AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
JUNE 2, 2026
WORK SESSION MINUTES

Members Present:	
Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member
Tim Holley	Council Member
Staci Carroll	Council Member
Ernie John	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
Derric Rykert	Community Service Director
Cameron Paul	Police Chief
Kevin Smith	City Engineer
Cody Opperman	City Planner

Also present: Lauren Leydsman (MHTN Architects), Susan Becker (Zions Public Finance, Inc), Mehrnaz Fereydouni (Horrocks), J. Ryan Wallace (MHTN Architects), John Schiess (Horrocks Engineers), Lauren Ploeger (Francon Civil Engineers), Jonathan Concidime (Zions Public Finance, Inc), Suzanne Nordin (AFPD), Dawna Whiting (AFPD), Cody Gunn (Horrocks), Ted Cannon (Horrocks), and Brian Tonetti (Alta Planning).

The American Fork City Council held a work session on Tuesday, June 2, 2026, in the City Administration Conference Room, located at 51 East Main Street, 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. Presentation of progress on the American Fork Transit Circulator Study and Polycentric City Master Plan.
   Mayor Frost indicated that the Council would begin with the presentation regarding the study's ongoing work and planning efforts.

Mr. O'Brien introduced the consultant team and provided background on the project. He explained that several small-area planning efforts were combined into one comprehensive project, funded jointly by MAG and American Fork City, to better coordinate transportation, land use, and development planning. He noted that the project was well underway and invited the consultants to present the study and answer Council questions. He also noted that portions of the project had previously been presented to the Council.

Project Status, Vision, and Planning Framework
Mr. Wallace explained that the presentation would highlight progress made since the Council's previous review, including how feedback had been incorporated into the plan. He noted the project was in its final stages, with completion targeted for August 1. He reviewed the plan's vision of creating six distinct activity centers connected through a cohesive citywide framework, with goals focused on quality of life, recreation, economic vitality, strategic growth, and improved multimodal transportation connections throughout the community.

Overview of the Six Activity Centers and Transit Circulator Study
Mr. Wallace reviewed the six activity centers identified through the General Plan process—Transit Center, Commercial Center, Downtown, East Gateway, Employment Center, and Recreation Center—and explained that each is intended to have a distinct identity while supporting a unified citywide vision.

Transit Study Needs Assessment and Planning Process
Ms. Fereydouni explained that the Transit Circulator Study was developed alongside the Polycentric City Center Plan with the goal of evaluating how transit could connect the six activity centers. As the study progressed, the project team recognized that while the full polycentric vision may take many years or even decades to fully develop, there are already existing transit needs within the community. She noted that residents currently rely on transit services and could benefit from improved access and connectivity.

Based on those findings, the study established two primary visions.

- The first is a short-term vision focused on improving access to existing transit infrastructure, particularly connections to the American Fork Frontrunner Station. She stated that while the station is a valuable regional transportation asset, residents on the east side of the city face challenges accessing it. The short-term vision therefore examines ways to improve current transit service and connections to destinations that already exist today.
- The second vision is a long-term strategy intended to prepare for future growth and development as the six activity centers become more fully established. This long-range vision focuses on creating a transit network capable of connecting those centers and supporting increased mobility throughout the city.

Ms. Fereydouni stated that the study identified five primary transportation needs, each accompanied by corresponding goals. These needs address both current and future travel demand.

1. Improve connections to the Frontrunner Station.
2. Focus on serving transit-dependent populations, including residents who do not have access to a personal vehicle.

3. Involve improving connectivity between activity centers such as Downtown and the East Gateway area, where significant numbers of short vehicle trips already occur and are expected to increase as development continues.
4. Identify strengthening connections to the regional transit network.
5. Address future growth on the west side of the city.

Ms. Fereydouni explained that the study followed a seven-step process, beginning with an analysis of existing conditions and coordination with UTA, UDOT, and MAG. The team then developed and refined transit alternatives, prepared ridership and cost estimates, evaluated the options against the study goals, and ultimately developed implementation strategies and recommended next steps. She explained that the study reviewed prior plans, transit projects, demographic data, and travel patterns to inform the development of transit alternatives. After evaluating a range of concepts, the team concluded that no single solution would meet the City's needs over time. Instead, the study recommends a phased approach with multiple transit strategies that can be implemented as growth and travel demand evolve.

Ms. Fereydouni explained that the study's primary short-term recommendation is a UTA-operated microtransit service, which functions similarly to Uber or Lyft by providing on-demand, door-to-door transportation within a designated service area. She noted that the service would use small shuttle vehicles and offer flexible trips rather than fixed routes. During the study, the team learned of a planned partnership among Utah County, UTA, and UDOT to launch a large on-demand transit zone serving American Fork, Lehi, Saratoga Springs, and Eagle Mountain, with service expected to begin in August. Ms. Fereydouni explained that the proposed microtransit zone would cover approximately 77 square miles, allowing residents and workers to travel between American Fork and neighboring communities throughout the service area. She said the program supports the study's short-term transit goals by improving access to employment centers and existing transit services without major infrastructure investments. She encouraged the city to actively promote the service once it launches and noted that ridership data will help UTA identify travel patterns and future transit needs. Over time, that information could support the development of fixed-route bus service or a local circulator system in areas with sustained demand.

Mayor Frost noted that the city had already submitted information to UTA regarding the proposed service area. He explained that City representatives had requested inclusion of an additional employment area that appeared to fall just outside the draft service boundary. He emphasized that the area contains a significant concentration of jobs and would likely generate substantial demand for transit service.

The study also evaluated two smaller circulator concepts intended to provide a more affordable alternative to a full citywide circulator system. Ms. Fereydouni noted that while circulator systems can be highly effective, they are also relatively costly to operate. Ms. Fereydouni then discussed the long-term alternatives, which envision a more comprehensive circulator system once the activity centers, particularly those on the west side of the city, become more fully developed. The primary distinction between the two long-term alternatives relates to the potential construction of Mid-Lake Crossing.

Ms. Fereydouni explained that the transit alternatives were evaluated using criteria such as projected ridership, service to transit-dependent populations, operating costs, agency support, future growth, and connectivity between the six activity centers. While the microtransit option received the highest overall score, followed by the larger circulator concepts, she emphasized that the scoring matrix was intended as a trade-off tool rather than a ranking of preferred alternatives, helping decision-makers understand the benefits and limitations of each option.

Ms. Fereydouni noted that even alternatives with lower overall scores may still be viable depending on the City's priorities. She cited Alternative 4B, which would provide peak-hour service between the Frontrunner Station and Employment Center, as an example of a lower-scoring option that could be attractive because of its relatively low cost and potential effectiveness in serving commuter demand. She emphasized that the evaluation was intended to help compare tradeoffs rather than eliminate options. The team then developed implementation strategies for each alternative, including potential operating models, funding sources, and recommended next steps.

Ms. Fereydouni explained that the study includes implementation plans for each transit alternative, outlining funding opportunities, key considerations, and next steps. She recommended using the upcoming microtransit service to gather ridership data and better understand travel demand. As the city grows, smaller circulator options could serve as mid-term solutions, with a full circulator system becoming a potential long-term option. She noted that the phased approach provides flexibility to expand transit services as development and demand evolve.

Council Member Holley asked how the study defined its near-, mid-, and long-term recommendations. Ms. Fereydouni explained that the near-term recommendations focus on current opportunities such as the upcoming microtransit service, while mid-term recommendations generally cover the next 5 to 10 years and long-term recommendations extend beyond 10 years. She noted that specific dates were not assigned because future growth and transportation needs may change over time.

Council Member Hunter asked whether microtransit trips would be limited to six miles. Ms. Fereydouni explained that six miles is generally UTA's preferred trip length, but longer trips may still be accommodated, particularly when no other transit connection is available. She noted that the city could potentially work with UTA to adjust service levels in the future. Mr. O'Brien added that staff plan to monitor origin and destination data from the service to better understand travel patterns and identify future transit needs.

Mr. Hunter reported that UTA expects to deploy approximately 16 microtransit vehicles throughout northern Utah County and that the $2.50 fare would include transfers to connecting transit services, with some trips to destinations such as the Frontrunner Station potentially incurring no additional cost.

Council Member Carroll asked about projected ridership for the transit alternatives. Mr. Hunter explained that the study estimated weekday ridership for both 2026 and 2050. Projections ranged from approximately 80 daily riders in 2026 for the limited peak-hour Alternative 4B to about 420 daily riders for the full circulator Alternative 5A. By 2050, ridership was projected to roughly double, with Alternative 4B serving about 160 riders and Alternative 5A serving approximately 920 riders per weekday.

Council Member Carroll asked how ridership projections were developed. Ms. Fereydouni explained that the estimates were based on MAG's travel demand model, which incorporates land use, population, employment, and growth forecasts, along with assumptions about fares, service hours, and transit operations. She noted that the study used MAG's previous model because an updated version was not yet available and stated that the newer model is expected to provide more accurate—and potentially higher—ridership projections.

Mayor Frost observed that the microtransit program may serve as a temporary solution and a tool for collecting travel data that could inform future transit services. Ms. Fereydouni agreed, noting that microtransit is expensive to operate and has been replaced by fixed-route transit in some areas once ridership increased. She added that the long-term funding for the Utah County microtransit program remains uncertain and should be considered as future transit plans are developed.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the city plans to use microtransit data to better understand local travel demand and noted that UTA's investment in the service indicates a recognized transportation need. However, he cautioned that a fixed-route or circulator system would require a much larger investment and may only become feasible as demand grows.

Ms. Fereydouni explained that many circulator systems are operated through contracts with private companies that provide vehicles, drivers, and transit operations. Mr. O'Brien added that some communities use hybrid models, such as Ogden, where responsibilities are shared between the city and a private operator. Mr. Hunter noted that operating costs were a key factor in the analysis, explaining that routes with shorter waiting times require more vehicles and therefore cost more to operate.

Council Member Hunter asked whether there are existing circulator systems that American Fork could use as models and requested additional information about what future City funding for a circulator service might involve. Mr. O'Brien responded that any discussion of local funding would relate to the mid- and long-term alternatives and would only become relevant if the city eventually determined that a circulator system was needed.

Council Member Hunter noted that decisions regarding a future circulator system would ultimately rest with the City Council and expressed interest in learning more about potential operating models, questioning whether UTA would necessarily be the most efficient provider. Council Member Carroll observed that circulator systems are often associated with tourist communities, while Council Member Hunter emphasized the importance of identifying examples from communities more comparable to American Fork and understanding their costs and performance.

Mr. Hunter and Mr. O'Brien acknowledged that identifying directly with comparable examples has been challenging. They noted that many of the communities with existing circulator systems are larger urban centers, such as Bethesda and other cities on the East Coast, and differ significantly from American Fork in terms of population, density, and development patterns. Mr. O'Brien stated that the project team had not identified a community of similar size and characteristics that currently operates a comparable circulator system, making direct comparisons difficult. Mr. Hunter added that many of those larger cities also do not face the same transportation and geographic challenges present in American Fork.

Mayor Frost observed that the primary value of discussing local transit connections stems from American Fork's access to the Frontrunner system. He noted that Frontrunner provides regional connectivity throughout the Wasatch Front, including access to destinations such as the Provo Airport. In his view, the key challenge is helping residents reach that regional transit network from within the city.

Mr. O'Brien agreed and stated that the issue is fundamentally one of connectivity. He explained that American Fork already benefits from regional transit services, including Frontrunner and bus service along State Street, but lacks an effective connection between those services and many areas of the city. He characterized the challenge as a "first- and last-mile" problem and stated that the study seeks to identify ways to bridge that gap.

Council Member Hunter requested additional information regarding potential funding sources and the City's possible financial obligations if a circulator system were pursued. Mr. O'Brien responded that the full report includes cost estimates and funding information for each of the alternatives.

Mr. Wallace introduced the next portion of the presentation, explaining that the study examined not only transit connections but also opportunities for active transportation, including walking and bicycling. He noted that American Fork has several unique assets, including rail corridors and waterways, that provide opportunities to improve connections between the city's activity centers. He invited Brian Tonetti with Alta Planning to present the trail network recommendations.

Mr. Tonetti explained that the team evaluated the regional trail network and identified opportunities to connect the six activity centers through existing and previously planned trail corridors. The analysis incorporated facilities already identified in prior planning efforts, including the Utah Lake Shore Trail, the American Fork River Trail, corridors from the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and connections identified in the Station Area Master Plan. He stated that these trails provide an important complement to transit by addressing first- and last-mile connectivity needs. In addition to improving access to destinations within the city, the trail network can help connect residents to regional transit services such as Frontrunner.

The team identified three major trail corridors as particularly significant opportunities for American Fork:

- *Rail Trail Corridor*: Utilizing the existing rail right-of-way, this trail would create a linear connection between the East Gateway, Downtown, and Commercial Center activity centers. Concept plans include trail amenities, public art, placemaking elements, and improved interactions between the trail and surrounding streets.
- *American Fork River Trail:* This corridor would connect the existing Art Dye Trail system to the future Utah Lake Shore Trail, linking Downtown with the Recreation Center. Concepts include trail improvements, green infrastructure, flood management features, and connections to surrounding destinations.
- *Spring Creek Trail:* Located on the west side of the city, this corridor would connect the Commercial Center and Transit Center areas, providing improved access to the Frontrunner Station. The concept also includes opportunities within the Meadows

development area, including boardwalks and recreational features that would serve both transportation and recreational purposes.

Mr. Tonetti emphasized that these trail corridors build upon previous planning efforts while creating a more connected citywide network that links the activity centers and supports both active transportation and recreation.

Council Member Carroll asked how much of the proposed American Fork River Trail currently exists and noted that she did not believe the entire corridor had been completed. Mr. O'Brien confirmed that significant portions of the trail remain unfinished. He explained that the city has recently been discussing the corridor with regional trail planning partners and anticipates participating in a feasibility study to identify solutions for several key barriers along the route. He noted that challenges include determining how the trail would pass through the downtown area and how users would safely cross obstacles such as I-15 and the railroad tracks near the lake. He emphasized that the trail alignments shown on the map represent a conceptual vision rather than final route locations.

Mr. Tonetti added that the plan also identifies interim connections that could be used while permanent trail segments are developed. In some locations, neighborhood streets or low-volume roadways could serve as temporary connections to maintain continuity within the network.

Mayor Frost asked whether there was a planned trail corridor running parallel to the Frontrunner rail line. Mr. Tonetti responded that such a corridor had been identified in the Station Area Master Plan.

Mayor Frost suggested that a trail could potentially be incorporated alongside the rail corridor if Frontrunner is double tracked in the future. Mr. O'Brien responded that the idea has been discussed previously due to available land near the rail line and noted that the city has been coordinating with Lehi on similar concepts. He emphasized the importance of creating regional trail connections that align across city boundaries and avoid disconnected segments.

Council Member Hunter asked whether the proposed Spring Creek Trail corridor had been coordinated with Lehi, noting that portions of the corridor extend into Lehi and that the value of the trail depends on its ability to connect across municipal boundaries. Mr. Tonetti responded that the need for coordination with Lehi had been identified during the planning process and was noted in the plan. While the study itself did not include formal coordination efforts, the importance of regional connectivity was recognized.

Mr. O'Brien explained that City staff had already engaged in discussions with Lehi regarding trail connectivity. Approximately a year earlier, he and Planning Manager Mike West met with Lehi representatives to discuss several trail connections and address locations where trails on one side of a roadway in one city connected to trails on the opposite side in the neighboring city. Those discussions focused on creating smoother transitions and improving continuity between the two trail systems.

Mr. Wallace emphasized that trail users do not think in terms of city boundaries and simply expect a connected route that allows them to travel from one destination to another without interruption.

Mr. Wallace invited Susie Becker and Lauren Leydsman to join the presentation and explained that the remainder of the discussion would focus on each of the six activity centers identified in the Polycentric City Center Plan. He stated that for each center the team would review the vision, summarize feedback received from the Council during previous discussions, present conceptual illustrations of potential development and public improvements, and discuss possible implementation strategies and funding opportunities.

Transit Center
Ms. Leydsman summarized the major themes previously identified by the Council, including the desire for distinctive amenities and a stronger sense of place, integration of agriculture and local community identity, pedestrian-oriented development, recognition of existing uses and community connections to the area, and respect for existing property boundaries and land uses. She then described the conceptual vision for the area. The concept includes:

- A public park associated with the Spring Creek corridor
- Restore natural features, trail improvements, and adjacent residential development.
- Future housing could be designed to interface with wetlands and open space while maintaining environmental and recreational amenities.

Ms. Leydsman noted that the proposed Transit Center Park, Spring Creek restoration, and trail improvements could be candidates for various grant opportunities and other funding sources, which Ms. Becker would discuss as part of the implementation strategy for the center.

Ms. Becker explained that the City's first priority for implementing projects within the activity centers should be pursuing available grant funding. She noted that many of the concepts identified in the plan—including trails, rail corridor improvements, river restoration projects, parks, and open space enhancements—align well with grant programs and could potentially be funded through external sources. She stated that in areas with significant opportunities for new development, impact fees should also be considered as a funding source for eligible infrastructure improvements. For larger infrastructure projects, she noted that a Public Infrastructure District (PID) may be appropriate, particularly where major improvements are needed, and ownership patterns are conducive to that approach.

Ms. Becker also highlighted Tax Increment Financing (TIF) as an important economic development tool because it allows the City to capture growth in property tax revenues generated by new development, including revenue contributions from other taxing entities. She noted that American Fork already has experience using tax increment financing through the Patriot Station area and observed that some existing redevelopment areas have expired or are nearing expiration. She suggested there may be opportunities to evaluate whether any remaining funds could support projects in areas such as Downtown and noted that the Egg Farm redevelopment area was also expected to expire in the near future.

In summary, Ms. Becker explained that the implementation strategy generally prioritizes available grants first, followed by economic development tools such as impact fees, PIDs, and tax increment financing. After those options are evaluated, the City could consider additional funding mechanisms, including sales tax revenues, bonding capacity, and other local financing strategies as needed.

Mr. O'Brien noted that some modifications may be necessary within the Transit-Oriented Development area to address challenges resulting from earlier development patterns. He explained that previous plans anticipated commercial nodes in certain locations, but those commercial components were never constructed, creating gaps that the city is now trying to address.

Commercial Center
Ms. Leydsman summarized feedback received from the Council, which emphasized maintaining the area as a strong commercial hub while improving the pedestrian experience within what is currently a highly auto-oriented environment. Other themes included:

- Modernize existing commercial areas
- Encourage experience-based destinations
- Strengthen placemaking and community identity
- Improve connections to other activity centers.

She described a concept that would capitalize on the area's wetland resources by restoring natural features, adding trails and boardwalks, and orienting future commercial development toward the wetlands rather than turning away from them. The concept is intended to create a more inviting environment that integrates recreation, natural amenities, and commercial activity. Another concept illustrated potential improvements to the entrance of the Meadows area, including modifications to the existing roundabout and enhanced gateway features.

Ms. Becker explained that many of the proposed trail, wetland, and restoration projects could qualify for grant funding. She also noted that remaining redevelopment funds and developer contributions may help fund certain improvements. The report identifies several potential grant opportunities, but she cautioned that tax increment financing is generally no longer available for retail-focused projects because of changes in state law.

Council Member Hunter asked whether trails, including equestrian trails, could realistically be developed through wetland areas. Mr. Tonetti responded that equestrian, hiking, and bicycling uses could be compatible with natural trail development in wetlands, subject to City policy decisions. He noted that any trail improvements would need to be carefully designed to minimize environmental impacts and comply with wetland regulations.

Downtown Center Vision
Ms. Leydsman introduced the Downtown Center recommendations and reviewed the primary themes identified through prior Council feedback. Those themes included:

- Maintain downtown as a community gathering place
- Create flexible streets and event-ready infrastructure,
- Improve connectivity across Main Street and State Street
- Support additional downtown residential development
- Reinforce downtown's unique identity

- Expand destinations and opportunities for local businesses
- Invest in creative solutions that strengthen the area's character.

She highlighted a concept referred to as the Hub and Fork Junction Plaza, envisioned at the intersection of the proposed Rail Trail and the American Fork River corridor. The concept would create a pedestrian-oriented public gathering space surrounded by retail and commercial uses while drawing architectural inspiration from the historic character already present downtown. The plaza is intended to serve as a central community destination and a key connection point within the broader trail network.

Ms. Becker noted that portions of the Downtown Center are located within an Opportunity Zone, which could provide incentives for private investment and economic development. She also suggested that partnerships and business recruitment efforts could help support redevelopment within the area.

Ms. Leydsman then presented a second concept illustrating how streets such as Church Street, Merchant Street, or Center Street could function as flexible public spaces. Under the concept, the street would remain open to traffic during normal conditions but could be temporarily closed to accommodate festivals, community events, and other public gatherings, creating a more adaptable and event-friendly downtown environment.

East Gateway Vision
Turning to the East Gateway Center, Ms. Leydsman summarized the key themes identified by the Council, including creating a stronger gateway identity and first impression for visitors entering the city from the east, promoting a more people-oriented urban form, overcoming transportation barriers, supporting regional destinations and tax-base growth, improving infrastructure and access, and maintaining a balanced mix of uses throughout the corridor. She described a concept for the eastern entrance to American Fork along State Street that incorporates the proposed Rail Trail as a linear park feature. The concept includes:

- Gateway elements that would welcome visitors into the city while orienting future development toward the street and trail corridor.
- Create a stronger sense of arrival
- Improve the pedestrian environment
- Establish a more defined identity for the corridor while encouraging development patterns that engage the public realm rather than turning away from it.

Mr. O'Brien emphasized that the images and concepts presented throughout the plan are meant to demonstrate what could be possible within each activity center and are not intended to dictate specific future projects or development outcomes. He stated that exploring ambitious ideas and pushing the boundaries of what might be achievable is an important part of long-range planning, as it helps establish a vision for the community and identify opportunities that may otherwise be overlooked.

Ms. Leydsman described a concept for the eastern end of the Rail Trail that would create small gathering spaces and neighborhood parks along the corridor, enhancing recreation opportunities and the East Gateway experience. For the Employment Center, she reviewed goals of improving connectivity, supporting business growth, strengthening the area's economic role, and adding complementary amenities. Concepts included a food plaza or food truck court surrounded by retail and commercial uses, as well as infill development opportunities within existing business park areas to better utilize available land and create a more active destination.

Ms. Becker stated that many of the same funding strategies discussed for other centers could also apply to the Employment Center. She noted that portions of the area may benefit from Opportunity Zone incentives and that Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding could potentially be available for certain qualifying improvements. She also highlighted a UDOT sidewalk program that may provide opportunities to improve pedestrian infrastructure and enhance the appearance and functionality of the area.

Recreation
Ms. Leydsman reviewed the Recreation Center vision, which focuses on activating the waterfront, expanding recreation opportunities, improving trail access, and creating destinations beyond the marina itself. Concepts included small-scale retail and dining opportunities along 100 West that could serve marina visitors and help establish the area as a broader recreational destination.

Mr. O'Brien added that future development along the Pony Express corridor could create opportunities for commercial nodes near new access points and intersections. He noted that convenience stores, travel-oriented businesses, and other commercial uses may be attracted to those locations, depending on future Council direction and market demand.

Ms. Leydsman then described a second concept for the Recreation Center focused on expanding public gathering opportunities at the marina. The concept includes a public space and amphitheater adjacent to the lake that could host community events and recreational activities. She suggested the area could support activities such as outdoor movie nights, performances, and other public gatherings, creating a destination that draws visitors to the waterfront and further activates the Recreation Center beyond its traditional marina functions.

Mayor Frost asked what the next steps would be following completion of the Polycentric City Center Plan and whether the Council would ultimately be required to adopt the document. Mr. O'Brien explained that the consultant team still needed to make several final revisions before preparing a completed draft. Once those revisions are finished, the final draft would be provided to the Council for review before being brought forward for formal consideration.

Mayor Frost then asked what the practical effect of adoption would be, specifically whether adoption would make the plan part of the General Plan, whether it would remain conceptual in nature, or whether it would become binding policy. Mr. O'Brien said that the Council has several options. The plan could be adopted as an element of the General Plan, which would give it greater policy significance and make it a stronger guiding document for future planning decisions. Alternatively, it could be adopted as a standalone planning document that serves as a vision and implementation strategy without being formally incorporated into the General Plan. He explained that, regardless of the approach selected, the document could be referenced when developing future policies, ordinances, projects, and implementation strategies.

Mr. Wallace explained that the purpose of the plan is to provide a more detailed framework for implementing the City's long-term vision. In addition to conceptual ideas, the document identifies practical opportunities, implementation strategies, and potential funding sources that can assist the city as projects move forward.

Mr. O'Brien emphasized that the plan is intended to serve as a working tool for the city. He stated that it does not necessarily need to be incorporated into the General Plan to be useful, but can still guide future economic development efforts, infrastructure investments, and planning decisions.

2. Report by Dawna Whiting on the American Fork Victim's Assistance Program.
Ms. Whiting presented the Victim Advocacy Program's quarterly statistics and provided an overview of services delivered during the reporting period. She stated that the advocacy team remains committed to supporting victims throughout the city and takes pride in the work they perform on behalf of those they serve.

For the third quarter, covering January through March,

- The program served 218 victims, including both primary victims and secondary victims such as children who were present during incidents or otherwise affected by the events. Ms. Whiting noted that domestic violence continued to be the largest service category, consistent with historical trends.
- Advocates provided a total of 1,653 service contacts and assistance activities during the quarter. She explained that each victim often receives multiple forms of support, including follow-up contacts, referrals, safety planning, resource coordination, and other advocacy services, resulting in a substantially higher number of service interactions than the number of individual victims served.

Ms. Nordin reported that, as of the date of the presentation, the Victim Advocacy Program had served 121 primary and secondary victims during the fourth quarter. Similar to prior reporting periods, domestic violence remains the most common category of cases served. She stated that advocates had provided 1,033 service contacts and assistance activities during the quarter to date, reflecting ongoing efforts to support victims through follow-up services, resource coordination, referrals, and other advocacy-related assistance.

Council Member Hunter asked for clarification regarding the statistics, noting that the report showed 218 victims were served but 342 victims contacted. He asked whether the difference indicated that a significant number of victims had declined services. Ms. Whiting explained that the figures represent different measurements. The 218 victims served reflects the number of individual primary and secondary victims who received services, while the 342 victim contacts reflect the total number of interactions with those victims. She noted that advocates frequently contact victims' multiple times for follow-up services, court notifications, welfare checks, resource coordination, and other support activities. In some cases, contact may also occur through a non-offending parent when children are involved.

Mayor Frost acknowledged the difficult and sensitive nature of victim advocacy work and asked the advocates what aspects of the job provide a sense of fulfillment and help them feel they are making a positive difference.

Ms. Whiting responded that one of the most rewarding aspects of the work is receiving positive feedback from victims. She stated that many individuals express appreciation for the assistance they receive and share that the advocacy services have helped them navigate difficult circumstances, which provides meaningful confirmation that the program is making a difference.

Ms. Nordin explained that advocates often help victims move from feeling overwhelmed and uncertain to feeling calmer, more informed, and supported. Ms. Whiting added that some victims are initially upset about a loved one's arrest, but through education and discussion, advocates are often able to help them better understand the situation and provide resources.

Mayor Frost noted that victims respond differently to law enforcement actions, with some feeling relieved and others struggling because of their relationship with the offender. Ms. Whiting agreed, explaining that advocates help victims understand their options, process events, and focus on safety and recovery.

Council Member Taylor remarked that Ms. Whiting's nearly eighteen years in the program reflects the meaningful impact of the work and the satisfaction that comes from helping people through difficult situations.

Ms. Whiting stated that although victim advocacy can be challenging, the work is rewarding and made sustainable by the strong support she receives from her department and coworkers. Council Member Carroll asked whether the program serves both American Fork and Cedar Hills, and Ms. Whiting confirmed that it does, noting that most cases originate in American Fork while Cedar Hills referrals are relatively infrequent.

Council Member Carroll asked whether demand for victim advocacy services has increased as the city has grown. Ms. Whiting responded that service levels have risen steadily and are roughly 50 percent higher than six years ago, with annual increases in victims served and services provided. She noted that adding Ms. Nordin has helped the program keep pace with growing demand.

Mr. Bunker asked about key community partners, and Ms. Whiting identified The Refuge and the Children's Justice Center as the program's primary partners. Ms. Nordin added that advocates also work closely with courthouse personnel and victim advocates throughout Utah County.

Ms. Whiting explained that the program maintains strong working relationships with a variety of partner organizations and participates in regular meetings with advocates from The Refuge and other service providers. These ongoing collaborations help ensure that advocates remain informed about available resources and can connect victims with appropriate services.

Mr. Bunker asked whether victims needing more extensive assistance are referred to organizations such as The Refuge or the Children's Justice Center. Ms. Whiting explained that the City's advocates primarily provide crisis intervention, emotional support, education, and guidance through the criminal justice process. While the program does not provide therapy or long-term counseling, advocates help connect victims with community partners that can provide specialized services such as counseling, shelter, and ongoing support.

Council Member Holley asked whether advocates help connect victims with therapists and other professional services. Ms. Whiting said the program provides referrals and resource lists but does not recommend specific providers.

Council Member John asked about crime victim reparations funding. Ms. Nordin explained that the program provides financial assistance for crime-related expenses such as medical care, counseling, and relocation costs, with victims applying through the reparations program to determine eligibility and receive assistance.

Ms. Nordin added that advocates meet weekly with the City's prosecutor to discuss cases and communicate victims' concerns and desired outcomes, helping ensure victims' perspectives are considered throughout the prosecution process.

Ms. Whiting noted that victim advocates develop extensive expertise in victim services, court procedures, and available resources through their work. Although advocates do not provide legal advice, they are frequently contacted by victims who have been referred by attorneys and often serve as a valuable source of information about victim assistance programs and navigating the criminal justice process

3. <u>Discussion on Master Plans, Impact Fee Facility Plans, and Impact Fee Analysis for Culinary Water, Parks, Pressurized Irrigation, Public Safety, Sewer, Storm Drain, and Transportation.</u>
Mayor Frost invited those participating in the presentation to introduce themselves for the public record before beginning the discussion. He noted that all participants would be involved in the conversation and requested brief introductions so the record would clearly identify everyone taking part in the presentation and subsequent discussion.

    - Jonathan Considine, with Zions Public Finance, stated that he worked with Ms. Becker on the Parks Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA).
    - Susan Becker, also with Zions Public Finance, indicated that she worked on the City's impact fee analyses.
    - John Shiess, with Horrocks Engineers, stated that he worked on the culinary water, pressurized irrigation, and sewer master plans.
    - Kelvin Smith, Assistant City Engineer, introduced himself as City staff participating in the project.
    - Ted Cannon, with Horrocks Engineers, explained that transportation consultant Shane Eller was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Cannon stated that he had reviewed the transportation materials in preparation for the discussion and would do his best to answer questions regarding the transportation portion of the study.
    - Cody Gunn, also with Horrocks Engineers, stated that he had been assisting with the City's transportation planning efforts and would help address questions as needed.
    - Lauren Ploeger, with Franson Civil Engineers, introduced herself as the consultant responsible for the storm drain master plan.

Mr. Gunn explained that the city worked with multiple consultants to prepare updated IFFPs and IFAs for seven service areas. Zions Public Finance prepared the public safety and parks analyses, Franson Civil Engineers prepared the storm drain master plan, Horrocks Engineers prepared the culinary water, pressurized irrigation, sewer, and transportation master plans, and Zions Public Finance completed the corresponding impact fee analyses.

Impact Fees

Ms. Becker stated that she would provide a high-level overview of the impact fee process before discussing each service area individually. She explained that an impact fee is a one-time charge assessed on new development to fund capital infrastructure needed to serve growth. Impact fees may only be used for capital improvements and cannot fund ongoing operational expenses. In addition, impact fees may only be used for system improvements that benefit a broader service area and cannot be used for project-specific infrastructure.

Ms. Becker noted that Utah law requires both an IFFP and an IFA. The IFFP serves as the technical and engineering foundation for the fee calculations and identifies service levels, growth projections, available capacity within existing facilities, future infrastructure needs, and the cost of those improvements. The IFA then applies a proportionate-share analysis to determine how much of those costs can legally be assigned to new developments. She explained that impact fees generally consist of two components:

1. Buy-in costs, which represent a new development's share of available excess capacity in existing infrastructure.
2. New growth-related construction costs, which represent the cost of future facilities needed to serve growth.

The analysis also accounts for credits, financing methods, and other legal adjustments that can significantly affect the final fee calculation.

Ms. Becker stated that the figures presented represent the maximum legally supportable impact fees for a typical single-family residential unit. If adopted at the maximum levels shown in the analysis, the total impact fee burden for a new single-family home would increase by approximately $4,000, from roughly $12,700 to approximately $16,700. She noted that the proposed changes vary significantly by service area. Culinary water fees would experience relatively little change, while pressurized irrigation fees would decrease substantially from current levels. Storm drain fees would increase significantly, public safety fees would see a moderate increase, parks and trails fees would remain relatively similar to current levels, and transportation fees would increase modestly.

Council Member Carroll asked for clarification regarding the term "maximum fee" and whether it represented the highest fee legally supported by the study. Ms. Becker confirmed that the proposed fees shown in the analysis represent the maximum impact fees supported by the underlying studies and calculations. She explained that the city may adopt any fee amount up to that maximum, but it cannot charge more than the amount justified by the IFFP and IFA. Charging more would require new development to pay more than its proportionate share of system costs.

Council Member John was excused to leave at 5:23 p.m.

Council Member Carroll then confirmed that the impact fee calculations are directly based on the master plans and facilities plans prepared by the consultants. Ms. Becker agreed, explaining that the IFFP Plans provide the technical foundation for the fee calculations. The infrastructure projects, service levels, growth projections, and costs identified in those plans are used to determine the impact fees.

Using the sewer system as an example, Ms. Becker explained that the analysis begins by identifying the total cost of planned system improvements. Those costs are then allocated for three groups:

- Existing development,
- Growth anticipated within the next ten years, and
- Growth is expected beyond the ten-year planning horizon.

Because impact fees can only fund growth-related infrastructure, the analysis must identify the portion of project costs that benefit existing development and remove those costs from the impact fee calculation. For the sewer system, approximately 53% of the identified project costs were determined to benefit existing development.

Ms. Becker explained that the analysis first calculates a gross impact fee, which represents the fee before any required credits are applied. Credits are then incorporated to ensure that new development does not pay twice for the same infrastructure. These credits generally fall into two categories:

1. Credits for future projects that address existing system deficiencies or provide benefits to existing development, and
2. Credits associated with debt service or bonds previously issued to finance existing infrastructure.

After applying the required credits for the sewer system, the calculated fee decreased from approximately $876 to $831. Ms. Becker noted that the final fees are then assigned according to the City's meter-size schedule, which allocates costs based on anticipated system demand from different types of users.

Ms. Becker stated that one point often misunderstood by the public is the gradual increase shown in the proposed sewer impact fee schedule over the next several years. She explained that the increase is not an inflation adjustment. Rather, it reflects the gradual reduction of credits associated with existing system deficiencies. As the years pass, there are fewer years remaining for future development to contribute toward those costs, causing the available credit to decrease slightly and the fee to rise incrementally. She noted that cities may either incorporate those annual adjustments directly into the ordinance or, in some cases, smooth the changes over several years depending on legal guidance and administrative preferences.

Ms. Becker then compared American Fork's proposed sewer impact fee to those of neighboring communities and noted that American Fork remains on the lower end of the range.

Mr. Bunker asked whether Orem's impact fee includes both sewer collection and treatment facilities because Orem operates its own treatment system. Mr. Schiess responded that Orem's fee likely includes both collection and treatment infrastructure. He explained that American Fork's sewer impact fee only covers the City's collection system and does not include the separate impact fee charged by the Timpanogos Special Service District (TSSD), which is assessed in addition to the City's fee.

Mr. Schiess explained that American Fork's relatively low sewer impact fee is largely due to excess capacity built into the original sewer system and capacity improvements completed over time. Because much of the necessary infrastructure is already in place—and future development will construct additional improvements south of the freeway—fewer growth-related costs remain to be recovered through impact fees.

Transitioning to culinary water, Ms. Becker explained that the ten-year capital improvement program includes about $17 million in growth-related projects, but roughly $13 million in credits must be applied because portions of those projects benefit existing development. The analysis also includes a buy-in for existing excess capacity, growth-related construction costs, and eligible consultant expenses, resulting in a gross culinary water impact fee of approximately $2,900 per equivalent residential unit before credits.

Ms. Becker explained that, as with the sewer analysis, credits must be provided for portions of future projects that benefit existing development. The water system analysis also includes credits associated with the City's 2020 bond issuance, which financed existing infrastructure improvements. As a result, both prior investments and shared project benefits are accounted for before determining the final recommended water impact fee.

Council Member Carroll asked how bond-funded water infrastructure that was built to accommodate future growth is treated in the impact fee analysis. Ms. Becker explained that the analysis allows new development to pay its proportionate share of existing excess capacity through a buy-in component. As a result, only the portion of bond-funded facilities that benefit existing development is credited. She noted that growth-related portions of those projects, including associated financing costs, can be recovered through impact fees, while costs attributable to existing users must be credited to prevent new development from paying more than its fair share.

After applying the required credits, the maximum culinary water impact fee is reduced to approximately $2,600 per equivalent residential unit. Ms. Becker noted that, similar to the sewer fee, the amount may increase slightly over time as credits associated with existing development gradually diminish. Cities may either incorporate those annual adjustments directly into the ordinance or average the amounts over multiple years, depending on legal guidance and administrative preferences.

She further explained that residential water impact fees are assessed on a per-unit basis for both single-family and multifamily development, while non-residential users are charged based on water meter size. Comparing the resulting fee to neighboring communities, she noted that American Fork's proposed culinary water impact fee falls generally in the middle of the range. She then indicated that the next utility category would present a somewhat different set of considerations.

Pressurized Irrigation Impact Fee
Ms. Becker turned to the pressurized irrigation impact fee analysis and highlighted the significant portion of project costs allocated to existing development. She pointed out that the amount attributed to existing users was substantial compared to the costs associated with

future growth and asked the Council to consider how that allocation would affect the resulting impact fee.

Council Member Carroll observed that this allocation appeared consistent with the City's recent irrigation rate increases, noting that many of those rate adjustments were intended to fund existing infrastructure needs rather than growth-related improvements. Ms. Becker agreed and explained that the pressurized irrigation system contains considerable existing capacity in water sources and storage facilities. The analysis also includes costs associated with outstanding bonds, interest expenses, and future construction projects. Before credits are applied, those costs produce a relatively large gross impact fee. However, she explained that substantial credits must then be applied for infrastructure deficiencies that benefit existing development and for previously issued bonds. After applying those credits, the maximum impact fee is approximately $3,000 per irrigated acre.

Ms. Becker noted that the fee can appear misleadingly large because it is calculated on a per-acre basis rather than per residential unit. For typical residential lot, only the irrigated portion of the property is subject to the fee. She explained that if a home has approximately 3,000 square feet of irrigated landscaping, that area would be converted to a fraction of an acre by dividing it by 43,560 square feet per acre. That fraction would then be multiplied by the per-acre fee, resulting in a much smaller charge for an individual property than the per-acre figure initially suggests. She indicated that the next slide would illustrate how that calculation translates into the actual fee assessed to a typical residential development.

Ms. Becker remarked that the substantial credits applied in the analysis were the primary reason the proposed fee was comparatively low. Mr. Schiess added additional engineering context. He asked whether the analysis had included the original pressurized irrigation bond, and Ms. Becker confirmed that it had.

Mr. Schiess explained that the pressurized irrigation system was originally designed and constructed to serve the City's full build-out, meaning much of the major infrastructure needed for future growth was installed and financed 15 to 17 years ago. Because relatively few additional system-wide improvements are needed today, the impact fee remains comparatively low. He added that several major projects, including shared water supply improvements, benefit both existing and future users, requiring costs to be allocated between the two groups rather than charged entirely to new development. This shared-cost approach further reduces the pressurized irrigation impact fee.

Mayor Frost asked whether the discussion regarding the TSSD water source project referred to reclaimed water used within the pressurized irrigation system. Mr. Schiess confirmed that it did.

Mr. Bunker noted that although the original pressurized irrigation system was designed to accommodate full build-out, actual demand has exceeded some of the original design assumptions in certain locations. He asked whether the master plan included improvements to address areas where lines may need to be upsized or paralleled to handle current demands. Mr. Schiess responded that all necessary system improvements identified through the master planning process were included in the analysis.

Mr. Bunker observed that the City's transition to metering pressurized irrigation usage should help reduce demand and bring consumption levels closer to the assumptions used when the system was originally designed. Mr. Schiess agreed and stated that future master plan updates may ultimately eliminate some currently planned improvements if conservation measures and metering reduce demand. As usage decreases, projected infrastructure needs may also decline.

Ms. Becker commented that it is not uncommon for pressurized irrigation impact fees to be relatively low compared to other utility impact fees. She noted that communities that recently constructed comprehensive pressurized irrigation systems often financed those facilities through large bond issuances. Because impact fee law requires credits for those previously financed facilities, the resulting impact fees can be substantially reduced.

Mr. Schiess explained that pressurized irrigation systems differ from older utility systems such as culinary water. While American Fork's culinary water system has evolved over many decades through incremental expansion, the pressurized irrigation system was largely constructed as a new, comprehensive system within the last twenty years. Because much of the infrastructure was built and financed upfront, the cost structure and impact fee calculations differ significantly from more mature utility systems.

Ms. Becker explained that financing can significantly affect impact fee calculations because impact fee law requires credits for previously financed facilities. As a result, large upfront infrastructure investments often reduce the fees that can be charged to future development. She noted that the relationship between financing methods and impact fees is being reviewed as part of an ongoing legislative examination of impact fee practices and emphasized that fees must maintain a reasonable relationship to the benefits received by new development.

Storm Drain

Ms. Becker explained that the storm drain fee is calculated on a per-developed-acre basis. Unlike pressurized irrigation, which is based on irrigated acreage, storm drain demand is tied to developed surfaces such as roofs, driveways, parking lots, and other impervious areas that generate runoff. After applying the required credits, the proposed maximum storm drain impact fee increases substantially compared to the current fee. When compared to neighboring communities using a typical single-family residential equivalent, American Fork's proposed fee would be significantly higher than its current rate.

Council Member Hunter noted that the current storm drain impact fee is only about $121 and observed that the proposed increase represents a dramatic change. Ms. Becker acknowledged the magnitude of the increase and indicated that the consultants would provide additional explanation regarding the factors driving the higher fee.

Mayor Frost commented that the current fee appears unusually low and suggested that the purpose of the update process is to identify situations where existing fees no longer reflect actual infrastructure costs and service demands.

Public Safety Impact Fees

Ms. Becker explained that the analysis assumes construction of a new police facility in approximately 2028 at an estimated cost of roughly $13 million and a new fire station in approximately 2028 at an estimated cost approaching $20 million. She stated that public safety impact fees are calculated using a two-part methodology. First, the analysis determines the capital cost associated with providing police and fire service. Second, it evaluates the number of police and fire calls generated by different types of development. Those two factors are then combined to determine each land use category's proportionate share of public safety facility costs.

The analysis includes a small amount of excess capacity in existing facilities because growth is expected to continue before the new facilities are completed. While the City may perceive existing facilities as operating near capacity today, the methodology requires recognition of available capacity until the replacement facilities are constructed. To establish service demand, City staff compiled extensive police and fire call data. Calls were categorized by land use type and matched to single-family residential, multifamily residential, and nonresidential properties based on the location where the service request originated.

The resulting analysis showed that a typical single-family residence generates approximately 1.23 police calls per year, while fire service demand is considerably lower at less than 0.2 calls per year. Ms. Becker noted that police call volumes have increased over time and recalled discussions suggesting that a portion of those calls are associated with alarm responses and other routine service requests. While individual properties vary significantly, the impact fee calculations are based on average service demand across the community.

Ms. Becker explained that the methodology combines the capital cost per service call with the average number of calls generated by each type of development. Multiplying those two figures produces the maximum supportable impact fee for police and fire facilities. She also noted that state law allows fire impact fees to include certain fire apparatus costs for nonresidential development when individual vehicles exceed $500,000 in value. As a result, an additional nonresidential fire impact fee component was included in the analysis at approximately $0.52 per square foot for eligible development.

The combined police and fire calculations produce the overall public safety impact fee.

Mr. Gunn asked how the facility cost-per-square-foot figures were developed. Ms. Becker explained that the values were calculated by dividing the estimated cost of planned future facilities by their anticipated square footage. Using the proposed police facility as an example, the analysis divided the estimated $13 million project cost by the planned building size to establish the cost-per-square-foot figure.

Ms. Becker added that impact fees may only be used for capital assets with a useful life of at least ten years and cannot be used to fund ongoing operational expenses such as personnel. Mr. Gunn further explained that state law allows certain fire apparatus costs to be included in impact fees, but only under limited circumstances. Fire vehicles may be included when the vehicle cost exceeds $500,000 and the expenditure qualifies as a capital asset.

Ms. Becker noted that the statutory threshold has become increasingly relevant as emergency vehicle costs continue to rise. She observed that ambulance costs are approaching the same price range as some fire apparatus and commented that it will be interesting to see how future legislation and impact fee regulations address those rising equipment costs.

Ms. Becker noted that, although the public safety analysis separately calculates police and fire facility impacts, Utah law treats both as components of a single public safety impact fee. She explained that communities generally combine the two into one public safety fee rather than assessing separate police and fire impact fees. She referenced Provo's ongoing impact fee update, noting that Provo has been addressing similar questions and is expected to increase its public safety fee as part of that process.

Transportation Impact Fees
Ms. Becker explained that transportation impact fee calculations begin with the total cost of planned transportation improvements. However, not all transportation projects are eligible to be funded through impact fees because some portions may be funded through grants, state programs, or other revenue sources. Those non-impact-fee-eligible costs are removed from the analysis before calculating the fee. After those adjustments, the transportation analysis identified approximately $129 million in transportation improvements attributable to future growth.

Ms. Becker noted that the transportation calculations require careful allocation of costs because not all traffic using American Fork's road system is generated by new development within the city. She explained that the consultants accounted for factors such as through traffic, regional traffic, cut-through traffic, and traffic generated by existing development. As a result, only the portion of roadway improvements attributable to new growth within American Fork can be recovered through impact fees.

Mr. Gunn explained that the transportation plan divides projects into two phases, with Phase One covering years 0–5 and Phase Two covering years 6–10.

Ms. Becker stated that the transportation impact fee is calculated by determining a cost per PM peak-hour trip—approximately $7,000 per trip—and then applying trip-generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) for different land uses. Using this methodology, a typical single-family home would generate a transportation impact fee of about $3,400. She noted that trip counts were adjusted to account for Horrocks' methodology, which counts vehicle movements across a driveway differently than the standard ITE model.

Ms. Becker cautioned that some ITE land-use categories generate very high traffic volumes and could result in exceptionally high impact fees for uses such as drive-through businesses and car washes. She recommended that the city carefully review and potentially consolidate land-use categories, as many cities do, to simplify administration and avoid unusually high fees while still maintaining a reasonable relationship between the fee and development's transportation impacts.

Parks Impact Fees
Mr. Concidine explained that the Parks Impact Fee Facilities Plan is based on planned capital improvements for parks, recreation facilities, and trails. The analysis assumes there is no excess park capacity available to serve future growth, meaning all eligible project costs are allocated to ten-year growth. He noted that Park impact fees are calculated based on the cost per improved park acre, which includes both the land and the amenities constructed on that land. Trail impact fees are calculated based on the cost per linear foot of trail. Planned projects include new parks, new trail segments, improvements to existing parks, and a new public works facility.

Ms. Becker added that the project list was intentionally structured to provide the city with flexibility when implementing future improvements. She noted that developers have increasingly challenged impact fees when projects are not completed exactly as described in the original plan. However, because many projects are planned years in advance, she believes cities need reasonable flexibility to adapt projects over time while still meeting the intended service needs. She indicated that this issue is one of the topics being discussed as part of the ongoing legislative review of impact fee laws.

Council Member Carroll noted that park impact fees can be challenging to administer because certain park improvements qualify for impact fee funding while others do not. She asked whether the distinction is based on whether the improvement is considered part of a larger park system. Ms. Becker responded that impact fees may only be used for system-level park facilities. She explained that very small neighborhood amenities, such as pocket parks or isolated playground features, generally do not qualify because they serve only a limited area rather than the broader community.

Mr. Bunker added that neighborhood parks intended solely to serve a specific subdivision are typically excluded from the impact fee analysis. In contrast, larger community parks—such as Mary and Art Dye Park—serve residents citywide and therefore qualify as system facilities. He noted that staff generally recommend a minimum park size of approximately five acres for inclusion in the system.

Council Member Taylor asked whether there is a formal size threshold. Mr. Gunn explained that while there is not necessarily a strict legal threshold, the City's planning practice is to avoid recommending parks smaller than five acres as part of the system. He acknowledged that the City does have some smaller specialty parks, but five acres is generally considered the minimum size for a community-serving park that would be included in the impact fee program.

Council Member Carroll asked whether park impact fees can only be used to create new parks. Ms. Becker explained that the key requirement is that the expenditure adds capacity to the park system. As a result, impact fees may be used for improvements to existing parks if those improvements increase the system's ability to serve additional users. She cited examples such as adding lighting or other amenities that expand the capacity and usefulness of existing facilities.

Mr. Hunter noted that the impact fee funds can also be used to expand facilities within an existing park when those improvements increase the park system's capacity to serve additional users. Ms. Becker agreed, explaining that the key consideration is whether the improvement adds capacity to the system.

Mr. Concidine offered examples of qualifying improvements, including playgrounds, ziplines, pickleball courts, and other amenities that increase recreational opportunities within a park.

Council Member Carroll asked whether a new amenity such as a dog park constructed within a large existing community park could qualify for the impact fee funds. Ms. Becker responded that it potentially could, provided the project is clearly identified and justified within the planning documents. She encouraged the city to be as specific as possible when identifying future projects.

Mr. Concidine added that although project lists should be detailed, Impact Fee Facilities Plans can be amended when priorities or circumstances change, allowing the city to adjust projects over time. Turning to the parks impact fee analysis, he explained that the parks account for the majority of the total per-capita cost within the parks and trails impact fee program. He also noted that a credit must be applied because the City currently has a substantial parks impact fee fund balance.

Ms. Becker explained that developers often argue that existing fund balances should be used before charging additional impact fees for new facilities. While legal interpretations can vary, the existence of a significant fund balance generally requires consideration in the impact fee analysis.

Mr. Concidine further noted that the city still has outstanding debt associated with Mary and Art Dye Park. The analysis assumes that a portion of the existing impact fee fund balance will be used to help retire that debt. As a result, the remaining fund balance available for future projects is reduced, and the impact fee calculations include credit reflecting those anticipated expenditures.

Ms. Becker and Mr. Concidine discussed the treatment of the City's parks impact fee fund balance. Mr. Concidine explained that the analysis already assumes a portion of the existing fund balance will be used to pay down the remaining debt associated with Mary and Art Dye Park. As a result, the credit reflected in the analysis is based on the remaining balance after those anticipated expenditures.

Mr. Concidine added that, as the City uses impact fee funds to construct parks and other eligible improvements, the available fund balance naturally decreases, which in turn affects future impact fee calculations. He then presented a comparison showing that American Fork's proposed parks impact fee remains generally in the middle range when compared to neighboring communities, despite increases in park land and construction costs. Ms. Becker noted that Lehi was currently updating its impact fee study and that its fees would likely change as part of that process.

Mr. Concidine highlighted that Utah law allows cities to establish impact fee exemptions or alternative fee calculations for certain types of development, including affordable housing, schools, and government facilities. He explained that any reduction must be based on objective, consistently applied criteria. As an example, he noted that developments with lower expected occupancy, such as studio apartments, could qualify for reduced impact fees if the City adopts a documented, rules-based methodology demonstrating lower service demand.

Mr. Concidine added that when a request is made, City staff can review the supporting information and determine whether the proposed adjustment is justified. In the school example, the City Council directed staff to investigate the request and evaluate whether the applicant's assumptions and supporting data warranted a modification to the standard impact fee calculation.

Council Member Carroll asked whether the requirement for impact fee reductions to be rule-based means the City cannot simply waive fees for a particular developer as an incentive to encourage a project. Ms. Becker responded that cities could choose to waive or reduce impact fees, but any such program must be applied consistently and fairly. She explained that fee reductions should be based on established policies or objective criteria rather than being granted selectively to individual applicants.

Mr. Bunker cautioned that offering discretionary reductions can become a slippery slope if similar treatment is not available to others in comparable situations. Ms. Becker agreed, emphasizing that any waiver or reduction program should apply equally to all qualifying developments.

Council Member Carroll stated that the City's goal should be to ensure fairness and consistency for all applicants. Ms. Becker noted that some communities have adopted programs that provide incentives for specific large types of projects. Mr. Concidine added that many of the details surrounding potential fee reductions or development incentives are negotiated and documented during the development process.

Mr. Bunker explained that statutory requirements must still be completed before the updated impact fees can be implemented. Ms. Becker recommended meeting with representatives of the Utah Valley Home Builders Association to review the proposed fees and gather feedback before adoption. Mr. Bunker then thanked the consultants and staff for their patience and diligence throughout the lengthy impact fee update process.

4. Adjourn.
   The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Stephanie Finau

Stephanie Finau
Deputy Recorder