

IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN

for Parks

June 2018

Prepared by:



Prepared for:



PARK IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN

June 2018

Prepared for:



Prepared by:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
Introduction.....	ES-1
Why is an IFFP Needed?	ES-1
Projected Future Growth.....	ES-1
Existing Capacity Available to Serve Future Growth.....	ES-2
Required System Improvements	ES-2
 SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION	 1-1
 SECTION 2 - EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE - 11-36a-302(1)(a)(i).....	 2-1
Performance Standard	2-1
Unit of Demand.....	2-1
Park Lands	2-1
Recreation Facility Improvements	2-4
Existing Trail Land and Improvements	2-5
Summary	2-6
 SECTION 3 - PROPOSED LEVEL OF SERVICE - 11-36a-302(1)(a)(ii)	 3-1
 SECTION 4 - EXCESS CAPACITY TO ACCOMMODATE FUTURE GROWTH - 11-36a-302(1)(a)(iii).....	 4-1
 SECTION 5 - DEMANDS PLACED ON FACILITIES BY NEW DEVELOPMENT - 11-36a-302(1)(a)(iv)	 5-1
 SECTION 6 - INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO MEET DEMANDS OF NEW DEVELOPMENT - 11-36a-302(1)(a)(v)	 6-1
Land for Parks and Trails.....	6-1
10-Year Improvement Plan.....	6-2
Project Cost Attributable to Future Growth.....	6-3
Basis of Construction Cost Estimates	6-3
 SECTION 7 - ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	 7-1
Manner of Financing - 11-36a-302(2)	7-1
Federal and State Grants and Donations	7-1
Bonds	7-1
Interfund Loans	7-1
Impact Fees	7-1
Developer Dedications and Exactions	7-1
Necessity of Improvements to Maintain Level of Service – 11-36a-302(3)	7-2
School Related Infrastructure (11-36a-302(2)).....	7-2
Noticing and Adoption Requirements (11-36a-502)	7-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS
continued

	Page No.
SECTION 8 - IMPACT FEE CERTIFICATION (11-36a-306(1)).....	8-1

LIST OF TABLES

No.	Title	On or Following Page No.
ES-1	Projected Population for the City Service Area.....	ES-1
ES-2	Required System Improvements	ES-2
2-1	System-Wide Parks	2-2
2-2	Recreation Facility Improvements for System-Wide Parks.....	2-5
2-3	Trails and Lengths.....	2-5
2-4	Existing Level of Service.....	2-6
5-1	Projected Population Growth.....	5-1
6-1	Impact on Established Park Land LOS by Anticipated Development.....	6-1
6-2	Additional Expense Required Meet Demand Placed on Existing Park, Recreation and Trails by New Development Activity	6-2
6-3	Proposed Lehi Parks and Trails Improvements	6-3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Lehi City has retained Bowen Collins & Associates (BC&A) and Zions Public Finance, Inc. (ZPFI) to prepare impact fee facilities plans (IFFPs) for eight different services provided by the City. This subject of this IFFP document is parks, recreation, and trails. The purpose of an IFFP is to identify demands placed upon City facilities by future development and evaluate how these demands will be met by the City. The IFFP is also intended to outline the improvements, which may be funded through impact fees.

WHY IS AN IFFP NEEDED?

The IFFP provides a technical basis for assessing updated impact fees throughout the City. This document will address the future infrastructure needed to serve the City with regard to current land use planning. The existing and future capital projects documented in this IFFP will ensure that level of service standards are maintained for all existing and future residents who reside within the service area. Local governments must pay strict attention to the required elements of the Impact Fee Facilities Plan, which are enumerated in the Impact Fees Act.

PROJECTED FUTURE GROWTH

To evaluate future parks, recreation and trails needs, it is first necessary to project how the City will grow in population over the next ten years. Based on projected growth in population the City is estimated to reach 84,281 in 2028. Table ES-1 details population projections.

**Table ES-1
Projected Population for the City Service Area**

Year	Population
2000	19,028
2010	47,746
2016*	61,130
2017	62,530
2018	63,930
2019	65,330
2020	66,730
2021	68,924
2022	71,118
2023	73,312
2024	75,506
2025	77,700
2026	79,893
2027	82,087
2028	84,281

*latest census estimate

EXISTING CAPACITY AVAILABLE TO SERVE FUTURE GROWTH

The City has determined that it desires to maintain its current level of park services and does not have excess capacity at any System-Wide Park.

REQUIRED SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

In order to maintain the current level of service of \$745.38 of investment per persons for park, recreation and trail land and improvements purchased by Lehi City, new residents will require the City to invest an additional \$15,169,219 over the next ten years. The City has 663.56 acres of parks and 34.51 linear miles of trails, plus a recreation center. Future parks will also need recreation facility improvements such as sports fields, playgrounds, restrooms, picnic tables, etc., in order to meet the needs of the growing population and to maintain current service levels for park and recreation facility improvements purchased by the City.

**Table ES-2
Required System Improvements**

Year	Population	Spending Per Year
2010	47,746	
2016	61,130	
2017	62,530	
2018	63,930	
2019	65,330	\$1,043,531
2020	66,730	\$1,043,531
2021	68,924	\$1,635,363
2022	71,118	\$1,635,363
2023	73,312	\$1,635,363
2024	75,506	\$1,635,363
2025	77,700	\$1,635,363
2026	79,893	\$1,634,617
2027	82,087	\$1,635,363
2028	84,281	\$1,635,363
	Total	\$15,169,219

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

Lehi City has retained Bowen Collins & Associates (BC&A) and Zions Public Finance, Inc. (ZPFI) to prepare impact fee facilities plans (IFFPs) for eight different services provided by the City. The subject of this IFFP document is parks, recreation and trails. The purpose of an IFFP is to identify demands placed upon City facilities by future development and evaluate how these demands will be met by the City. The IFFP is also intended to outline the improvements, which may be funded through impact fees.

Requirements for the preparation of an IFFP are outlined in Title 11, Chapter 36a of the Utah code (the Impact Fees Act). Under these requirements, an IFFP shall accomplish the following for each facility:

1. Identify the existing level of service
2. Establish a proposed level of service
3. Identify excess capacity to accommodate future growth
4. Identify demands of new development
5. Identify the means by which demands from new development will be met
6. Consider the following additional issues
 - a. revenue sources to finance required system improvements
 - b. necessity of improvements to maintain the proposed level of service
 - c. need for facilities relative to planned locations of schools

The following sections of this report have been organized to address each of these requirements.

It should be noted that this study was initiated in 2014 but was not completed until 2018 as a result of extensive coordination efforts with project stakeholders. During this period, a number of improvements were completed. The definition of existing demand and level of service are all based on conditions as they existed in 2018.

SECTION 2

EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE (11-36a-302(1)(a)(i))

Level of service is defined in the Impact Fees Act as “the defined performance standard or unit of demand for each capital component of a public facility within a service area”. This section discusses the level of service being currently provided to existing users.

PERFORMANCE STANDARD

It is difficult to establish a performance standard for parks, recreation, and trails. While some industry guidelines do exist for general planning, the actual level of facilities provided can vary widely between communities. Ultimately, the performance standard for parks is established individually by each community based on the individual values and expectations of the community.

UNIT OF DEMAND

For the purpose of discussion and calculation, the unit of demand used to define level of service for various components of the Parks, Recreation, and Trails system will be measured in terms of historic dollars invested per person. This will allow the City to allocate the cost of investment fairly between different types of improvements including land purchase and recreational facility improvements for both parks and trails

Based on meetings with City personnel from the Parks department, the City has determined that it desires to maintain its current level of park service as measured by historic dollars invested per person. The City currently provides the existing residents with a LOS for park and trail land and improvements. The City would like to continue to provide the same LOS to future development. In the subsequent sections, the current LOS provided to existing residents is quantified.

Park Lands

Utah Code allows cities to include only system-wide parks for the purpose of calculating impact fees. Parks that benefit only one development area cannot be used to establish levels of service eligible to be maintained through impact fees. Based on input from Lehi City, a system-wide park is defined as a park that serves more than one local development area. System-wide parks qualifying under this definition are summarized in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1
System-Wide Parks**

Park Name	Acres
1900 N Water Tank	0.46
2100 N Mt View Corridor	17.45
Allred Park	4.96
Anthem Country Estates	0.33
Arnold Estates Basin	0.24
Aspen Ridge	0.20
Autumn Ridge Estates	0.48
Aztec Basin	0.05
Baird Property	0.20
Band Wagon Park	2.13
Benny Estates	0.68
Blossom Meadows	0.20
Bull River Detention	0.24
Canyon View Estates	0.99
Cedar Hollow Detention	0.47
Cemetery	54.00
Centennial Park	3.94
Chapel Valley Large Park	1.74
Chapel Valley Small Park (Detention Basin)	0.40
City Center/Legacy Center	7.60
Clark Estates Detention	0.22
Cranberry Farms Basin	0.93
Cranberry Ridge Basin	1.37
Dahl Basin	0.11
Dairy View Park	0.60
Dapple Gray Park	5.76
Dry Creek City Purchase	3.73
Dry Creek Park PRD	9.40
DUP Historic Pioneer Cemetery	2.10
Eagle Point	0.23
Eagle Summit Park	8.20
Fire Station Park	0.63
Fox Borough Detention	0.27
Foxmoor Ridge Basin	1.00
Gateway Park	2.57
Gateway Park (Access)	0.07
Gray Farms	1.89
Green Acres Basin	0.54
Green Park	3.78
Hadfield Estates Basin	0.25

Park Name	Acres
Harvest Homes Phase I Basin	3.97
Holiday Acres Detention	0.61
Ivory Ridge Basin	3.69
Ivory Ridge Park	9.62
Joe Adams Memorial Park	1.78
Jordan Meadows Detention	0.27
Jordan Narrows Park	21.02
Jordan Willows Park	96.42
Kensington Place Park	4.92
Lehi Country Estates Detention	0.41
Lehi Ranches Detention	0.71
Leisure Villas	3.84
Meadow Brook Detention	0.99
Monument Park	4.63
Murdock Trailhead	0.30
Newman Ranch Basin	0.34
North Lake Park	28.57
Old Farm Detention	0.19
Olympic Park	14.98
Outdoor Pool Park	4.56
Park View Detention	0.24
Park View Park	4.45
Peck Park	74.91
Pheasant Point Detention	1.13
Pilgrims Landing Park	4.86
Pioneer Crossing	23.47
Pointe Meadow Park	5.22
Prett's Place Detention A	0.34
Prett's Place Detention B	0.39
Rail Trail Basin	2.40
Railroad Museum	0.38
Rhodes Mellor Park	54.00
Rodeo Grounds	5.23
Sage Vista Park	3.00
Smithfield Ridge Basin (Plat A)	0.37
Smithfield Ridge Detention 2	0.27
Snow Springs Detention	0.49
Snow's Spring Park	0.75
Sommerset Large Park (North)	2.92
Sommerset Small Park (South)	1.92
South Towne Estates Detention (Plat B)	0.55
Sports Park	24.04
Spring Creek Park	12.16
Spring Meadow Ranches Basin	0.65
Stafford Estates Basin	0.13
Stagecoach Crossing Large Park	2.87

Park Name	Acres
Stagecoach Crossing Small Park	1.09
Summercrest Park	2.76
Sunrise Summit	1.76
Tennis Court Park	1.70
Timpview Meadows Detention	0.44
Vets Ball Park	15.31
Willes Estates	45.34
Willow Brook Detention	0.18
Willow Haven Park (Under Construction)	4.17
Willow Park River Park	16.76
Willow Springs Basin	0.20
Wines Park	3.49
Woods Meadow Detention B	0.25
Woods Meadow Detention C	0.22
Woods Meadow Detention D	0.51
Totals	663.56

Lehi City’s system-wide park lands consist of land that was purchased by the City and land that was donated to the City. In order to assure an equitable allocation of costs borne in the past to costs borne in the future, future residents will not be expected to pay for a level of park service that has been “gifted”, and that current residents have not purchased through impact fees or other means. By using the historic cost incurred by Lehi City for park land as the basis of the LOS, fairness is achieved.

Lehi currently has 663.56 park acres. The City has documentation for \$25,792,162 in historic costs for the purchase of parks for a level of service of \$403.44/person in 2018.

Recreation Facility Improvements

In addition to the purchase of land, the City has constructed additional recreational facility improvements to improve each park. Recreation facility improvements include all park landscaping and physical improvements, such as the recreation center, with a useful life of ten years or more.

Table 2-2 shows the historic costs for System-Wide recreation facility improvements for Lehi City parks.

**Table 2-2
Recreation Facility Improvements for System-Wide Parks**

Improvements	Amount Impact Fee Qualifying
Total	\$17,120,294
LOS Improvements per Capita	\$267.80

Lehi City’s System-Wide parks include a wide variety of recreation facility improvements that were purchased by the City and recreation facility improvements that were donated to the City. However, in order to assure an equitable allocation of costs borne in the past to costs borne in the future, only the historic cost for City funded recreation facility improvements that were purchased by the City will be used in determining impact fees. Recreation facility improvements that were donated to the City are not included in the LOS calculation. The City has contributed \$17,120,294 to recreation facility improvements for a level of service of \$267.80/person.

Existing Trail Land and Improvements

The City provides existing residents 34.51 linear miles of trails. Table 2-3 details the trails and their lengths along with the impact fee qualifying costs of each trail.

**Table 2-3
Trails and Lengths**

Trails	Length	Impact Fee Qualifying Cost
Dry Creek Trail (North of I-15)	1.19	\$119,381
Rail Trail	3.22	\$45,224
Rail Trail (Phase 2)	0.52	\$7,303
Rail Trail East	0.16	\$32,102
Jordan Willows	1.80	\$361,152
Jordan River Parkway	8.33	\$1,671,331
JRP to 2100 N Connection	0.20	\$40,128
Murdock Canal Trail	3.22	\$646,061
Mountain View Road Sidepath	0.30	\$24,077
Power Line Trail	1.64	\$310,591
Pioneer Crossing	0.18	-
Utah Lake Parkway Trail	0.61	\$122,390
Spring Creek Weeping Willow Trail	0.25	\$50,160
2100 N	2.41	\$290,125
300 N. Dry Creek Trail South Fork	0.39	\$46,950
3200 N. to Murdock Canal Trail	0.06	\$12,038
Ivory Ridge Sidepath	1.47	\$176,964
Chapel Ridge Sidepath	1.01	\$81,059
Jordan Murdock Connector Trail	0.11	\$22,070
Clubhouse Dr Sidepath	0.40	\$19,210

Trails	Length	Impact Fee Qualifying Cost
Dry Creek South Fork	0.20	\$32,102
Morning Vista Road Sidepath	1.25	\$100,320
Spring Creek Trail	1.45	\$247,590
Timpanogos Sidepath	0.54	\$0
Traverse Mountain Blvd Sidepath	1.63	\$130,817
Traverse Terrace Sidepath	0.30	\$24,077
Triumph Blvd Sidepath	0.27	\$43,338
Waste Ditch Trail	0.00	\$0
1700 W Leg	0.07	\$0
2300 W Leg	0.16	\$0
300 N Leg	0.48	\$0
Waterbury Dr	0.58	\$69,823
3600 W Holbrook Farms	0.11	\$13,242
Total	34.51	\$4,739,627

Documentation for original cost of trail land and improvements funded by Lehi City total \$4,739,627 for a level of service of \$74.14/person.

Summary

Table 2-4 summarizes the existing level of service for park, recreation, and trail facilities.

**Table 2-4
Existing Level of Service**

Level of Service Definition	
Category	Dollar Invested Per Capita
Park Lands	\$403.44
Recreation Facility Improvements (Parks)	\$267.80
Trails (Land and Improvements)	\$74.14
Total Dollars Invested	\$745.38

SECTION 3
PROPOSED LEVEL OF SERVICE (11-36a-302(1)(a)(ii))

The proposed level of service is the performance standard used to evaluate system needs in the future. The Impact Fee Act indicates that the proposed level of service may:

1. diminish or equal the existing level of service; or
2. exceed the existing level of service if, independent of the use of impact fees, the City implements and maintains the means to increase the level of service for existing demand within six years of the date on which new growth is charged for the proposed level of service.

In the case of this IFFP, no changes are proposed to the existing level of service. As discussed above, future growth will be evaluated based on maintaining the same level of service provided for existing residents as measured in terms of dollars invested by the City per person.

SECTION 4
EXCESS CAPACITY TO ACCOMMODATE
FUTURE GROWTH (11-36a-302(1)(a)(iii))

The City has determined that it desires to maintain its current level of park service for all future residents. As a result, the existing level of service has been calculated based on current population and current facilities. By definition, this means that all existing capacity is being used by current users and the system does not have excess capacity at any System-Wide park or trail.

**SECTION 5
DEMANDS PLACED ON FACILITIES
BY NEW DEVELOPMENT (11-36a-302(1)(a)(iv))**

Based on the most recent Census, Lehi City had a 2010 population of 47,746 and currently has an estimated population of 62,530. The City projects a population of 79,893 by 2026. This growth in residential population will generate demand for additional parks, trails and improved recreation and trail facilities. Table 5-1 shows the projected growth in Lehi City through 2026. It is anticipated that future commercial growth will not place any additional demand on parks, trails and recreation facilities. This demand analysis considers only future population growth.

**Table 5-1
Projected Population Growth**

Year	Population
2010	47,746
2016	61,130*
2017	62,530
2018	63,930
2019	65,330
2020	66,730
2021	68,924
2022	71,118
2023	73,312
2024	75,506
2025	77,700
2026	79,893
2027	82,087
2028	84,281

*latest census estimate

**SECTION 6
INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO MEET DEMANDS
OF NEW DEVELOPMENT (11-36a-302(1)(a)(v))**

To satisfy the requirements of State law, demand placed upon existing system facilities by future development was evaluated as described in the sections below. The purpose of these sections is to describe the “demands placed upon existing public facilities by new development activity at the proposed level of service; and...the means by which the political subdivision or private entity will meet those growth demands” (Section 11-36a-302-1.a of the Utah Code).

LAND FOR PARKS AND TRAILS

Because the City has determined that it desires to maintain its current level of park services and does not have excess capacity at any System-Wide park, the City will need to purchase and develop additional parks and trails to maintain the established purchased park, recreation and trail LOS (\$734.72 per capita combined). As shown in Table 6-1, the existing established level of purchased park land service of \$734.72 would drop to \$557.31 per capita over the next ten years (through 2028) and continue to drop *if no additional* park, recreation or trail improvements are purchased to serve future anticipated development.

**Table 6-1
Impact on Established Park Land LOS by Anticipated Development Activity
(with No Future Park or Trail Purchases)**

Year	Population	System Value with No Additional Improvements	Parks, Recreation and Trail LOS
2010	47,746		
2016	61,130	\$47,652,115.28	
2017	62,530	\$47,652,115.28	
2018	63,930	\$47,652,115.28	\$745.38
2019	65,330	\$47,652,115.28	\$729.41
2020	66,730	\$47,652,115.28	\$714.10
2021	68,924	\$47,652,115.28	\$691.37
2022	71,118	\$47,652,115.28	\$670.04
2023	73,312	\$47,652,115.28	\$649.99
2024	75,506	\$47,652,115.28	\$631.10
2025	77,700	\$47,652,115.28	\$613.28
2026	79,893	\$47,652,115.28	\$596.45
2027	82,087	\$47,652,115.28	\$580.51
2028	84,281	\$47,652,115.28	\$565.40

Table 6-2 shows the annual amount that will need to be spent by the City through 2028 to maintain the existing level of park land service. The 10-year total equals \$14,952,373.

**Table 6-2
Additional Expense Required Meet Demand Placed on Existing Park,
Recreation and Trails by New Development Activity**

Year	Population	Spending Per Year
2010	47,746	
2016	61,130	
2017	62,530	
2018	63,930	
2019	65,330	\$1,043,531
2020	66,730	\$1,043,531
2021	68,924	\$1,635,363
2022	71,118	\$1,635,363
2023	73,312	\$1,635,363
2024	75,506	\$1,635,363
2025	77,700	\$1,635,363
2026	79,893	\$1,634,617
2027	82,087	\$1,635,363
2028	84,281	\$1,635,363
	Total	\$15,169,219

10-YEAR IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The City intends to at least maintain its existing level of service through construction of additional parks and recreational facility improvements. For the purpose of quantifying the need for additional park land and recreational facilities, this study uses the City’s existing park land and recreational facilities cost per capita for parks. As a result of increased development activity, more parks and recreational facilities are needed to maintain existing standards.

The City has plans to add several parks and improve others. Table 6-3 lists all of the master plan projects for Parks in the City and identifies those parks the City believes will be purchased and improved in the next 10-years. The City will perpetuate the same level of service and may adjust their plans for projects. The City will develop its parks to serve development best and may not necessarily follow the exact plan found in the following table. Planned trails assumes the length of trails will continue to increase proportional to existing condition (miles/person).

**Table 6-3
Proposed Lehi Parks and Trails Improvements**

Parks & Trails	Size (acres)	Estimated Cost - City Portion²
Dog Park (Kensington) ¹	1.07	\$150,000
New NE Park (Eaglecrest Area)	1.9	\$385,000
Sunrise Summit Park	1.7	\$345,000
TM4	2	\$405,000
Gurney Park	11.5	\$2,331,000
Monument Park	4.6	\$932,000
North Willes Park	2.5	\$507,000
River Park	11.8	\$2,392,000
Spring Creek Ranch Park	12.5	\$2,534,000
TM1	13	\$2,635,000
TM2	5	\$1,014,000
TM3 ¹	9.6	\$1,946,000
TM5	5	\$1,014,000
TM6	3.2	\$649,000
Willes Park	3.6	\$730,000
Forrest Park	20	\$4,054,000
Mellor Park ¹	25.9	\$5,250,000
New NW Park (PLT & 2600 North)	25	\$5,068,000
New NW Park 2 (PLT & 2600 North)	25	\$5,068,000
Peck Park ¹	71.5	\$14,494,000
Curtis Center	40.4	\$8,190,000
10-Year Park Plan	108.07 acres	\$21,840,000
10-Year Trails	12 miles	\$1,649,000
10-Year Total Parks & Trails		\$23,489,000

¹planned project in the 10-year window

²based on average unit costs for existing parks and trails

Of the costs in Table 6-3, \$15,169,219 may be funded by impact fees. The balance of costs will need to be funded by other sources of revenue.

PROJECT COST ATTRIBUTABLE TO FUTURE GROWTH

The approach used for this IFFP excludes the cost of parks that will be attributable to growth beyond the 10-year window. All costs associated with “non-impact fee funding sources” such as grants, developer, and community contributions have been excluded from the per capita calculation of costs expended by the City.

BASIS OF CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATES

The construction cost estimates contained in this report have been provided by City personnel. These have been based on bids already received or cost estimates developed as part of preliminary evaluation and design activities for the above projects. Some projects include land purchases, other are simply park improvements on City owned land.

SECTION 7 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

MANNER OF FINANCING (11-36a-302(2))

The City may fund the infrastructure identified in this IFFP through a combination of different revenue sources.

Federal and State Grants and Donations

Impact fees cannot reimburse costs funded or expected to be funded through federal grants and other funds that the District has received for capital improvements without an obligation to repay. Grants and donations are not currently contemplated in this analysis. If grants become available for constructing facilities identified in the impact fee analysis, impact fees will need to be recalculated and an appropriate credit given. Any existing infrastructure funded through past grants is removed from the system value during the impact fee calculation.

Bonds

None of the costs contained in this IFFP include the cost of bonding. The cost of bonding required to finance impact fee eligible improvements identified in the IFPP may be added to the calculation of the impact fee. This will be considered in the impact fee analysis.

Inter-fund Loans

Because infrastructure must generally be built ahead of growth, often situations arise in which projects must be funded ahead of expected impact fee revenues. In some cases, the solution to this issue will be bonding. In others, revenue from other funds, such as user rate revenue, may be loaned to the impact fee fund to complete initial construction of a project and will be reimbursed later as impact fees are received. Consideration of potential inter-fund loans will be included in the impact fee analysis and should be considered in subsequent accounting of impact fee expenditures.

Impact Fees

It is recommended that impact fees be used to fund growth-related capital projects as they help to maintain the proposed level of service and prevent existing users from subsidizing the capital needs for new growth. Based on this IFFP, an impact fee analysis will be able to calculate a fair and legal fee that new growth should pay to fund the portion of the existing and new facilities that will benefit new development.

Developer Dedications and Exactions

Developer exactions are not the same as grants. Developer exactions may be considered in the inventory of current and future public safety infrastructure. If a developer constructs facility or dedicates land within the development, the value of the dedication is credited against that particular developer's impact fee liability.

If the value of the dedication/exaction is less than the development's impact fee liability, the developer will owe the balance of the liability to the District. If the value of the improvements dedicated is worth more than the development's impact fee liability, the District must reimburse the difference to the developer from impact fee revenues collected from other developments.

It should be emphasized that the concept of impact fee credits pertains to system level improvements only. For project level improvement (i.e. projects not identified in the impact fee facilities plan), developers will be responsible for the construction of the improvements without credit against the impact fee.

NECESSITY OF IMPROVEMENTS TO MAINTAIN LEVEL OF SERVICE (11-36a-302(3))

According to State statute, impact fees cannot be used to correct deficiencies in the system and must be necessary to maintain the proposed level of service established for all users. Only those projects or portions of projects that are required to maintain the proposed level of service for future growth have been included in this IFFP. This will result in an equitable fee as future users will not be expected to fund any portion of the projects that will benefit existing residents.

SCHOOL RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE (11-36a-302(2))

As part of the noticing and data collection process for this plan, information was gathered regarding future school district and charter school development. Where the City is aware of the planned location of a school, required public facilities to serve the school have been included in the impact fee.

NOTICING AND ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS (11-36a-502)

The Impact Fees Act requires that entities must publish a notice of intent to prepare or modify any IFFP. If an entity prepares an independent IFFP rather than include a capital facilities element in the general plan, the actual IFFP must be adopted by enactment. Before the IFFP can be adopted, a reasonable notice of the public hearing must be published in a local newspaper at least 10 days before the actual hearing. A copy of the proposed IFFP must be made available in each public library within the City during the 10-day noticing period for public review and inspection. Utah Code requires that the City must post a copy of the ordinance in at least three places. These places should include the City offices and the public libraries within the City's jurisdiction. Following the 10-day noticing period, a public hearing will be held, after which the City may adopt, amend and adopt, or reject the proposed IFFP.

SECTION 8
IMPACT FEE CERTIFICATION (11-36a-306(1))

This report has been prepared in accordance with Utah Code Title 11 Chapter 36a (the “Impact Fees Act”), which prescribes the laws pertaining to Utah municipal capital facilities plans and impact fee analyses. The accuracy of this report relies upon the planning, engineering, and other source data, which was provided by the City and their designees.

In accordance with Utah Code Annotated, 11-36a-306(1), Bowen Collins & Associates, makes the following certification:

I certify that this impact fee facility plan:

1. Includes only the cost of public facilities that are:
 - a. allowed under the Impact Fees Act; and
 - b. actually incurred; or
 - c. projected to be incurred or encumbered within six years after the day on which each impact fee is paid;
2. Does not include:
 - a. costs of operation and maintenance of public facilities;
 - b. cost of qualifying public facilities that will raise the level of service for the facilities, through impact fees, above the level of service that is supported by existing residents;
 - c. an expense for overhead, unless the expense is calculated pursuant to a methodology that is consistent with generally accepted cost accounting practices and the methodological standards set forth by the federal Office of Management and Budget for federal grant reimbursement; and
3. Complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.



Andrew T. McKinnon, P.E.

Dated: June 27, 2018

Draper, Utah Office:
154 East 14000 South
Draper, Utah 84020
Phone: (801) 495-2224
Fax: (801) 495-2225

Eagle, Idaho Office:
776 East Riverside Drive
Suite 250
Eagle, Idaho 83616
Phone: (208) 939-9561
Fax: (208) 939-9571

St. George, Utah Office:
20 North Main
Suite 107
St. George, Utah 84770
Phone: (435) 656-3299
Fax: (435) 656-2190

WWW.BOWENCOLLINS.COM

