity and natural gas which goes into the
180 general fund. Royce Swensen confirmed that the city already collects this tax. It is not required to have a
181 public hearing to implement these taxes. Council would rather be 100% transparent and have public
182 hearings. The process to implement these taxes is easy; the city adopts an ordinance, sends a form to the
183 Utah Tax Commission, and waits for the next collection period. These revenue streams will benefit the city
184 by providing for more sustainable projects. Mayor Haddock asked about an optional (donation) Park tax
185 which Spencer will look into as well as tax on storage units. Councilmember Wixom asked about road fees.
186 Spencer stated the city can implement fees on roads, but this is controversial.
187

188 COUNCILMEMBER MOTIONED TO DO A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE SALES TAX AND THE
189 TRANSIENT ROOM TAX COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED

190 VOTE

191 AYE (5)

NAY (0)

192 Approved

193 2. **RESOLUTION 25-11-11-1R Privacy Policy**

195 COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS MOTIONED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 25-11-11-IR PRIVACY
196 POLICY COUNCILMEMBER PAXTON SECONDED

197
198 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved
199 Councilmember Peterson AYE
200 Councilmember Thompson AYE
201 Councilmember Willis AYE
202 Councilmember Paxton AYE
203 Councilmember Wixom AYE

204
205 **3. FEE SCHEDULE EMERGENCY SERVICES, LIFT FEE DISCUSSION**

206 Councilmember Thompson suggested looking into adding a lift fee to the fee schedule to be able to charge
207 the Assisted Living Lift Fees for nonemergency calls to pick up patients because the care facility does not
208 have personnel on hand to be able to lift residents. Council will look into this further and get a clear
209 definition of what this would encompass and discuss it further in an upcoming meeting.

210
211 **4. FEE SCHEDULE: WHOLESALE/COMMERCIAL WATER RATES**

212 Discussion ensued on removing the wholesale water rates and making fee schedule for non-resident and
213 commercial water rates. The rates for HOA common fee schedule will be charged for the actual water tier
214 they use instead of adjusting per unit.

215 COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 25-11-11-2R CHANGING
216 THE WATER RATES ON THE FEE SCHEDULE AS SHOWN WITH THE ADDITIONAL WORDING
217 ON THE WATER CHARGES FOR 1-A TO BE CHANGED TO RESIDENTIAL IN CITY BASE FEE
218 AND B TO NON RESIDENTIAL IN CITY AND STRIKING C MISCELLANEOUS WATER
219 CHARGES THE HOA COMMON AREA AND THE WHOLESALE WATER SCHEDULES
220 COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED

221
222 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved
223 Councilmember Wixom AYE
224 Councilmember Thompson AYE
225 Councilmember Peterson AYE
226 Councilmember Willis AYE
227 Councilmember Paxton AYE

228
229 **5. HB48 WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE MODIFICATIONS**

230 The motion for a public hearing will be made after the Fire Chief has the map drafted after which the map
231 will be sent to the Planning Commission for recommendation. The public hearing will take place in City
Council.

232 COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO HAVE THE FIRE CHIEF REVISE THE MAP AND
233 SEND THE MAP TO PLANNING COMMISSION COUNCILMEMBER WIXOM SECONDED

234
235 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved

236
237 **6. FRAUD ASSESSMENT**

238 Mayor Haddock stated the city scored a 340 on the Fraud Assessment report, which means the fraud risk is
239 low. IT and computer security, cash receiving and deposits, and informal internal audit functions need
240 written policy to improve the number. Policies are already in place, the handbook is being rewritten
241 currently that covers this.

242 COUNCILMEMBER WIXOM MOTIONED TO ACCEPT THE FRAUD ASSESSMENT REPORT
243 COMPLETED JUNE 30, 2025 AS PRESENTED COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED

244
245 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved
246

247 7. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR OCTOBER 28, 2025**

248
249 COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM OCT 28, 2025
250 WITH THE CORRECTION ON LINE 98 AND 100 THE POLL VOTE FROM 2 AYE AND 3 NAY
251 COUNCILMEMBER WILLIS SECONDED

252
253 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved
254

255 COUNCILMEMBER PAXTON MOTION TO GO IN CLOSED SESSION PER UTAH CODE 52-4-204
256 TO DISCUSS REAL ESTATE PURCHASE

257
258 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved
259

260
261 COUNCILMEMBER THOMPSON MOTIONED TO ADJOURN COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIS
262 SECONDED

263

264

265

266 VOTE AYE (5) NAY (0) Approved
267

268

269


Laura Oliver