



Members Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Ernie John	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member
Tim Holley	Council Member
Staci Carroll	Council Member

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Assistant City Administrator
Anna Montoya	Finance Director
Stephanie Finau	Deputy Recorder
Patrick O'Brien	Development Services Director
Sam Kelly	Public Work Director
Dan Loveland	Assistant PW Director
Ben Hunter	City Engineer
Derek Rykert	Community Service Director
Cameron Paul	Police Chief
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief

Also present: Cody Opperman (City Planner I), Annie (City Planner II), Jay Brems (Water), Cherylyn Egner, Ms. Phelon, Royce Shelley, and Stephen Phelon

City Council will hold a work session on Tuesday, March 31, 2026, in the City Hall, located at 31 Church St, commencing at 4:00 p.m.

WORK SESSION

The purpose of the City Work Sessions is to prepare the City Council for upcoming agenda items on future City Council Meetings. The Work Session is not an action item meeting. No one attending the meeting should rely on any discussion or any perceived consensus as action or authorization. These come only from the City Council Meeting.

1. Discussion on proposed amendments to the city's municipal code, general plan, and zoning.

Mayor Frost opened the meeting by noting the change in location to City Hall to accommodate potential public attendance. The discussion then moved to proposed amendments to the municipal code, general plan, and zoning.

Patrick O'Brien explained that the city's general plan serves as a long-term roadmap, providing vision and policy guidance rather than regulating day-to-day development, which is controlled by zoning ordinances. The plan anticipates growth, challenges, and community needs, helping the city prepare for future conditions. He discussed the

ongoing general plan update, the first major revision in about 15 years, which has involved extensive public and stakeholder engagement since 2024, including input from council members, government agencies, developers, and residents. The update addresses housing demand, state compliance, infrastructure, open space, and citywide connectivity, with land use as a central element guiding zoning and development decisions. The update also incorporates emerging priorities such as water reuse planning, economic development, and connectivity. Given the city's dispersed development pattern with multiple activity nodes, the plan identifies seven focus areas to guide land use and service organization in the future. Updating the plan is necessary because prior population projections have been exceeded and growth pressures continue to challenge housing, infrastructure, and state compliance.

Mr. O'Brien explained that one area near the north gateway is designated for long-term growth but is not part of the immediate planning discussion. The remaining six focus areas are being addressed through a separate polycentric city center master plan, developed with outside consultants. This emphasizes economic development, connectivity, and transportation solutions to respond to challenges identified in the general plan. He compared the existing land use map with the proposed version, noting that the current map is outdated, misaligned with actual conditions, and inconsistent with other planning tools, including the city's transit-oriented development (TOD) overlay. The proposed map corrects these issues and better reflects the true extent of designated areas.

Staff are refining the map to reflect city goals, including integrating mixed uses, properly identifying open spaces, and ensuring practical guidance for future zoning and planning. Council's feedback is requested early to identify any major concerns before further revisions.

Council Members voiced their concern on inconsistencies in the land use map; they discussed the commercial district near the boat harbor where a future utility-related project (TSSD) is planned and shifted to commercial areas that functions like a utility or civic use rather than a traditional commercial district.

Mr. O'Brien clarified that the proposed updates to the land use map do not involve changes in use, but are intended to reflect existing conditions, correcting inaccuracies inherited from previous consultants. Examples include developments like duplexes or parks that were built or mapped incorrectly. He emphasized that staff are working through numerous corrections and are still evaluating appropriate land use designations, asking the council for patience as the document is refined.

Council Member Carroll expressed concern about the map's level of detail, noting that many elements are unclear and that a parcel-by-parcel review would be required if it were final. Mr. O'Brien reassured the council that the map is not final, is intended to gather feedback, and that staff have already incorporated some initial council input while seeking further guidance before moving to the Planning Commission and broader public engagement.

Discussion ensued amongst the council members examining whether the proposed map aligns with current land uses and long-term planning intentions.

Mr. O'Brien addressed concerns about the industrial area along the freeway, explaining that while much of it is currently developed as warehouse space, its zone (GC2) allows for broader commercial use. He noted that staff are trying to better align zone with the city's vision, particularly along key corridors like 500 East and State Street—where more consumer-oriented development (such as retail and restaurants) is desired rather than industrial uses.

The discussion then shifted to an area near the TOD, where land use designations appear mixed. Mr. O'Brien suggested that a civic designation might be more appropriate, allowing flexibility for infrastructure such as parking, roads, and connectivity improvements.

Mr. O'Brien reiterated that the general plan itself does not implement immediate changes, but instead sets long-term direction for growth, transit, water, and infrastructure. Zoning and code updates will be the tools that implement those decisions over time. He concluded by introducing another focus area tied to a recent development proposal, noting that staff have identified more existing commercial activity in that area than previously reflected. He indicated that staff is considering adjustments to “square off” land use boundaries and better align the plan with actual conditions, while seeking council feedback before moving forward.

Council Member Carroll asked whether much of the Main Street area was already commercial. Mr. O'Brien responded that while there are existing commercial uses, they are generally small, scattered, and not representative of a cohesive or “highest and best use” commercial area. He noted that the area is no longer functioning as a true residential neighborhood, especially as new commercial development continues to surround remaining homes. He acknowledged that some longtime residents still live in the area but emphasized that their existing uses would be protected under current zones. The proposed changes are focused on guiding future development, ensuring land use designations better reflect how the area is evolving.

Mr. O'Brien then shifted to broader policy direction, explaining that staff aims to preserve existing single-family neighborhoods while improving how residential land uses are categorized. Instead of relying on somewhat ambiguous terms like “low,” “medium,” or “very low” density, the city is considering a clearer framework based on detached (single-family) and attached housing types. He explained that this approach would provide greater flexibility and clarity as properties are annexed and developed, allowing the city to more effectively transition densities—particularly in relation to transit-oriented development (TOD) areas—without being constrained by outdated or unclear classifications. This would also give the council more practical tools to evaluate development proposals on a case-by-case basis moving forward.

Mr. O'Brien explained that much of the general plan document is driven by state requirements, including mandated elements such as the moderate-income housing plan. He noted that while the document is lengthy (around 143 pages), a significant portion consists of background information and required components, not just policy direction. He emphasized the need to move the project toward completion, as the regional planning agency (MAG) still considers it an open, funded project until it is formally adopted by ordinance. This creates some urgency to finalize the plan.

Mr. O'Brien then asked the council how they would prefer to review the material—whether they want the full document or to focus primarily on the proposed land use map, which has been the central topic of discussion.

Council Member John requested the entire document, noting that he had already identified several minor inaccuracies likely originating from the consultant. He expressed confidence that staff could correct these issues with further review.

Mr. O'Brien clarified that staff have not yet completed a full internal revision of the document. He asked for directions from the council on whether they would prefer to review the document as-is (including consultant errors) or have staff first clean up and refine the document before sharing it. This reflects an effort to balance efficiency with ensuring the council reviews a more polished and accurate version of the plan.

Mr. O'Brien offered to share the draft general plan with council members for further review and suggested one-on-one meetings to address questions or concerns in detail. He emphasized that staff want to ensure alignment with council priorities and avoid moving in the wrong direction. He noted that the Planning Commission work session is scheduled for April 15, where the plan will be presented in a similar format. Following that meeting, staff will compile feedback from both the council and the Planning Commission.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the intent is to incorporate all input into a revised version of the plan, while making it clear that the City Council sets the overall direction. Any recommendations from the Planning Commission will be brought back to the council for consideration to ensure they align with the council's vision before being finalized. Overall, the process is designed to be collaborative and iterative, with staff refining the plan based on feedback while keeping final decision-making authority with the council.

Mayor Frost acknowledged the importance of having a timeline but emphasized that the council should not feel rushed. He noted that if additional time is needed to feel confident in the plan, the council can slow the process down and revisit it in future meetings.

Mr. O'Brien also reflected on why the process has been challenging, explaining that the city's general plan had not been actively maintained for some time, while growth and annexations continued. As a result, the city is now working to reestablish the general plan as a guiding framework to help shape future decisions, rather than reacting to development without a clear long-term strategy.

Mr. O'Brien proposed using the month of April to further refine the general plan and return with a more polished draft for council review. He expressed appreciation for the council's patience as staff continues working through the document. He also acknowledged the challenge of balancing input from multiple elected officials, noting that differing perspectives are expected. As a result, staff's role is to find a workable middle ground that reflects the council's collective direction rather than any single viewpoint. He emphasized the importance of continuing discussions to resolve differing opinions and build consensus on key issues, ensuring the final plan represents a shared vision moving forward.

Ms. Egner asked for clarity on the council's direction, noting mixed expectations. She said the original goal was to streamline and modernize zoning to align with nearby cities, but that direction may have shifted. Before moving forward, she wants confirmation on whether to stick with current zoning standards or pursue broader changes so staff efforts match the council's vision.

Mayor Frost asked about the code rewrite and the way it's being reorganized, does it make the standards easier to access and understand? His understanding is that there's a lot of scattered language in the current version, and this effort is really about reorganizing what already exists to make it clearer. The goal is to simplify it so that someone working on a homebuilding project, especially without extensive experience or an engineering background, can navigate it more easily. In his view, this rewrite is about removing outdated or archaic elements, resolving conflicting terms that appear in different places, and bringing everything together into a simpler, more cohesive document.

Council Member Taylor stated that the intent of the rewrite was to allow a person to review the document and understand what is happening. He noted this was the original objective at the outset of the process.

Ms. Egner agreed and stated that this goal has largely been accomplished. She noted, however, that some elements appear to be reverting to previous approaches. She clarified that this is not necessarily a lack of progress, but rather a shift that has occurred while attempting to align American Fork standards with those of neighboring communities. She added that the city appears to prefer maintaining its current standards, including setbacks and building heights, and leaving those unchanged for the time being.

Council Member John stated that one benefit of the rewrite is that future changes can be made more efficiently. He explained that rather than making the same change in multiple sections, updates could be made in a single location within the reorganized code. He added that this approach would help maintain simplicity and ease of use for those reviewing the document.

Ms. Egner stated that some of the earlier direction may have been influenced by the number of changes being made, noting that items such as easements had been revised multiple times. She explained that, at a certain point, the intent was to apply changes more consistently across the code. She stated that she would review the document again to ensure greater consistency, while acknowledging that it is already largely consistent with only a few changes.

Ms. Egner then referenced the updated setbacks chart and provided an example for the R-1-20,000 zone. She explained that the current code requires a 30-foot front setback, 25-foot rear setback, 8-foot interior side yard setbacks, and a 20-foot corner side yard setback. Under the proposed changes, the primary adjustment would be to the side setbacks, increasing them to 10 feet on each side, with a combined total of 22 feet, compared to the current 8 feet per side. For corner lots, she noted the proposal would require a minimum of 10 feet on each side, with a combined total of 30 feet, effectively resulting in a 20-foot and 10-foot configuration. Ms. Egner asked for directions on whether to retain the currently adopted side setbacks and stated that she could easily revise the proposal to revert from 10 feet back to 8 feet if desired.

Council Member Carroll stated that she may be misunderstanding, but her expectation was that the code rewrite would not be the stage to address specific policy preferences or detailed changes within the development code. She noted that there are likely many elements that could be revisited, but those discussions should occur at a later time. She explained that the purpose of the rewrite was to organize the code into a more functional and accessible format, as the current structure is difficult to navigate and makes logical discussion challenging.

Ms. Egner responded that the process evolved over time. She explained that, at the beginning, work sessions included discussions of specific elements, often addressing one or two items at a time, and she understood that those changes would be incorporated into the rewrite. She noted that the direction has since shifted. She added that making updates—such as revising charts—is relatively straightforward and can be completed by staff, but she wanted to confirm the Council’s preference before proceeding further.

Council Member Hunter stated that the goal should be to achieve a consistent framework that staff can manage effectively daily. He expressed concern that certain changes—such as increased setbacks on smaller corner lots (e.g., 7,500 square feet)—could significantly reduce the buildable footprint. He noted that in such cases, the remaining space may force homes into a more vertical design due to limited lot area.

Mr. O’Brien added that there are also variations in setback requirements within certain zones, such as the PR-3 zone, which contribute to ongoing issues. He explained that some properties can reduce setbacks to as little as five feet through Planning Commission approval, which can create challenges. These include limited or no access to rear yards, lack of side yard space for parking trailers or recreational vehicles, and difficulties with construction access for features such as foundations, shops, or pools. He noted that these constraints can create additional impacts on neighboring properties when access must be obtained through adjacent lots.

Council Member Hunter stated that these are the types of issues he hopes a code rewrite can better address through improved structure and organization. He explained that once the code is clearly structured, it would allow for more focused discussion on individual provisions. He expressed concern about making changes without fully understanding their practical implications, citing an example involving industrial properties where an adjustment intended to limit warehouse uses in a specific area unintentionally restricted them more broadly. He emphasized the importance of evaluating how changes function in real-world applications.

Council Member Carroll asked whether, based on prior comparisons, the City’s standards differ significantly from those of surrounding communities. Ms. Egner responded that the differences are not substantial. She explained that, for example, the comparison between 8-foot and 10-foot setbacks is relatively minor, though it can amount to a total difference of several feet when applied across a lot. She noted that many neighboring communities tend to use 10-foot setbacks rather than 8-foot setbacks but stated that it would not be accurate to characterize the City’s standards as significantly different.

Mr. O’Brien added that the current code includes provisions allowing reduced setbacks under certain conditions. He explained that on internal or corner lots, setbacks may be

reduced from 8 feet to 6 feet if the structure is an attached garage without living space above. However, he noted that there is no restriction preventing future additions of living space above those areas, which can create further constraints. He emphasized the need to simplify the code by reducing layered exceptions and ensuring that standards are clear, consistent, and easy to understand.

Ms. Egner stated that the draft provided to the Council is formatted very differently from the current hard-copy binder of the code. She explained that she could review the existing code and flag specific items for consideration, particularly those identified by staff as concerns. She noted that some provisions—such as reducing setbacks from 8 feet to 6 feet—could be revisited, potentially retaining the 8-foot standard while removing the reduction. She added that part of her approach was informed by a list of requested changes from engineering and development services to be addressed during the rewrite.

Mr. O'Brien explained that one reason for proposing larger setbacks is related to building code requirements. He noted that as structures are built closer to property lines, fire rating requirements under the International Residential Code increase, which can add cost to development.

Council Member Carroll stated that these types of discussions are valid but are more appropriate for focused conversations on specific topics, such as setbacks. She expressed concern about addressing numerous detailed issues simultaneously without a structured approach.

Ms. Egner stated that she will review and incorporate required changes mandated by the state legislature, noting that many of these are procedural in nature, such as updates to appeals processes, approvals, and similar items. She explained that these changes will be clearly flagged so the Council can identify sections that differ significantly from the current code. She added that, aside from those required updates, she will work to keep the remainder of the document as consistent as possible with the existing code. She also noted that Mr. O'Brien will address any additional technical items identified by his staff.

The Council discussed the progress and goals of the code rewrite. Mr. O'Brien explained that staff will conduct a thorough internal review before the document returns to the Council, ensuring all relevant issues are addressed. Ms. Egner added that previously flagged items will be incorporated and clearly identified so the Council can track changes.

Mayor Frost asked whether the rewrite has achieved its goal of simplification, specifically whether the new structure makes the code easier to navigate and consolidates references appropriately. Ms. Egner responded that significant progress has been made, though a few sections still require restructuring. She expressed confidence that the next version will be clearer and more organized.

Mr. O'Brien noted that the existing code lacks clear definitions for key terms, such as "mixed-use," warehouses, and offices, which has caused confusion and complications in appeals. He also pointed out that processes like commercial site plan approvals are scattered across multiple sections, sometimes referencing dead ends. The rewrite aims to resolve these issues, improve consistency, and modernize the code, much of which dates

from the 1980s. He emphasized that the project is intended to create clarity without imposing drastic changes and encouraged the Council to provide feedback on the direction.

The discussion focused on evaluating the progress and effectiveness of the code rewrite. Mayor Frost asked whether there is a way to test the new code against prior conflicts to confirm that it achieves its intended goals. Mr. O'Brien and Ms. Egner noted that some trial runs have already been conducted, and the main body of the rewrite is in place, though it still requires alignment with the current code and flagging of items that need attention. They highlighted those outdated sections, including 30 pages of obsolete building code references, which have been removed, simplifying the document. Mayor Frost asked whether the rewrite would make processes faster or easier to interpret. Mr. O'Brien explained that clearer organization, inclusion of definitions, and streamlined processes bring staff and developers closer to a shared understanding, even if interpretation issues can never be fully eliminated.

Ms. Egner emphasized that the rewrite significantly streamlines the code and will be more user-friendly, even for developers who struggled with the previous version. Mr. O'Brien added that certain areas, like the TOD sections, were not included in this project due to complexity and will be addressed separately in the future. Overall, the consensus was that the rewrite accomplishes essential updates, improves clarity, and provides a foundation for more consistent application of the code.

Ms. Egner explained that once the rewrite streamlines the code, the Council could handle ongoing adjustments—such as zoning or use updates—through periodic work sessions, addressing a few items at a time. She referenced a chart showing current uses, noting that, for example, the CC-1 zone currently lists 819 uses because of broad categorization. She highlighted the challenge of defining specific uses, such as distinguishing between a medical facility, a blood draw clinic, or a cosmetic service, and suggested that a more detailed breakdown would help clarify permitted uses. She proposed developing a refined chart that incorporates her interpretation along with input from Mr. O'Brien and staff to align with Council expectations.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the main challenge is defining the Council's intent for each zone. He used CC-1 as an example, noting questions such as whether there is a meaningful distinction between general commercial and shopping center zones, or what types of uses—like a pickleball court, fitness, or recreational facilities—are appropriate in each. He emphasized that clarifying these definitions is necessary because current practice has led to ambiguity about where certain uses should be allowed.

Council Member Hunter agreed that guidance is needed. He explained that the previous list he reviewed—50 potential uses across 20 zones—was overwhelming, making it unrealistic to confirm each use without structured direction.

Ms. Egner acknowledged that the Council will need to provide direction on permitted uses. She clarified that the list was adapted from other cities' chart-based systems, with some additional uses added based on local needs. She provided examples, such as hotels and motels in CC-1, and asked whether certain uses should be limited to specific areas, like downtown. She proposed creating a simplified chart reflecting her interpretation of

current zoning, which the Council could then review and adjust. Her goal was to get general guidance from the Council so staff can refine the code and the charts more effectively.

Mayor Frost suggested starting with the existing input from Council members and staff as a baseline. He recommended using the chart shown earlier as a reference and then collaborating in a work session to review it. He noted that interpretations vary widely, so having a structured discussion would help align perspectives.

Council Member Hunter expressed concern about differing opinions, emphasizing the need for a framework to guide decisions. He wants a starting point that allows him and others to provide input while understanding the practical implications from staff who work with these zones daily.

Mayor Frost proposed that instead of focusing on very specific uses, it may be better to define broader categories or language describing the types of activities, which could reduce confusion over individual businesses.

Ms. Egner responded that she could organize the chart by broad categories, such as “retail stores,” and then include subcategories under each. She would work with staff to refine the list and ensure clarity. Mr. O’Brien cautioned that the code should clarify that a business’s primary use determines its zoning classification. Simply selling a product does not automatically categorize it as a retail store. He noted that some uses may no longer fit in their previous zones but could be logical in another, such as moving certain uses from an auto mall (GC-2) to a different zone (PI-1), rather than trying to redefine every use within each zone. The goal is to create logical, consistent guidance for zoning and permitted uses.

Council Member Hunter asked what happens if a grandfathered business wants to make building improvements. Mr. O’Brien explained that businesses could make improvements to their building, but they could not expand the structure or its footprint beyond what was previously allowed. Ms. Egner added that grandfathering language could be crafted to allow maintenance and improvements without permitting an increase in size or intensity of use.

The discussion focused on zoning adjustments and their impact on existing and future businesses. Council Member Hunter confirmed exclusions in certain zones and emphasized preventing an overconcentration of uses like car washes downtown. Mr. O’Brien clarified which zones the restrictions apply to and how frontage affects use suitability. Council Member Carroll suggested focusing on future development rather than grandfathering existing businesses, noting that some current owners are fine with potential changes. Ms. Egner highlighted that the changes affect future development, not existing businesses, and raised concerns about other uses like warehousing, gyms, and indoor sports in industrial areas.

The council and staff discussed zoning adjustments and how specific uses affect the broader area. Council Member Hunter noted that changes often have unintended consequences for future developments. Mr. O’Brien emphasized evaluating impacts zone-wide rather than just for individual properties. Council Member Hunter stressed that

warehouses should retain warehouse uses unless the zone itself changes. Council Member Carroll raised questions about placing recreational uses, like volleyball or pickleball, in warehouse spaces. Mr. O'Brien suggested conditional uses but acknowledged their challenges. The conversation also touched on balancing community amenities with revenue-generating uses that support city funding, particularly in shopping center contexts.

They discussed how larger non-retail uses, like swimming centers or gyms, are occupying prime retail spaces in shopping centers, reducing available revenue-generating retail. Ms. Egner and Mr. O'Brien discussed potential alternatives, such as locating these uses in secondary or back-of-block areas (GC-1 or GC-2 zones) rather than downtown cores. Council Member Carroll acknowledged the appeal of using underutilized spaces for recreational purposes. Ms. Egner emphasized the need for specificity in zoning categories rather than broad labels and outlined her plan to organize current uses while keeping the code simplified. Mr. O'Brien noted that higher-level use decisions will be addressed gradually as part of the general plan and other development projects, rather than in a single comprehensive rewrite.

2. Discussion on fiscal year ending 2027 Fitness Center, Road CIP, Impact Fees, and Local Building Authority funds.

Ms. Montoya stated that this meeting was the second budget work session and that the session would address the fitness center, roads, CIP and impact fee funds for general purposes, which include roads, parks, public safety, and the local building authority. Ms. Montoya explained a tentative budget will be presented on May 5, with adoption planned for June. Legislative changes require the adoption of an interim budget in June, with a final budget possible in August if a tax increase is approved.

Fitness Center

Ms. Montoya noted that discussions in the previous workshop focused on improvements. The current direction is not to undertake a full renovation or issue bonds. Only essential improvements are being considered and will be presented at a future work session.

Revenue is expected to remain flat. Personnel costs have increased slightly due to merit increases and health benefits. Operating expenses have increased by 10%, primarily due to building maintenance and utilities. Capital expenditure has decreased because no major renovations are currently programmed; these will be addressed in a later session. Next steps include continuing evaluation of fitness center improvements and presenting an update at the next budget work session.

Council Member Hunter asked about subsidies for the fitness center. Ms. Montoya explained that the city currently subsidizes 35% of the fitness center's operations, consistent with previous years. Any additional improvements or capital projects would temporarily increase this subsidy, but no ongoing increase is planned. Recommended improvements will be presented in a future session.

Road CIP & Impact Fees

Ms. Montoya then discussed the Roads CIP fund, which is dedicated to Class C funds and transportation-related sales tax. This fund was separated from other capital improvements a few years ago. Recent adjustments reflect a "truing up" of sales tax

revenue, resulting in a \$400,000 difference, but this does not indicate an increase in spending. Operating expenses now include streetlight and traffic signal maintenance, which are eligible Class C expenses. Planned capital improvements for fiscal year 2027 include water line upgrades along 100 W and 100 E (pending CDBG award), annual overlay and pavement maintenance projects, and equipment replacement, including a 1996 dump truck. Ms. Montoya noted that revenue increases are primarily due to truing up funds from the past two years, and overall expenses remain largely consistent.

Ms. Montoya reviewed impact fee revenues and expenditures, noting a decrease in intergovernmental revenue due to prior-year MAG reimbursements not continuing into the current year. Interest revenue has increased slightly, while impact fee revenues are projected to decline significantly due to reduced development activity, prompting a more conservative estimate.

On the expenditure side, operational costs are decreasing as the impact fee study is being completed. Capital projects eligible for impact fee funding include:

- 700 North extension (design phase now, construction planned for fiscal year 2027)
- 200 South 300 West roundabout (MAG)
- Pony Express Corridor (including the city's 50% required MAG match)
- 1100 South and 100 East intersection
- Lakeshore Drive project (Phase 1).
- A placeholder is also included for future growth and development reimbursements that may arise during the year.

Council Member Hunter asked how the city is funding road projects without a dedicated transportation utility fee (TUF). Ms. Montoya explained that road projects are funded through road impact fees and the Roads CIP fund, which are dedicated revenue sources. She noted that most cities similarly rely on restricted transportation funds rather than general funds for capital road projects.

Mr. Bunker added that many cities use similar funding mechanisms, such as Class B&C funds, tax programs and some also adopt transportation utility fees. Council Member Hunter referenced this as a potential consideration based on prior discussions. Council Member Carroll asked whether any general funds are used for these projects. Ms. Montoya clarified that general funds are used only for street operations, including personnel and utilities, while capital road projects are funded through dedicated sources. Maintenance activities like slurry seal are categorized as capital expenses and are not funded through the general fund.

The discussion focused on funding strategies for road maintenance and the potential need for additional dedicated revenue sources. Mr. Bunker clarified that while maintenance activities like slurry seal are ongoing, they can be treated as one-time expenditures because funding is allocated year to year.

Council Member Hunter emphasized the need to consider new funding mechanisms, noting that neighboring cities have established dedicated revenue streams, such as transportation utility fees, to maintain higher-quality roads. He expressed concern that the

city may fall behind without similar funding and advocated for initiating a study to explore creating a dedicated road fund.

Ms. Montoya explained that recent legislation requires a formal study before implementing a transportation utility fee, and any such fund would need to be separated from the general fund and other dedicated funds. Mr. Kelly added that the general fund currently supports personnel and in-house road maintenance activities, such as crack sealing and chip sealing, while contracted work and larger projects are handled through other funds. Ms. Montoya noted that some of these costs are being shifted from the general fund into dedicated road funding sources to better align with their intended use.

The council discussed the possibility of conducting a study for a transportation utility fee. Mayor Frost and Council Member Hunter expressed interest in exploring the option, with Hunter noting that a study is required before any decision can be made. Mayor Frost and Council Member John raised concerns about the cost of conducting such a study and the need to budget for it.

Council Member Carroll and Mr. Bunker clarified that the study would evaluate the road network and determine appropriate fee levels based on usage and service levels, rather than simply dividing costs among households. They emphasized that, in order to qualify as a fee, it must be based on user consumption rather than a flat charge, making the study a necessary step in establishing a legally compliant and equitable funding structure.

Mr. Bunker stated he would obtain cost estimates for the study and determine whether it could fit within the budget. Mayor Frost cautioned that pursuing a study should reflect a strong commitment to potentially implementing the fee, as legislative changes could alter requirements and result in additional costs, estimating the study could cost around \$50,000.

Council Member Carroll expressed general support for the concept but raised concerns about whether residents could absorb an additional fee at this time. The council agreed to first gather information on the cost of the study and then evaluate next steps, including the level of commitment required if funds are allocated.

Park Impact Fees

Ms. Montoya reviewed park and fleet impact fees, noting continued declines in revenue due to reduced development activity compared to previous years. Intergovernmental revenue includes a MAG grant for the Art Dye Trail. Operating expenses are decreasing as the impact fee study is being completed. Capital projects for parks include the continuation of the multi-year Art Dye Trail and the planned development of Lakeview Park on 620 South, with a preliminary budget of \$4 million pending bids.

Council Member Carroll asked about funding for an additional trail connection, and Ms. Montoya indicated she would review timing and budgeting for a future year.

Police Impact Fees

For fleet impact fees, Ms. Montoya noted a correction reducing projected revenue by \$100,000. Capital projects include the evidence building, which has been carried forward,

and tenant improvements on the third floor of the police building, with total capital costs estimated at \$1.8 million for capital improvements.

Mr. Bunker stated that the item discussed will be brought back to the City Council as an action item at the next meeting, scheduled for the 14th, and will be included in the council packet for review.

Fire Impact Fees

Ms. Montoya reviewed fire impact fees, noting that no new capital projects are planned. Current expenditures primarily cover debt service for two fire trucks, including a 2019 ladder truck and a newly purchased 2026 truck, with impact fees contributing to those payments. She also discussed financing for the public works facility through the local building authority using lease revenue bonds. By issuing the bonds in January rather than March, the city saved approximately \$1.2 million due to favorable market timing. The total bond proceeds are about \$40 million, slightly higher due to premiums, and are allocated toward the project.

Council Member Hunter expressed appreciation for the cost savings. Ms. Montoya concluded the presentation, stating that the next steps include returning at the end of April to review the general fund, general capital, and fleet funds, as well as likely presenting fitness center improvement plans.

3. Discussion on our current water supply.

Mayor Frost introduced the topic, noting rapidly changing conditions and the need for the council to build understanding and possibly reach consensus.

Council Member John reported on a recent Provo River Water Users Association (PRWUA) meeting, explaining that the city relies on multiple water sources, including American Fork Canyon, Deer Creek, and Jordanelle. He highlighted unusual conditions this year, with snowpack reaching near-normal levels in late February but then melted extremely quickly. As a result, the area has already experienced significant early runoff, with rivers running high and muddy. He noted that this rapid melt is unprecedented in his experience and that much of the runoff cannot be captured due to water rights limitations, requiring it to flow downstream. Some water users may even need to release stored water to comply with regulations. With most snowpack already gone, he warned that there may be limited sustained stream flows later in the season, requiring the city to rely more heavily on alternative water sources.

Council Member John, along with Mr. Bunker, Mr. Kelly, and others, noted that while the city has been actively brainstorming operational responses to water shortages, it currently lacks a formal, phased drought plan (e.g., Phase 1 through Phase 4). Such a plan would standardize responses and make implementation easier, though any action would still require Council approval. He suggested studying sister cities that have implemented drought plans, noting that Salt Lake City, for example, recently reduced watering to two days per week and may further reduce to one day per week as early as May. The plan would provide weekly guidance on watering needs, using state data averages to establish tiered water restrictions.

Jay Brems provided an overview of the city's water supply, emphasizing that the American Fork River is the primary source and largely determines how other sources are used. In a standard year, the river provides 65–70% of the city's total water demand. He explained that the city also relies on CUP water, which typically provides just over 2,000 acre-feet. This year, full allotment is expected, but future years could see reductions if drought conditions persist. The Provo River Water supply (the old Murdock Canal pipeline) usually supplements the system; last year it was at 100%, but this year the allocation has been reduced to 50%, providing only about 750 acre-feet.

Combined, the CUP and Provo River allocations will account for roughly 28% of the city's water supply this year, compared to a larger proportion in typical years. Because these are late-season sources, the city generally delays using them until late June or early July. Due to the unusually low river flow this year, the city anticipates relying more heavily on wells, which are normally less utilized. This situation highlights the variability and strain on the city's three primary water sources and underscores the importance of careful management under the current drought conditions.

Mr. Brems then provided a detailed overview of the city's water system, explaining that the city has two pressure zones. The upper zone, fed by the American Fork River and CUP water, covers the northern part of the city down to roughly 700 N. The lower zone is supplied primarily by the lower reservoir and the Murdock pipeline. The river and CUP water can be directed to both zones, but the Murdock pipeline only serves the lower zone. He emphasized that water management between these sources is critical. If one source runs low, such as CUP water, the upper zone can only rely on the river, highlighting the limitations and interdependencies of the system. Additionally, the city has two wells, the Country Club and Boley wells—located in Highland, which only supply the lower zone and cannot supplement the upper zone if shortages occur. This underscores the importance of careful allocation and operational planning to manage water effectively during drought conditions.

Mr. Brems explained that the city has three wells that can supply the pressurized irrigation system, including one that can help serve the Fox Hollow golf course. Additional water comes from the Kelly pasture ponds, though that source is limited. He noted that most supply will go to the lower zone and that water availability depends heavily on river conditions. Wells vary widely in output and will likely need to be used extensively this year, increasing pumping costs. One well is currently offline due to motor issues but is expected back in service by mid-to-late April. Jay emphasized that with many variables and potential equipment issues, managing the system this season will be complex and uncertain.

Mayor Frost asked for clarification on how the city's wells integrate with the culinary and PI (pressurized irrigation) systems. Jay Brems and Council Member John explained that the wells are not just directly injected into the system at random points—they actually fill reservoirs. The Country Club and Boley wells feed the lower reservoir in the PI system. In the culinary system, water from wells is pumped into the pipes and, if demand exceeds supply, it can flow up to the tanks to maintain pressure. The PI system can also direct well water either to the lower pond or, if needed, to the culinary system, depending on demand. The Boley Well, for instance, primarily supplies the American Fork irrigation ditch, which leads to the lower pond, but it can be redirected if necessary. Essentially, the

wells provide flexible water inputs that can serve either the PI or culinary system, with reservoir storage acting as a buffer to manage supply and demand.

Mr. Brems explained that when the pressurized irrigation system was installed in 2008, backflows were added to the culinary system to supply water to customers online before the reservoirs were completed. There are seven 6-inch backflows, including one at Park Valve, which allow the system to be filled slowly from the culinary system. Once the reservoirs and transmission lines are filled with canyon water, the small pipes in town are supplied through these backflows. He noted that the system operates differently than in other cities and highlighted the dynamic role of these backflows.

Council Member John provided an update on reservoir capacities as of that morning, stating that Jordanelle Reservoir is at 67% capacity and Deer Creek Reservoir is at 88%.

Council Member Hunter asked about water allocation, storage, and whether early-season use could impact supply later in the year. Council Member John explained that the current 50% allocation is reliable, with potential for slight increases depending on additional snowpack, but emphasized the need to conserve carryover water due to uncertainty in future years. He also sought clarification on reservoir storage, and confirmed that current levels are still benefiting from high water in 2023. Hunter noted that reservoirs are not long-term “banks” and raised concerns about conservation fatigue when water levels appear strong.

Council Member Taylor added that public perception is important and asked about the ongoing operational costs of running wells and pumps, including how long they have been running at high levels.

Mr. Brems reported that the city has spent about \$40,000 so far this year on power costs for operating the wells. Running them 24/7 for four weeks would cost roughly \$200,000, which is already budgeted. He emphasized that using the wells is unavoidable to meet the city’s irrigation (PI) demand. He explained that without additional conservation, all available water sources—including CUP water, the Murdock pipeline, and the three wells—will need to run continuously for about five months. On average, the city uses 55 acre-feet per day for PI water, which is roughly 18 million gallons daily, compared to over 3 million gallons per day for culinary water.

Mr. Brems noted that if resources are insufficient, reservoirs will drop, complicating water management. Brems stressed the importance of not impacting the culinary system. He reported that the spring line provides around 75% of culinary needs, consistently producing 2,400 gallons per minute, dropping only to 2,200 gallons per minute at its lowest since the pipeline project was completed. He added that unused PI wells may need to supplement the culinary system if demand increases. Mr. Brems also mentioned potential operational risks, including power failures that occasionally shut down wells for 6–7 hours, which could disrupt reservoir management and necessitate careful coordination to avoid shortages.

Council Member Taylor supported strict enforcement and a two-day watering limit, noting that some lawn stress may be necessary since water is limited. He highlighted past conservation successes and said tougher restrictions will be needed to protect supply.

Council Member Holley emphasized prioritizing drinking water and long-term sustainability, stating residents may need to accept fewer green lawns as drought conditions persist. He stressed planning for the next several years, not just the current season.

Council members discussed current state watering guidelines and restrictions. Questions were raised about whether limits apply to all types of watering, including gardens and hose use. It was clarified that both the city and residents draw from the same water source, so all usage impacts supply. While current guidance suggests no watering, there is public demand for clarity, and some support was expressed for allowing minimal irrigation to keep plants alive while prioritizing culinary water.

Mr. Brems explained the current watering schedule (three days plus one for spot watering) and noted inconsistent compliance, stressing the need for a clear plan if restrictions tighten. Council Member John shared that Lehi's two-day odd/even system reduced water use by about 20% and improved system balance but said any change would require council approval. Council Member Hunter supported moving two days per week and suggested conservation incentives like rebates to encourage savings.

It was also clarified that the city has not previously reduced to two-day watering, and that water use rose again in 2023 after earlier conservation gains.

There was discussion about delaying the start of the pressurized irrigation system, but concerns were raised that doing so could lead to a surge in usage once it opens. Instead, the plan is to begin filling the system soon and be operational by mid-April, while urging residents to conserve and use water carefully.

Council Member John emphasized the need to take advantage of available snowpack runoff now, while recognizing that tougher decisions may be needed later in the year. Mr. Brems stated that he will provide regular updates on water supply and usage, as conditions will require ongoing, day-to-day monitoring and adjustments.

Mayor Frost asked about the remaining uncertainty on the Snowbird side and whether there is a chance that the city might not use all available water, possibly allowing surplus to be sent elsewhere, such as to Lehi.

Council Member Carroll suggested messaging that the year is likely to be strict on water, keeping the current three-day schedule initially but noting that a switch to two days per week may become necessary depending on flow observations. Mayor Frost noted that the newsletter has already communicated the three-day voluntary conservation schedule. He emphasized encouraging residents to participate and collectively conserve water.

Council Member John explained that snowpack at Snowbird could still potentially increase if additional storms occur over the next 20 days. He stressed that the message to the public should highlight the difficulty of the year while encouraging voluntary conservation. He expressed preference for starting conservatively rather than immediately enforcing strict measures.

Mr. Bunker reminded the Council that a water shortage contingency plan exists from 2021, which includes four stages: advisory, moderate, severe, and critical. He suggested reviewing and updating the plan as needed. He recommended starting the season with a two-day-per-week watering schedule, noting that spring typically requires less water and beginning with three days could create shortages later in the summer months.

Council Member John noted that delaying the activation of wells for three weeks to a month would be a significant savings and benefit for the water system. Council Member Carroll expressed concern that if the April newsletter has already been distributed, the public might not see the updated guidance in time. Mayor Frost explained that the Council and staff had met with the water team just a few days prior, before conditions triggered action, and acknowledged the unusual and rapidly changing situation.

Council Member Holley emphasized the effectiveness of current communication tools like email and social media and encouraged sending updates quickly to residents.

Council Member John asked what level of drought restrictions would trigger a two-day watering schedule. Mr. Bunker clarified that limiting watering to twice per week falls under Stage 2 (severe) restrictions in the city's drought plan.

There was discussion about whether implementing this requires formal council action, with staff indicating they would need to confirm the process. Council Member Taylor suggested moving forward with clear messaging regardless, and Mr. Bunker stressed the importance of informing residents that the city has a drought plan and will escalate restrictions as conditions worsen.

Mr. Brems stressed that any changes to watering rules will require enforcement, noting frequent complaints from residents about neighbors' usage.

The council discussed whether water restrictions should be mandatory or voluntary. Mayor Frost emphasized that enforcement depends on clear wording. Mr. Brems and Council Member John reviewed past enforcement measures—warnings, fines, and water shutoffs—which were not very effective.

Council Member Taylor recommended focusing on strong public messaging and voluntary compliance, encouraging residents to limit watering to two days per week, as citywide enforcement may be challenging.

Mayor Frost stressed that behavior change takes time but can yield significant savings. Council Member Taylor also suggested using visuals like graphs to help residents understand the impact, and staff confirmed that information is already being shared via the website, social media, and newsletters, including guidance to delay watering until May 1.

The council discussed keeping messaging consistent, with a focus on encouraging residents to wait until May 1 if possible and then limiting watering to two days per week. Staff emphasized the importance of avoiding frequent changes to messaging, as consistency helps prevent confusion and improves public compliance.

Mayor Frost noted that residents are receiving mixed signals about water use and suggested that the messaging may need to be simplified to avoid confusion. He emphasized that water use behavior is difficult to quickly correct, comparing it to steering a large ship, but once residents adjust, they tend to do well. He also mentioned that in the past, simply asking residents to conserve resulted in significant water savings.

Mr. Bird explained that the city has already been sharing information through the website, social media, and newsletters. He clarified that the current messaging includes the standard three-day watering schedule, along with a request for residents to hold off on watering until May 1. He asked for confirmation that the “wait until May 1” message should remain in place, followed by a transition to two days per week watering. He emphasized the importance of consistency in messaging. He noted that minor discrepancies, such as some residents seeing a three-day schedule in earlier communications, are not a major concern, but repeatedly changing the message could create confusion and reduce public trust.

Action Items

- Maintain the “wait until May 1” message.
- Transition to a two-day-per-week watering schedule starting May 1.
- Consider including a graph in social media posts to clarify the message.
- Ensure messaging is consistent across all platforms to avoid confusion.

4. Adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 6:38 p.m.



Stephanie Finau
Deputy Recorder