HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
Tuesday, November 12, 2019

Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland Utah 84003

6:30 WORK SESSION (CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS)
Call to Order – Mayor Rod Mann

1. GARBAGE AND RECYCLING CONTRACT EXTENSION PROPOSAL
Administrative (30 minutes)
The City Council will review and discuss a proposal from Republic Services for a contract extension for garbage and recycling collection services. This item is being presented for information and discussion.

7:00 PM REGULAR SESSION (CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS)
Call to Order – Mayor Rod Mann
Invocation – Mayor Rod Mann
Pledge of Allegiance – Council Member Scott L. Smith

1. UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES
Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments. (Please limit comments to three minutes per person. Please state your name and address.)

2. PRESENTATIONS (35 minutes)
   a. Youth Council Report – Youth Council Member
   b. Recognition of Fire Prevention Week/Poster from Highland Elementary – Fire Chief Reed Thompson
   c. Recognition for Trails Improvement Project – Mayor Rod Mann
   d. New Community Event Coordinator Corrine Prestwich – Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells

3. CONSENT ITEMS (5 minutes)
Items on the consent agenda are of a routine nature or have been previously studied by the City Council. They are intended to be acted upon in one motion. Council members may pull items from consent if they would like them considered separately.
   a. ACTION: Approval of Meeting Minutes Administrative
      Regular City Council Meeting October 1 and 15, 2019
   b. ACTION: Approval of the Library Long-Range Strategic Plan Administrative
      City Council will consider approving the updated 2019-2022 Highland City Library Long-Range Strategic Plan. The Council will take appropriate action.
   c. ACTION: Amend the Moderate Income Housing (MIH) Section and Qualified Subsection of the General Plan (GP-19-01) Legislative
City Council will consider a request to amend the General Plan relating to Moderate Income Housing requirements as outlined in recently adopted legislation. The Council will take appropriate action.

d. **ACTION: Final Plat Approval for a 1-lot Subdivision Approximately .55 Acres located at 5833 W 9600 N** Administrative
   The City Council will consider a request by Scott Dunn for final plat approval of a 1-lot subdivision located at 5833 W 9600 N. The Council will take appropriate action.

e. **ACTION/ORDINANCE: 2020 City Council Annual Meeting Schedule** Administrative
   City Council will consider the 2020 City Council Annual Meeting Schedule. Regular meetings are typically held on the first and third Tuesdays of each month excluding holidays. The Council will take appropriate action.

f. **ACTION: Approval of a General Services Agreement with Blaisdell, Church, & Johnson, LLC to Serve as a General Civil Counsel for the City** Administrative
   The City Council will consider a request to approve a general services agreement with Blaisdell, Church, & Johnson, LLC to serve as general civil counsel for the city and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Clerk to execute the necessary contract documents. The Council will take appropriate action.

g. **ACTION: Approval of a Bid with Dream Carports, Inc. to Proceed with the Design and Fabrication of the Metal Roof Structure for the Salt Storage Facility** Administrative
   The City Council will consider a request to approve a bid with Dream Carports, Inc. to proceed with the design and fabrication of the metal roof structure for the Salt Storage Facility, and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Recorder to execute the necessary contract documents for the project. The Council will take appropriate action.

4. **PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION: AMEND ARTICLE 3 APPEAL AUTHORITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT CODE (TA-19-13)** Legislative (5 minutes)
   The City Council will hold a public hearing to consider a request to amend Article 3 Appeal Authority of the Highland City Development Code. The Council will take appropriate action.

5. **ACTION/RESOLUTION: ADOPT RESOLUTION FOR COMMON BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT WITH LEHI CITY** Legislative (15 minutes)
   The City Council will consider the adoption of a resolution indicating the intent of Highland City to adjust a common boundary with Lehi City. The Council will take appropriate action.

6. **DISCUSSION: HIGHLAND CITY MARKET ANALYSIS** (20 minutes)
   The results of the Highland City Market Analysis will be presented to the Council for information and discussion.

7. **MAYOR/COUNCIL AND STAFF COMMUNICATION ITEMS**
   a. Future Meetings
      - November 13, Mountain Ridge Park Design Open House, 6:30 pm, City Hall
      - November 19, Canvass General Election Returns, 6:00 pm (electronic meeting), City Hall
      - November 19, Planning Commission Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall
      - November 21, Westside Collector Road Traffic Study Report, 6:30 pm, City Hall
      - December 3, City Council Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall

ADJOURNMENT
In accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act, Highland City will make reasonable accommodations to participate in the meeting. Requests for assistance can be made by contacting the City Recorder at (801) 772-4505 at least three days in advance of the meeting.

**ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION**
Members of the City Council may participate electronically via telephone, Skype, or other electronic means during this meeting.

**CERTIFICATE OF POSTING**
I Cindy Quick, the duly appointed City Recorder certify that the foregoing agenda was posted in three public places within Highland City limits. The agenda was also posted at the principal office of the public body, on the Utah State website (http://pmn.utah.gov) and on Highland City's website (www.highlandcity.org).

Please note the order of agenda items are subject to change in order to accommodate the needs of the City Council, staff and the public.

**Posted and dated this 7th day of November, 2019**

Cindy Quick, MMC
City Recorder

| THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN ALL CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS. |
For his Eagle Project, Jonathan Daniels, did trail maintenance for about 1 mile of asphalt trail in the Canterbury Neighborhood. He not only cut back the grass and edged the trail, he filled in and fixed 76 cracks that had formed in the asphalt as a result of shrinking. He arranged with the Ty Christiansen from the city to donate about a cubic yard of cold asphalt. He also worked with the BigRed Asphalt company to donate time, materials and equipment to assist in sealing the smaller cracks.

On the day of the project he organized more than 20 people into groups to cut grass, clean out the cracks with a high-pressure air compressor, fill in and compact the asphalt into each of the cracks. The following the Tuesday, he followed up with BigRed Asphalt and more people to seal the smaller cracks with a rubberized sealant.

In all there were 134 hours donated by fellow scouters, friends and neighbors.
PRESIDING: Mayor Rod Mann

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Braithwaite, Ed Dennis, Tim Irwin, Kurt Ostler, Scott L. Smith

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Administrator / Community Development Director Nathan Crane, Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells, Finance Director Gary LeCheminant, City Engineer Todd Trane, Planner & GIS Analyst Tara Tannahill, City Attorney Tim Merrill, Brian Gwilliams, Reed Thompson, and City Recorder Cindy Quick

OTHERS: Jim Price, Roger Dixon, Deanne Dixon, Natalie Reed, Claudia Stillman, Devirl Barfuss, Krisel Travis, Chris Cottle, Mike Hancock, Doug Cortney, Ken Knapton, Jessica Anderson, Wayne Tanaka, Cheryl Tooley, Brianna Hugh, Tim Ball, Wesley Warren, Helene Pockrus

7:00 PM REGULAR SESSION (CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS)

Call to Order – Mayor Rod Mann
Invocation – Library Chair Roger Dixon
Pledge of Allegiance – Ethan Young

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Rod Mann as a regular session at 7:00 p.m. The meeting agenda was posted on the Utah State Public Meeting Website at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The prayer was offered by Library Chair Roger Dixon and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Ethan Young.

Mayor Mann noted that item 5 was being pulled because the applicant withdrew the request.

1. UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES

There were none.

2. PRESENTATIONS (30 minutes)
   a. MOUNTAINLAND ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (MAG) REPORT – Jim Price

Jim Price distributed copies of the MAG report detailing the transportation plans for Utah County. MAG was currently working with Utah County, the cities within its jurisdictions and the federal government. The intent was to spend the funds jointly.
Mr. Price presented a map outlining the State of Utah’s projects within Utah County. He explained that the County would grow more than Salt Lake, Davis and Weber Counties combined, and stressed the importance of planning for this growth. MAG was urging the State legislature to find funding for these transportation projects.

Council Member Tim Irwin asked if it would be appropriate to reward the cities funding that were doing their best to restrain their growth. He suggested restraint was the best way to prevent traffic and transportation problems. Mr. Price responded that there was nothing currently in place to reward cities in this fashion. He further explained MAG’s role in working with UDOT.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked if MAG received funds from the quarter cent sales tax. Mr. Price stated that one portion of the funding was distributed based on population whereas the rest of the funding was distributed according to need as determined by the County’s mayors. Council Member Kurt Ostler asked about an update on the east west corridor, to which Mr. Price responded that there was no update. They were still looking for funding for the entire project. Council Member Kurt Ostler asked if the project on 6800 West belonged to MAG. Mr. Price explained that this project was awaiting additional funds. They would have the funds available by 2020. Council Member Kurt Ostler explained that there were no new projects planned for Highland in the next 30 years. He noted that if the City did not have projects then it would lose transportation funds. Mr. Price said this had to do with the affordable housing programs. MAG did not have any control over these policies. Council Member Kurt Ostler explained that there were transportation issues in Highland, but MAG was not planning anything in their City. He asked how they could obtain these funds. Mr. Price said they had created a demand program and determined Highland did not meet the demands for the MAG funds.

Mr. Todd Trane explained they would have an opportunity to compete for the funds. As a City, they would have to make these projects a part of its master plans.

b. LIBRARY ANNUAL REPORT - Library Director Donna Cardon

Library Board Chair Roger Dixon presented the annual report. He then introduced the members of the board and thanked them for their service. Mr. Dixon noted that the report was to be compliant with Utah State code 9-7-406(1). He explained that the Library presented a positive face to the community. It was a critical year and they appreciated the guidance of Erin Wells and Ed Dennis. They had improved equipment by acquiring a new copier, reference desk, and a new magnetic white board from the Friends of the Library donations. The Library was a full member of NUCLC. Mr. Dixon presented the Library’s Operation and Statistics information and discussed the increased number of board members and activities. The long-range strategic plan was presented. Mr. Dixon noted that the last time this was presented was in 2016 at the request of the City Council. Their goal was to introduce the library to a broader range of residents. He asked the Council to review the plan and send any revisions by October 15th.

The Council Members thanked the Library board members and Friends of the Library for their efforts. Council Member Tim Irwin asked if they would need additional funds to accomplish their goals. Mr. Dixon stated their projection would be covered by their budget. He said if they included the construction of a new building, they would need more funding.

c. YOUTH COUNCIL REPORT - Youth Council Member

Tayt Godwin was not present. The Mayor announced that he was selected to be the Youth City Council Mayor for 2020.
3. CONSENT ITEMS (5 minutes)
Items on the consent agenda are of a routine nature or have been previously studied by the City Council. They are intended to be acted upon in one motion. Council members may pull items from consent if they would like them considered separately.

a. ACTION: APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
Regular City Council Meeting August 6, 2019
Regular City Council Meeting September 3, 2019

b. ACTION: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR ARABIAN MEADOWS
City Council will consider a request from Sterling Gardner for a Preliminary/Final Plat Approval of a two-lot subdivision. The property is approximately 1.67 acres located at 10530 N 6000 W. The Council will take appropriate action.

c. ACTION: APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION BID WITH ROOTS LANDSCAPING
The City Council will consider a request to approve a construction bid with Roots Landscaping for cobble stone lining in the Country French Detention Basin in the amount of $37,200 and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Clerk to execute the necessary documents. The Council will take appropriate action.

d. ACTION: APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION BID WITH FENCE SPECIALISTS
The City Council will consider a request to approve a construction bid with Fence Specialist for the replacement of the portion of the cemetery fence along SR92 in the amount of $48,263.70 and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Clerk to execute the necessary documents. The Council will take appropriate action.

e. RESOLUTION: RECERTIFICATION OF THE HIGHLAND CITY JUSTICE COURT
The City Council adopt a Resolution requesting the recertification of the Highland Justice Court. The Council will take appropriate action.

Council Member Ed Dennis asked that item 3c. and 3d. be pulled off the consent agenda for further discussion.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED to approve consent items a., b. and e. as listed on the agenda. Council Member Tim Irwin SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Council Member Brian Braithwaite    Yes
Council Member Ed Dennis            Yes
Council Member Tim Irwin             Yes
Council Member Kurt Ostler           Yes
Council Member Scott L. Smith        Yes

The motion passed 5:0.

Council Member Ed Dennis asked for clarification regarding item 3c, questioning whether the detention basin designed by Patterson had any additional liability. City Engineer Todd Trane explained that the detention basin had been plugged and filled up about eight to ten feet deep, very close to homes. Pictures of the flooding was shown. It was rebuilt and a pipe was installed through the basin; below there was an
overflow structure. A retaining wall was built, and vegetation was removed. They needed Council approval to build it correctly. Council Member Ed Dennis asked if there were any pictures of the proposed fence for item 3d. City Engineer Todd Trane responded that they only included the bids; one was for a six-foot fence and the other for a five-foot fence. They were currently approving bids.

Council Member Scott L. Smith asked how long the improvements would take to build. City Engineer Todd Trane did not have an answer.

Council Member Tim Irwin MOVED to approve consent items 3c. and 3d. as listed on the agenda. Council Member Scott L. Smith SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
- Council Member Brian Braithwaite: Yes
- Council Member Ed Dennis: Yes
- Council Member Tim Irwin: Yes
- Council Member Kurt Ostler: Yes
- Council Member Scott L. Smith: Yes

The motion passed 5:0.

4. PUBLIC HEARING/RESOLUTION: ADOPTION OF A MUNICIPAL TRANSIENT ROOM TAX (10 minutes)

City Attorney Tim Merrill oriented the City Council with a resolution for the adoption of a 1% Municipal Transient Room Tax for short term rentals. When Council approved the short-term rental ordinance there was a 1% tax that needed to be collected. While this was not a major financial boost for the City it was recommended by the State. This would go into effect at the beginning of the year.

Council Member Scott L. Smith asked how this would be monitored. City Attorney Tim Merrill responded that he would come back to the Council when he learned this answer.

Council Member Tim Irwin commented that they would not be able to enforce this tax. Mr. Merrill responded that it would be enforced by the sales tax on the rental. Council Member Kurt Ostler explained that individuals needed to register with the State.

Mayor Mann opened the public hearing at 7:49 PM and called for any citizens who would like to speak on the item to come to the podium and state their name for the record.

Citizen Comments:

There were none.

Mayor Mann closed the public hearing at 7:50 PM.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite noted that there was another .5% tax that could be used for bonding. Mr. Merrill stated that Highland did not qualify for the tax in question because it did not satisfy the requirements. There was brief discussion regarding the tax requirements.

Council Member Tim Irwin MOVED to approve the Municipal Transient Room Tax. Council Member Brian Braithwaite SECONDED the motion.
The vote was recorded as follows:
Council Member Brian Braithwaite Yes
Council Member Ed Dennis Yes
Council Member Tim Irwin Yes
Council Member Kurt Ostler Yes
Council Member Scott L. Smith No

The motion passed 4:1.

5. PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION: AMEND THE R-P ZONING DISTRICT TO ALLOW RECEPTION AND EVENT CENTERS AS CONDITIONAL USES. (20 minutes) continued from September 17, 2019

The item was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

6. ACTION: WATER EXCHANGE AGREEMENT WITH SARATOGA SPRINGS AND DR HORTON TO APPROVE AN EXCHANGE OF UTAH LAKE DISTRIBUTING WATER SHARES FOR LEHI IRRIGATION WATER SHARES. (20 minutes)

City Engineer Todd Trane reviewed the agreement, explaining that Saratoga Springs received 195 shares of irrigation water due to development by DR Horton. DR Horton approached the City and asked if they could swap shares. Highland owned Utah Lake Water shares it could not use. The agreement was reviewed by water attorney Tavis Timothy. Staff was comfortable with the conditions outlined in the agreement.

City Engineer Todd Trane further explained that the City used irrigation water almost full-time throughout the year. They had a good flow this year, but during bad years they pumped water for three months. This agreement would give them better sources of water and they would still have underground water available.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite asked about storing water in the aquifer to build credit. Mr. Trane stated that this would be complicated. He said they could make this a project in the future and noted this agreement was a good trade to complete these types of goals.

Mayor Mann said this was a good deal because they were not currently able to use the shares. Council Member Brian Braithwaite agreed.

Council Member Kurt Ostler said he was concerned about the trade. Mr. Trane said they could not currently use the shares so it would not make a difference if they had a dry year. He continued by discussing the connections and sources for the PI water systems. Council Member Kurt Ostler asked for a monetary assessment of the trade. Mr. Trane explained the Utah Lake Water was evaluated less than the East Jordan shares. The difference in value was negligible.

Council Member Tim Irwin MOVED to approve the water exchange agreement with Saratoga Springs and DR Horton for an exchange of Utah Lake Distributing Water shares for Lehi Irrigation Water shares. Council Member Brian Braithwaite SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Council Member Brian Braithwaite Yes
Council Member Ed Dennis Yes
City Engineer Todd Trane explained that that City Council provided direction for construction of concrete chokers by a dental office on SR92 on 5500 West. This also include signage entering the subdivision. Staff was waiting for the completion of the dental offices. The concrete chokers would help slow traffic. He said it would cost between $2,000 to $4,000 to install the concrete. They would not include any landscaping.

There were some concerns for the public safety regarding the chokers. Chief Thompson stated that it was an emotional decision to put in the chokers as this would cause some challenges for the residents entering the neighborhood. Additionally, it would also cause challenges for fire trucks if there were any fires down this street. Council Member Brian Braithwaite asked how this would cause problems. Chief Thompson said it would be a challenge for fire trucks and ambulance vehicles to set up in this area.

Council Member Ed Dennis asked if they had monitored the traffic. Mr. Trane explained that they were waiting to see if it was a problem; they needed to gather additional information. There was concern the chokers would not accomplish what they wanted. It was noted they promised the residents a traffic calming device. Council Member Brian Braithwaite said they should follow through with their commitment. Council Member Tim Irwin agreed.

Mayor Mann asked for direction from the Council. Council Member Brian Braithwaite explained that they should install and measure the impact. Mayor Mann said he was concerned with the safety of the residents in the area.

Mayor asked if there were any comments from audience.

Scott Christensen, resident, commented he had lived in the area for 45 years. He asked the Council to invest in the community. He wanted measures to be taken to control traffic speed. He noted this specific location was dangerous. He was in favor of the chokers because they were low cost and could offer a good return.

Council Member Scott L. Smith MOVED to approve the construction of the Chokers along 5500 W to keep the commitment to the citizens that was made and include the stipulation of placing traffic counters before and after installation. Council Member Ed Dennis SECONDED the motion.

City Engineer Todd Trane asked for clarification. Council Member Brian Braithwaite and Council Member Kurt Ostler suggested they place the counters now to determine the traffic as the business park grew.

The vote was recorded as follows:
- Council Member Brian Braithwaite: Yes
- Council Member Ed Dennis: Yes
- Council Member Tim Irwin: Yes
- Council Member Kurt Ostler: Yes
- Council Member Scott L. Smith: Yes
The motion passed 5:0.

8. ACTION: APPROVE CONSTRUCTION BID WITH A & D QUALITY CONSTRUCTION, INC. AND FLATLINE CONSTRUCTION.  (15 minutes)

City Engineer Todd Trane oriented the City Council with a request to approve construction bids with A & D Quality Construction, Inc. for the footing and foundations. The total cost was $38,111.21 for A & D Quality Construction, Inc and $58,735 for Flatline Construction. City staff was interested in moving forward with the bids before winter began. They needed to install the footings and foundation as soon as possible.

Mayor Mann asked for clarification on the construction details. Mr. Trane explained that this would be like a home foundation. The walls would act as retaining walls. He continued by giving details of the design.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite asked if they had experience with the construction company. Mr. Trane said they had done work within the City and came highly recommended.

Council Member Scott L. Smith stated they needed a salt building. He asked if they had adjusted the plans to accommodate concerns. Mr. Trane responded they received approval from UDOT for access on SR92. This would be much safer and allow for a fully fenced facility. There was a bus stop near the facility and the Council discussed moving or creating safety measures around the stop.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED to approve the construction bids with A & D Quality Construction, Inc. for foundation and footings, and Flatline Construction for the flat work of the Salt Building and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Clerk to execute the necessary contract documents for the project. Council Member Council Member Tim Irwin SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
- Council Member Brian Braithwaite  Yes
- Council Member Ed Dennis  Yes
- Council Member Tim Irwin  Yes
- Council Member Kurt Ostler  Yes
- Council Member Scott L. Smith  Yes

The motion passed 5:0.

9. MAYOR/COUNCIL AND STAFF DISCUSSION AND COMMUNICATION ITEMS

Council Member Scott L. Smith commented that the medians looked great. He thanked City Engineer Todd Trane for his work on the project. City Engineer Todd Trane said they hired the project out believed the other medians would be finished soon.

10. FUTURE MEETINGS
   a. Future Meetings
   - October 10, Council Candidate Debate, 7:00 PM City Hall
   - October 15, City Council Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall
   - October 22, Planning Commission Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall

11. CLOSED SESSION
The Highland City Council may temporarily recess the City Council meeting to convene in a closed session to discuss the pending or reasonable imminent litigation and the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual as provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205.

At 8:49 PM Council Member Tim Irwin MOVED that the City Council recess to convene in a closed session to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual; strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; strategy sessions to discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property; strategy sessions to discuss the sale of real property; or investigative proceedings regarding allegations of criminal misconduct; as provided by Utah Code Annotated § 52-4-205. Council Member Scott L. Smith SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Council Member Brian Braithwaite  Yes
Council Member Ed Dennis  Yes
Council Member Tim Irwin  Yes
Council Member Kurt Ostler  Yes
Council Member Scott L. Smith  Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Ed Dennis MOVED to adjourn the CLOSED SESSION and Council Member Brian Braithwaite SECONDED the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

The CLOSED SESSION adjourned at 11:07 PM.

Council Member Ed Dennis MOVED to adjourn the regular meeting and Council Member Brian Braithwaite SECONDED the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 11:08 PM.

I, Cindy Quick, City Recorder of Highland City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on October 1, 2019. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Highland City Council Meeting.

Cindy Quick, MMC
City Recorder
HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
Tuesday, October 15, 2019
Waiting Formal Approval

Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland Utah 84003

PRESIDING: Mayor Rod Mann

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Braithwaite, Ed Dennis, Tim Irwin, Kurt Ostler, Scott L. Smith

CITY STAFF PRESENT: City Administrator / Community Development Director Nathan Crane, Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells, Finance Director Gary LeCheminant, City Engineer Todd Trane, Dani Cepernich, and City Recorder Cindy Quick Chief Gwilliams and Thompson

OTHERS: Ellen Burns, Patrick Topus, Doug Cortney, Britteny Bills, Claudia Stillman, Elisabeth Luntz, Robert Lee, Natalie Ball, Robert Valentine, Mike Bready, Joan Jansen, Tim Ball, Wesley Warren, Rena Barfuss, Ruth White

7:00 PM REGULAR SESSION (CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS)

Call to Order – Mayor Rod Mann
Invocation – Robert Valentine
Pledge of Allegiance – Council Member Kurt Ostler

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Rod Mann as a regular session at 7:00 p.m. The meeting agenda was posted on the Utah State Public Meeting Website at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The prayer was offered by Robert Valentine and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Council Member Kurt Ostler.

1. UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Ms. Susan Blind and Mr. Mike Townsman invited the Council and everyone else to the Highland City Arts production of Wait Until Dark.

Mr. Robert Valentine, Highland Resident, said he was concerned about the traffic on Highland Blvd. He noted it was so bad that they could not get out onto Wild Rose Road when high school was in session. He suggested a roundabout or a stop light on Kady Lane to address safety concerns.

2. CONSENT ITEMS (5 minutes)

Items on the consent agenda are of a routine nature or have been previously studied by the City Council. They are intended to be acted upon in one motion. Council members may pull items from consent if they would like them considered separately.
a. **ACTION: Approval of Meeting Minutes**
   Regular City Council Meeting September 17, 2019

b. **ACTION: Approval of a Construction Bid with M&M Asphalt Services for the Crack Seal Work of the 2020 Road Preservation Projects for a Price Not to Exceed $43,002.30**
   The City Council will consider a request to approve a construction bid with M&M Asphalt Services for the crack seal work of the 2020 Road Preservation Projects for the amount of $43,002.30 and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Clerk to execute the necessary contract documents for the project. The Council will take appropriate action.

c. **ACTION: Amendment to Residential Solid Waste Collection and Recycling Agreement**
   The City Council will consider a request by Republic Services’ to amend the solid waste collection contract in relation to Christmas tree removal and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Recorder to execute the necessary contract documents for the project. The Council will take appropriate action.

d. **ACTION: A Request by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) to Replace the Existing Statewide Utility License Agreement (SULA)**
   The City Council will consider a request by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) to replace the existing Statewide Utility License Agreement (SULA) with a new agreement. The Council will take appropriate action.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED to approve the consent agenda as listed on the agenda. Council Member Tim Irwin SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Council Member Brian Braithwaite Yes
Council Member Ed Dennis Yes
Council Member Tim Irwin Yes
Council Member Kurt Ostler Yes
Council Member Scott L. Smith Yes

The motion passed 5:0.

3. **PUBLIC HEARING/ORDINANCE: APPROVAL OF A REQUEST FROM MCKAY CHRISTENSEN TO REZONE AND ALLOW RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT, APPLE CREEK, UNDER THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD) DISTRICT. THE PROPERTY IS APPROXIMATELY 5.80 ACRES LOCATED AT 10786 N 5320 W (PD-19-03)**

City Administrator Nathan Crane oriented the City Council with a request by McKay Christensen to rezone 5.8 acres from Town Center Retail and Town Center Flex Use to Planned Development (PD) District and to allow for a mixed-use development with 121 residential units and a 10,000 square foot commercial space. He explained that it was located by Utah Credit Union site. The zoning of the property in question was Town Center with a sub-district for flex use and commercial retail along Alpine Highway.

Mr. Crane provided a brief background of the property. He explained that this process would require a legislative action through the Development Code to approve the rezone of the Town Center. The original proposal was considered by the Planning Commission in August 2019 and they recommended approval.
Mr. Crane then displayed the original proposal and the revised proposals. He explained the changes that were made and noted that staff was concerned with the amount of parking available. He continued by discussing open space, noting that the requirements were either met or exceeded. There were three primary access points that shared access with other commercial properties. Staff was concerned with these access locations. Mr. Crane then explained that the proposed architecture included modern farmhouse, twin, and townhome styles. Lastly, he stated that the overall density was appropriate for the location. However, as a Council they needed to discuss if townhomes were appropriate for the location. Additionally, they also needed to discuss the setbacks, the location and quality of open space, access points, the office space, and several other items.

Council Member Scott L. Smith asked about the access with Ace Hardware. Mr. Crane responded this parking lot had always planned to include another access point.

McKay Christensen, representing the applicant, explained that he had met with several Council Members in advance to find out what was appropriate for this area. He said they planned to adopt everything that was suggested. He then explained how they planned to incorporate the townhomes into the development.

Mr. Christensen continued by showing the changes between the original plan and their revised plans. He began by showing how they reduced the number of residential units and their amenities. He then showed the plans for the office spaces. Mr. Christensen explained there was enough parking available for the developments. He discussed the open space and noted they were exceeding the requirements. He noted the amenity space was smaller due to the changes they had made. Mr. Christensen said they were working on removing anything that conflicted with the code. They would make any adjustments to meet the requirements or needs of the community.

Council Member Ed Dennis asked if they had any occupancy projections for the office space, to which Mr. Christensen responded in the negative. He noted they would need 70% of the space occupied to be profitable. He then explained other necessary projections for ensuring they would be profitable.

Spencer Holmes, resident of Highland, stated that he and his brother owned Holmes Homes. They had built 300-500 homes per year and prided themselves in building high quality homes. He said these homes would be a good addition to the City and the area.

Mayor Mann opened the public hearing at 7:39 PM and called for any citizens who would like to speak on the item to come to the podium and state their name for the record.

Citizen Comments:

Sara McGill, resident, thanked the Council and the Planning Commission. She also thanked the applicant for making the adjustments. She stated that the traffic would increase in this area, affecting hers and the adjacent neighborhood. She suggested they discuss this at the Planning Commission level before approving the development.

Mike Brady, resident, said this development was too dense and he was also concerned about the traffic. He said he understood the valley was growing but the parking and congestion was increasing.

Dan Stratten, resident, was also concerned about the traffic and noise. He asked that they remove the medians for safety.
Brady Mather, resident, commented about the traffic on Alpine Highway. He was concerned it would increase with the high-density project. He asked if the commercial would be viable; if not, he asked if they would still allow the residential portion.

Elizabeth Luntz, resident, asked how the high-density housing benefited the residents’ quality of life.

Robert Lee, resident, requested that they include a traffic study and make it available to the residents. Staff directed Mr. Lee to the web address to acquire a copy.

Wesley Warren, resident, expressed concerns about the density and said he also wanted a copy of the traffic study. He was in favor of the proposal because of the changes that were made.

Jamie Wright, resident, said she did not think this would be a benefit to the town center as the area was already crowded. They City needed to preserve large lots and the bedroom community, and this proposal conflicted with that vision.

Mayor Mann closed the public hearing at 7:52 PM.

Mayor Mann thanked those present for their comments.

McKay Christensen understood there had been concerns over the last three years. He felt that they had tried to make everyone happy and he reiterated that the proposal should be a good benefit to the City. He noted a couple of restaurants were planned with retail space and outdoor patios. He agreed traffic was a concern and an issue. They had made a preliminary application with UDOT and they would provide a full-service access where they could turn left, thereby eliminating the U-turn option. They suggested taking out the median or pulling it back. Mr. Christensen also noted they had reduced density to 70 units. Residential development had less of a footprint than commercial. He explained the entire length of the eastern border would have 75-foot pine trees which would help reduce light and noise.

Council Member Scott L. Smith asked what they would do if they did not sell the commercial space. Mr. Christensen stated that they would build an additional 25 condos instead of retail. They were confident the commercial space would be utilized.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked if their executive offices in Alpine had been successful, to which Mr. Christensen responded in the affirmative. He noted there were a lot of executives in Alpine and Highland that would utilize this space.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked about the parking requirements not being met. Mr. Christensen responded 50% of the twin homes and the townhomes had driveways which were not accounted for in the parking. Council Member Kurt Ostler commented there were parking concerns at another development that were similar. Mr. Christensen explained that the parking problems would be in the evening. This would not be a problem because the office park would not be used at night.

Council Member Kurt Ostler continued to express his concerns about parking and density. Mr. Christensen responded they had tried to make changes so that the development fit with the area. He shared the design plans for the development and green spaces.

Council Member Scott L. Smith asked Chief Thompson whether he had concern for emergency access. Chief Thompson responded they required 28 feet of asphalt access. He said if there was no parking on the roadway through the access, they would have adequate space.
Council Member Brian Braithwaite thanked Mr. Christensen for the presentation. He said this was closer to the vision of the Town Center. He gave a brief history of the area and the changes. He noted there were parking and traffic concerns. He addressed the concerned relating to how this would benefit the community. He responded that the land value would rise, and they would be able to collect revenue from taxes.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite continued by stating he was confident in Holmes Homes. He was concerned mostly about parking and traffic. He said he wanted the office space to be utilized and built correctly to benefit the community.

Mr. Christensen stated that the parking would be built prior to the buildings being finished. This would give them an idea of the available space for the parking.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite stated the several issues raised by the Council and residents were enough to not approve the application. He suggested they work with staff to address these concerns. He said he would rather have retail in the development. Mr. Christensen said he was willing to work with staff.

Council Member Kurt Ostler suggested the Planning Commission also review the application.

*Council Member Scott L. Smith MOVED that the City Council continue application PD-19-03 to allow staff to complete a thorough review of the application and that it be forwarded to the Planning Commission for their deliberation.* Council Member Kurt Ostler SECONDED the motion.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite asked for further clarification from the Council regarding what the Planning Commission could add. Council Member Scott L. Smith noted his main concerns were with parking issues and the architectural design. He felt very uncomfortable with having access through someone else’s parking lot for the development. SR74 and SR92 were very congested and labeled as an “F”, and the extra density would make it a “G.” He said he was still concerned about the density in the back and not sure it was a good road plan for fire access. Council Member Kurt Ostler wanted them to address the density, parking, and open space for the entire area. He said they also should address the need for sprinklers in the residential buildings due to the poor fire access.

Council Member Ed Dennis asked that the traffic study be updated.

*Council Member Scott L. Smith MOVED that the City Council continue application PD-19-03 to allow staff to complete a thorough review of the application and that it be forwarded to the Planning Commission for their deliberation.* Council Member Kurt Ostler SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Member</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Braithwaite</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Dennis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Irwin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Ostler</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott L. Smith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion passed.

Mayor Mann recommended that they schedule home tours.
4. PUBLIC HEARING/ORDINANCE: AMEND THE MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING (MIH) SECTION AND QUALIFIED SUBSECTION OF THE GENERAL PLAN (GP-19-01) (15 minutes)

John Jensen oriented the Council with a request to amend the General Plan relating to Moderate Income Housing requirements as outlined in recently adopted legislation. He explained that this was a requirement from the 2019 General Legislative session. They found areas throughout the plan that discussed housing issues and suggested they be stricken from the plan.

Mr. Jensen explained their objective was to create a goal for Moderate Income Housing. There were four strategies for accomplishing this: senior housing, mixed use zones, partnership with MAG, and examining regulations in the ADU ordinance for potential modification.

Council Member Tim Irwin said this was an exercise in futility. He suggested they restrain growth rather than encourage the growth. Mr. Jensen explained that the legislation allowed each community to work on this problem differently. Council Member Tim Irwin stated that the traffic problems were growing, and they would have more problems by including more Moderate-Income Housing. There was subsequent discussion regarding accessory units.

Council Member Scott L. Smith agreed this was an exercise in futility. He noted the benefit would be linked to the transportation funds. UDOT would only do projects in areas that met the Moderate-Income Housing requirements. Mr. Jensen noted it was important to comply because the State could potentially take more power away from the local governments.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked if they were required to approve the plan every year. Mr. Jensen said he was unsure.

Council Member Ed Dennis noted there were inconsistencies in the report, pointing out that they were using utility information from 2015. Mr. Jensen said the information came from State reporting and he would double check the figures. There was subsequent discussion on senior housing.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED that the City Council continue the time to the next meeting and gather all input from Council Members and staff regarding issues and concerns and take final action at the next meeting. Council Member Scott L. Smith SECONDED the motion.

Mayor Mann opened the public hearing at 9:05 PM and called for any citizens who would like to speak on the item to come to the podium and state their name for the record.

Citizen Comments:

Elisabeth Luntz, resident, asked about the minimum requirements set by the State. Mr. Jensen responded there were minimum standards.

Mayor Mann closed the public hearing at 9:06 PM

Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED that the City Council continue the time to the next meeting and gather all input from Council Members and staff regarding issues and concerns and take final action at the next meeting. Council Member Scott L. Smith SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Council Member Brian Braithwaite  Yes
5. ACTION: A REQUEST BY DEVIRL BARFUSS ON BEHALF OF THE COTTAGES ON THE GREEN SUBDIVISION FOR A REDUCTION IN THE PRESSURIZED WATER DEDICATION REQUIREMENT (15 minutes)

City Engineer Todd Trane oriented the Council with a request by Devirl Barfuss on behalf of the Cottages on the Green Subdivision (Cottages) to reduce the pressurized irrigation (PI) water dedication requirement from three acre-feet per acre to two acre-feet per acre. He further explained that when Cottages came in, they looked at other ways to provide watering. The culinary system was getting overburdened; therefore, they looked at creating a private system. They provided water that went to the golf course and the Alpine Country Club and they provided water back to the cottages on the greens for outdoor watering. This meant they were no longer on the culinary system. The developments now were required to provide adequate water.

Highland City Code requires the three-acre feet per acre be adopted from the State. This was not received during drought years. The Cottages on the Green were now asking for a reduction. He noted they were cut off from water during a portion of the summer and assistance. Mr. Devirl Barfuss was then asked to discuss the subdivision. He stated they required a reduction of the PI requirement due to extenuating circumstances. He noted the unusual nature of the development and displayed the statistics of the development’s water use. Mr. Barfuss continued by explaining their circumstance and history justified having PI reduction. He then reviewed an appeal for providing the reduction. He noted they had implemented a serious water conservation program and had reduced the amount significantly. They anticipated to be under 20-acre feet by next year. In summary, Mr. Barfuss explained they would continue to save water and set the bar for the rest of the City.

Council Member Scott L. Smith asked what it would cost if the City continued to require more acre feet. Mr. Barfuss responded $5,000 per resident. He noted five of the residents would be forced to sell their homes. Council Member Scott L. Smith asked what happened with the Country Club Agreement. Mr. Barfuss responded they were connected to the Country Club in 1989. Through the years the water system changed, and the Country Club was able to change this agreement.

Council Member Scott L. Smith commented this request was reasonable because they were not a new neighborhood. He said it was appropriate to grant this request.

Council Member Kurt Ostler asked for clarification on the history of the irrigation system. It was clarified the City required three-acre feet for new connections. The Cottage on the Green subdivision was metered from the Country Club. There was subsequent discussion on the water provided to the subdivision. There was concern if they could provide enough water during a drought.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite stated that monitoring helped the City to provide water more efficiently. City Engineer Todd Trane said it was the City’s plan to monitor water more carefully. He noted there was a finite amount of water to use.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite asked why the subdivision did not opt into the City system in 1996. Mr. Barfuss responded that he did not know. Mr. Barfuss recommended that the City take open space from their
subdivision. There was discussion about additional connections to the PI system. Council Member Tim Irwin suggested a lien on each home when they were sold in order to pay back the City.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite suggested staff discuss this issue and return with a plan. Council Member Tim Irwin agreed. City Attorney Dani Cepernich commented the Council needed to decide whether they would grant an exception.

*Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED that the City Council direct staff and Mr. Barfuss with several options coming back, including requiring the 3-acre feet as well as other options. Council Member Tim Irwin SECONDED the motion.*

Council Member Kurt Ostler commented this was what Mr. Barfuss had already done. Council Member Scott L. Smith asked how this solved anything. Council Member Tim Irwin said staff needed to provide recommendations and costs for the changes.

City Administrator Nathan Crane explained that staff’s recommendation was to deny the request and not reduce the three-acre feet requirement. City Engineer Todd Trane explained that the appeal would be to the detriment of the rest of the City. He said they were not opposed to work with the Cottages. Council Member Kurt Ostler was in favor of keeping the three-acre feet requirement and mitigate the cost, connections, shares, terms, and deeds.

Council Member Brian Braithwaite noted that there was already an exemption made with the LDS Church. If they could meet the same requirements, then they could allow that exemption.

*Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED that the item be referred to staff to provide some options for mitigating the cost to the homeowners of the Cottages on the Green, without changing the three-acre feet requirement.*

Council Member Ed Dennis asked if there could be a provision to restrict the amount of shares they received based on what shares they had. Mr. Barfuss said they would do everything they could to limit their usage to what they already had.

Council Member Tim Irwin commented there was no guarantee for anyone to receive the shares. There was little reason for them to spend the extra money. City Engineer Todd Trane said it was important to get more water into the system. He said he did not want other communities in the City requesting the same treatment.

*Council Member Brian Braithwaite MOVED that the request be referred to staff to work with the Cottages on the Green residents to find a solution to help mitigate the impact to the residents and maintain the three-acre feet requirement. Council Member Kurt Ostler SECONDED the motion.*

The vote was recorded as follows:

- Council Member Brian Braithwaite: Yes
- Council Member Ed Dennis: Yes
- Council Member Tim Irwin: Yes
- Council Member Kurt Ostler: Yes
- Council Member Scott L. Smith: No (he felt there should be an exemption made)

The motion passed 4:1.
6. ACTION: A REQUEST TO ADOPT VOTER PARTICIPATION AREAS FOR THE PURPOSES OF INITIATIVES AND REFERENDUMS AS REQUIRED BY UTAH CODE 20A-7-401.3 (10 minutes)

City Recorder Cindy Quick oriented the Council with a request to approve Voter Participation Areas for the purpose of signature collection for initiatives and referendums as required in Utah Code 20A-7-401.3. She explained that during the 2019 Legislative General Session, HB 119 was passed. This bill required certain municipalities to establish Voter Participation Areas by dividing the City into four contiguous and compact voter participation areas of substantially equal population. The County provided the map in the packet to comply with this requirement and for their consideration.

Council Member Tim Irwin asked for clarification with what they were designating. It was clarified they needed four equal areas within the City. Mayor Mann further explained that the signature requirement would now be required from 75% of the proposed areas.

Council Member Scott L. Smith commented that the areas were not equal. Ms. Quick noted they needed to be substantially equal. Mayor Mann commented this would be reevaluated after the 2020 census. Council Member Kurt Ostler asked what class of City they were, to which he was informed they were a City of the fourth class. This meant they were a City over 10,000 but less than 30,000. There was subsequent discussion on the method of dividing the four areas.

Council Member Kurt Ostler MOVED that the City Council approve the resolution creating Voter Participation Areas as required by Utah Code 20A-7-401.3. Council Member Brian Braithwaite SECONDED the motion.

Council Member Ed Dennis asked to amend the motion and include a requirement that they define what “substantially equal” meant. He thought this map was not substantially equal. City Administrator Nathan Crane explained that in Q1 and Q3 there would be more residents added and it would be much closer to the 3,071 quadrants.

Council Member Ed Dennis MOVED that the City Council approve the resolution creating Voter Participation Areas as required by Utah Code 20A-7-401.3 contingent upon legal counsel accepting the numbers as substantially equal. Council Member Scott L. Smith seconded the motion.

Attorney Dani Cepernich explained that the term substantially equal was not defined in the code and he did not feel there would be an exact answer.

Council Member Ed Dennis MOVED that the City Council approve the resolution creating Voter Participation Areas as required by Utah Code 20A-7-401.3 contingent upon legal counsel accepting the numbers as substantially equal. Council Member Scott L. Smith seconded the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
Council Member Brian Braithwaite   No
Council Member Ed Dennis           Yes
Council Member Tim Irwin            No
Council Member Kurt Ostler          No
Council Member Scott L. Smith       Yes

The motion failed 3:2.
Council Member Kurt Ostler MOVED that the City Council approve the resolution creating Voter Participation Areas as required by Utah Code 20A-7-401.3. Council Member Brian Braithwaite SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
- Council Member Brian Braithwaite: Yes
- Council Member Ed Dennis: No
- Council Member Tim Irwin: Yes
- Council Member Kurt Ostler: Yes
- Council Member Scott L. Smith: No

The motion passed 3:2.

7. ACTION/RESOLUTION: ADOPTING OF COUNCIL PROCEDURES POLICIES (15 minutes)

Assistant City Administrator Erin Wells oriented the City Council with an updated City Council Procedure Policy. She explained that the update provided clarification to how the Council currently functioned based on State Code, municipal codes and current practice. She hoped to have it approved by the current Council so that new Council would have a fresh start moving forward.

Council Member Scott L. Smith stated that there needed to be more discussion on the changes. He suggested the new Council members also have a chance to provide input on the changes. Council Member Brian Braithwaite agreed.

Council Member Scott L. Smith MOVED to continue the resolution to November 12th and have Council Members provide input and to newly elected candidates as well. Council Member Ed Dennis SECONDED the motion.

The vote was recorded as follows:
- Council Member Brian Braithwaite: Yes
- Council Member Ed Dennis: Yes
- Council Member Tim Irwin: Yes
- Council Member Kurt Ostler: Yes
- Council Member Scott L. Smith: Yes

The motion passed.

8. MAYOR/COUNCIL AND STAFF DISCUSSION AND COMMUNICATION ITEMS

Can discuss items just not take a final action.

9. FUTURE MEETINGS
   a. Future Meetings
      - October 22, Planning Commission Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall
      - November 12, City Council Meeting, 7:00 pm, City Hall

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Rod Mann called for a motion to adjourn.
Council Member Tim Irwin MOVED to adjourn the meeting and Council Member Kurt Ostler SECONDED the motion. All voted yes and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at **10:34 PM**.

I, Cindy Quick, City Recorder of Highland City, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on October 15, 2019. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Highland City Council Meeting.

Cindy Quick, MMC
City Recorder
City Council will consider approving the updated 2019-2022 Highland City Library Long-Range Strategic Plan. The Council will take appropriate action.

On October 1, 2019, the Library Board gave an annual report to the City Council and submitted to them the current Long-Range Strategic Plan for review. Some members of the City Council submitted suggestions for minor revisions, including the suggestion that we include the cost associated with each of the items proposed in the Long-Range Strategic Plan.

The Library Board and I have gone through the Long-Range Strategic Plan and estimated costs of each of the items in the plan. All the planned items can be accomplished without additional funding beyond the current tax revenue levels and expected grant funds. I have attached a version of the Long-Range Strategic Plan with the costs included for your information. The Library Board and I felt that there was no benefit to including the costs in the official version of the Long-Range Strategic Plan that is posted on our website because those costs are better dealt with in the Library budget rather than in a strategic plan. The official version of the Long Range Strategic Plan will instead contain a statement that all the items planned can be accomplished with the current level of tax and expected grant funding.

FISCAL IMPACT:
None. The items proposed in the Highland Library Strategic Plan can be accomplished without any additional funding from the General Fund.

PROPOSED MOTION:
I move that the City Council approve the Highland City Library Strategic Plan.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Strategic Plan 2019-2022 Revised for Council approval
2. Strategic Plan 2019-2022 with costs
Highland City Library: Long-range Strategic Plan
2019-2022

Introduction
Public libraries have long been an important aspect of American life. From the early days of the Republic, libraries were valued by Americans. Benjamin Franklin founded the first subscription library in Philadelphia in 1732 with fifty members to make books more available for citizens of the young nation. From that time to the present, public libraries have been valued because they allow equal access to information and educational resources regardless of social or economic status.

Library service has long been important to the residents of Highland. From 1994 to 2001, residents of Highland and Alpine were served by a joint use facility at Mountain Ridge Junior High School. That arrangement was eventually terminated and in 2001 the entire library collection was relocated to the old Highland City building for storage. In 2008, Highland City built a new city hall and dedicated a portion of the building for a city Library. In 2016 the Library received permission to convert a public meeting room into a Children’s Room for the Library. The new Children’s Room was opened in spring of 2018.

The Library joined the North Utah County Library Cooperative (NUCLC) April 1, 2012 as an associate member. NUCLC is a reciprocal borrowing system that allows library card holders from participating libraries to check out materials from other participating libraries. It is not a county library system. Each participating library maintains its own policies, budget, administration, non-resident fees, etc. In 2018 the Library reached the required collection size and was accepted as a full NUCLC member.

The Library is supported by three constituent bodies: the Library Board; the Friends of the Library; the Library Foundation.

1. The Library Board oversees the operation of the Library. It consists of nine persons, eight volunteers appointed for three year terms and a representative from the City Council. All meetings are held in the Highland City Hall. Records of the Library Board meetings are available from on the City website.

2. Friends of the Library contribute in the following ways: increase Library awareness and membership, keep the community and Library connected, increase volunteerism to support and supplement Library resources, support Library services including story time, displays, and shelving, fundraise through sales and grants, and assist with used book sales.

3. The Library Foundation is a nonprofit, tax-exempt foundation dedicated to assisting the Highland City Library with fund-raising and additional support. Charitable bequests to the Library help the Library fulfill its mission. Bequests to the Library are not subject to estate tax. Donations of $500 or more are recognized on the plaques in the Library.
**Vision Statement**
The Highland City Library seeks to be a valued resource in the community that evolves with changes in society while meeting learning, information, and entertainment needs.

**Mission Statement**
The Highland City Library provides materials, programs, tools, and space that strengthen the community by informing, educating, and entertaining community members of all ages.

**Long-range Strategic Plan, 2019-2022**
The elements of the Strategic Plan support the goals and values expressed in the Library Mission Statement. Some goals are expected to be funded by grants and are indicated with * below. Outside of those goals funded by grants, the goals listed below are expected to be accomplished within the current annual budget for the Library.

### Materials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Date Initiated/Completed</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add juvenile fiction series labels</td>
<td>Inform/Entertain</td>
<td>Have all J FIC and I FIC series labeled</td>
<td>Summer 2019/Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Collection Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add YA fiction series labels</td>
<td>Inform/Entertain</td>
<td>Have all YA FIC series labeled</td>
<td>Fall 2019/Summer 2020</td>
<td>Collection Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassess and Re-label I Fic and J Fic Sections</td>
<td>Inform/entertain</td>
<td>Assessment and Relabeling completed</td>
<td>Summer 2020/Summer 2021</td>
<td>Collection Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Literacy Kits</td>
<td>Educate/Serve all ages</td>
<td>Add 50 Literacy Kits to Library Circulating Collection</td>
<td>Summer 2019/Fall 2019</td>
<td>Kristen Burgon/Collection Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire Test Prep Materials</td>
<td>Inform/Educate</td>
<td>Increase test prep materials by 20%</td>
<td>Spring 2020-Spring 2021</td>
<td>Kim Bergeson/Collection Development Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Date initiated/Completed</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide at least one STEM program/week for</td>
<td>Educate/Serve all ages</td>
<td>Attendance of 10 first year, 15 second</td>
<td>Spring 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Programming Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Date initiated/Completed</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade school age children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide monthly adult education programs</td>
<td>Educate/Serve all ages</td>
<td>Attendance of 10 first year, 15 second year, 20 third year.</td>
<td>Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Programming Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide two programs/year for seniors</td>
<td>Educate/ Entertain/ Serve all ages</td>
<td>Have at least 10 seniors attend each of two events</td>
<td>Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Programming Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present two large community programs/ year</td>
<td>Entertain/ Build Community</td>
<td>Have at least 100 people attend event</td>
<td>Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Programming Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Monthly parent/child book clubs</td>
<td>Educate/build community</td>
<td>Hold 9 book clubs during school year</td>
<td>Fall 2020 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director/ Programming Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Summer Reading Participation</td>
<td>Educate/ Entertain</td>
<td>Percent of population participating in Summer Reading increases by 5% each year.</td>
<td>Summer 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director/ Programming Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide volunteer opportunities to Teens</td>
<td>Educate/ Build Community/ Serve all ages</td>
<td>Work with Lone Peak to have at least 3 Civics Volunteer projects each year</td>
<td>Spring 2020 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start the 1000 Books Before Kindergarten program</td>
<td>Educate/Serve all ages</td>
<td>Acquire material from ALA have 50 patrons participate each year.</td>
<td>Fall 2020 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tools and Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Date initiated/Completed</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current book review blog online</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Add at least one new book review each week</td>
<td>Summer 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acquire Self-Checkout capabilities</em></td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Acquire self-checkout stands and add RFID tags to all books</td>
<td>Winter 2020/ and ongoing</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire RFID tags for physical collection</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Equip each physical item with an RFID tag to expedite book processing.</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase E-Book Access</td>
<td>Educate/Entertain</td>
<td>Spend at least 10% of annual material budget on E-book/e-audiobooks</td>
<td>Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director/Collection Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Public Access Computers</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Replace 2 public access computers each year</td>
<td>Fall 2019, and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Date initiated/Completed</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send at least one staff member to ULA conference each year</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Staff member attends ULA</td>
<td>Spring 2019, and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a staff member present a training presentation each month</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Training session at monthly staff meeting</td>
<td>Spring 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a staff member complete “Uplift Training”</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Staff member receives Uplift Training Certificate</td>
<td>Already initiated/ Fall 2022</td>
<td>Library Director/Participating Staff Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Date initiated/Completed</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a “Teen Corner”</td>
<td>Build Community</td>
<td>Purchase “teen friendly” furniture and decorations</td>
<td>Fall 2019/Fall 2020</td>
<td>Library Director/Teen Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a “Reference Desk”</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Purchase a reference desk and have staff man it during high use times</td>
<td>Fall 2019/Spring 2020</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Create a YA Nonfiction section</td>
<td>Inform/educate</td>
<td>Separate YA titles from YNF and Adult NF</td>
<td>Winter 2020/Spring 2021</td>
<td>Collection Development Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean or replace aging area carpets</td>
<td>Provide Space</td>
<td>Clean or Replace area carpets</td>
<td>Fall 2021/Fall 2022</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funded entirely or partially with grant funds.
Highland City Library: Long-range Strategic Plan
2019-2022

Introduction
Public libraries have long been an important aspect of American life. From the early days of the Republic, libraries were valued by Americans. Benjamin Franklin founded the first subscription library in Philadelphia in 1732 with fifty members to make books more available for citizens of the young nation. From that time to the present, public libraries have been valued because they allow equal access to information and educational resources regardless of social or economic status.

Library service has long been important to the residents of Highland. From 1994 to 2001, residents of Highland and Alpine were served by a joint use facility at Mountain Ridge Junior High School. That arrangement was eventually terminated and in 2001 the entire library collection was relocated to the old Highland City building for storage. In 2008, Highland City built a new city hall and dedicated a portion of the building for a city Library. In 2016 the Library received permission to convert a public meeting room into a Children’s Room for the Library. The new Children’s Room was opened in spring of 2018.

The Library joined the North Utah County Library Cooperative (NUCLC) April 1, 2012 as an associate member. NUCLC is a reciprocal borrowing system that allows library card holders from participating libraries to check out materials from other participating libraries. It is not a county library system. Each participating library maintains its own policies, budget, administration, non-resident fees, etc. In 2018 the Library reached the required collection size and was accepted as a full NUCLC member.

The Library is supported by three constituent bodies: The Library Board; the Friends of the Library; the Library Foundation.

1. The Library Board oversees the operation of the Library. It consists of nine persons, eight volunteers appointed for three year terms and a representative from the City Council. All meetings are held in the Highland City Hall. Records of the Library Board meetings are available from on the City website.

2. Friends of the Library contribute in the following ways: increase Library awareness and membership, keep the community and Library connected, increase volunteerism to support and supplement Library resources, support Library services including story time, displays, and shelving, fundraise through sales and grants, and assist with used book sales.
3. The Library Foundation is a nonprofit, tax-exempt foundation dedicated to assisting the Highland City Library with fund-raising and additional support. Charitable bequests to the Library help the Library fulfill its mission. Bequests to the Library are not subject to estate tax. Donations of $500 or more are recognized on the plaques in the Library.

**Vision Statement**
The Highland City Library seeks to be a valued resource in the community that evolves with changes in society while meeting learning, information, and entertainment needs.

**Mission Statement**
The Highland City Library provides materials, programs, tools, and space that strengthen the community by informing, educating, and entertaining community members of all ages.

**Long-range Strategic Plan, 2019-2022**
The elements of the Strategic Plan support the goals and values expressed in the Library Mission Statement. Some goals are expected to be funded by grants and are indicated below. Outside of those goals funded by grants, the goals listed below are expected to be accomplished within the current annual budget for the Library.

**Materials:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Date Initiated/Completed</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add juvenile fiction series labels</td>
<td>Inform/Entertain</td>
<td>Have all J FIC and I FIC series labeled</td>
<td>Summer 2019/Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Collection Development Team</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add YA fiction series labels</td>
<td>Inform/Entertain</td>
<td>Have all YA FIC series labeled</td>
<td>Fall 2019/Summer 2020</td>
<td>Collection Development Team</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassess and Re-label I Fic and J Fic Sections</td>
<td>Inform/entertain</td>
<td>Assessment and Relabeling completed</td>
<td>Summer 2020/Summer 2021</td>
<td>Collection Development Team</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Kits</td>
<td>Educate/Serve all ages</td>
<td>Add 50 Literacy Kits to Library</td>
<td>Summer 2019/Fall 2019</td>
<td>Kristen Burgon/Collection</td>
<td>$5000 funded by grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Date Initiated/Completed</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire Test Prep Materials</td>
<td>Inform/ Educate</td>
<td>Increase test prep materials by 20%</td>
<td>Spring 2020-Spring 2021</td>
<td>Kim Bergeson/ Collection Development Team</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Date Initiated/Completed</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide at least one STEM program/week for grade school age children</td>
<td>Educate/Serve all ages</td>
<td>Attendance of 10 first year, 15 second year, 20 third year.</td>
<td>Spring 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Programming Team</td>
<td>$300/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide monthly adult education programs</td>
<td>Educate/Serve all ages</td>
<td>Attendance of 10 first year, 15 second year, 20 third year.</td>
<td>Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Programming Team</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide two programs/year for seniors</td>
<td>Educate/ Entertain/ Serve all ages</td>
<td>Have at least 10 seniors attend each of two events</td>
<td>Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Programming Team</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present two large community programs/year</td>
<td>Entertain/ Build Community</td>
<td>Have at least 100 people attend event</td>
<td>Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Programming Team</td>
<td>$1500/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Date initiated/Completed</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Monthly parent/child book clubs</td>
<td>Educate/build community</td>
<td>Hold 9 book clubs during school year</td>
<td>Fall 2020 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director/Programming Team</td>
<td>$270/ year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Summer Reading Participation</td>
<td>Educate/ Entertain</td>
<td>Percent of population participating in Summer Reading increases by 5% each year.</td>
<td>Summer 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director/ Programming Team</td>
<td>$3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide volunteer opportunities to Teens</td>
<td>Educate/ Build Community/ Serve all ages</td>
<td>Work with Lone Peak to have at least 3 Civics Volunteer projects each year</td>
<td>Spring 2020 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start the 1000 Books Before Kindergarten program</td>
<td>Educate/Serve all ages</td>
<td>Acquire material from ALA have 50 patrons participate each year.</td>
<td>Fall 2020 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Date initiated/ Completed</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current book review blog online</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Add at least one new book review each week</td>
<td>Summer 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire Self-Checkout capabilities</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Acquire self-checkout stands and add RFID tags to all books</td>
<td>Winter 2020/ and ongoing</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>$15,000 Funded by a LSTA grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire RFID tags for physical collection</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Equip each physical item with an RFID tag to expedite book processing.</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>$8,000 from funds left over from the 2019 budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase E-Book Access</td>
<td>Educate/ Entertain</td>
<td>Spend at least 10% of annual material budget on E-book/e-audiobooks</td>
<td>Fall 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director/Collection Development Team</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Public Access Computers</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Replace 2 public access computers each year</td>
<td>Fall 2019, and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>$2000/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Date initiated/Completed</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Send at least one staff member to ULA conference each year</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Staff member attends ULA</td>
<td>Spring 2019, and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>$300-$500 depending on location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a staff member present a training presentation each month</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Training session at monthly staff meeting</td>
<td>Spring 2019 and continuing forward</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a staff member complete “Uplift Training”</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Staff member receives Uplift Training Certificate</td>
<td>Already initiated/ Fall 2022</td>
<td>Library Director/ Participating Staff Member</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Date initiated/Completed</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a “Teen Corner”</td>
<td>Build Community</td>
<td>Purchase “teen friendly” furniture and decorations</td>
<td>Fall 2019/Fall 2020</td>
<td>Library Director/Teen Coordinator</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a “Reference Desk”</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Purchase a reference desk and have staff man it during high use times.</td>
<td>Fall 2019/Spring 2020</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>$1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Date initiated/Completed</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a YA Nonfiction section</td>
<td>Inform/educate</td>
<td>Separate YA titles from YNF and Adult NF</td>
<td>Winter 2020/Spring 2021</td>
<td>Collection Development Team</td>
<td>$200 from Library budget and $500 from CLEF grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean or replace aging area carpets</td>
<td>Provide Space</td>
<td>Clean or Replace area carpets</td>
<td>Fall 2021/Fall 2022</td>
<td>Library Director</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City Council will consider a request to amend the General Plan relating to Moderate Income Housing requirements as outlined in recently adopted legislation. The Council will take appropriate action.

The City Council held a public hearing on October 22, 2019. There were no comments from the public on the request. However, there were several minor comments from Council Member Ed Dennis. These comments have been addressed as shown on Attachment 1. The deadline for completion of this amendment is December 1, 2019. If the Council has any additional comments, please provide them to staff as soon as possible.

Two bills passed by the legislature and supported by ULCT during the 2018 session provide the foundation for SB 34 – HB 259 (Moderate Income Housing Amendments) and SB 136 (Transportation Governance Amendments).

In 2019, the legislature passed SB 34 which added to the foundation of HB 259 and SB 136 in two main ways: (1) adding elements that reinforce transportation-efficient land use into cities’ general plans; and (2) providing specific strategies cities must consider adopting in their MIH plans.

SB 34 requires cities to include at least three of the twenty-three strategies in their general plan and submit to Workforce Services by December 1, 2019.

Cities must be up-to-date on the MIH plan and reporting requirements in order to be eligible for the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) and the Transit Transportation Investment Fund (TTIF) money. The TIF was $702 million last year, and 65 out of 81
(80%) of cities that are subject to the MIH requirements either have funds currently programmed or are in phase 1 of the TIF process.

On July 16, 2019, Highland City contracted with Planning Solutions to update Highland City’s General Plan for Moderate Income Housing.

On September 10, 2019 the City Council and Planning Commission hosted a joint work session to go over the twenty-three (23) eligible options in SB 34.

A General Plan amendment is a legislative process.

**SUMMARY OF THE REQUEST:**

1. The request is to review and update several sections of the 2008 General Plan as follows:
   - Executive Summary
   - Glossary of Terms
   - Community Profile and Demographics
   - Land Use Element
   - Affordable Housing Element (replace entire section)
   - Senior Housing

   All changes have been identified in legislative format on Attachment 1.

2. Based on the joint session meeting with the City Council and Planning Commission the following four strategies are suggested:
   - Goal to examine regulations for Senior Housing projects in the land use code and the specific examination of parking requirements for such.
   - Goal to examine the regulations in mixed-use zones in the land use code to provide for a variety of housing types.
   - Goal to examine any potential programs or partnerships with the Mountainlands Association of Governments (MAG).
   - Goal to examine the regulations in the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance in the land use code for potential modifications and incentives to encourage a variety of housing options for residents.

**ANALYSIS:**

- The updates to the General Plan are needed to meet the state law for SB 34 reporting and are required to be submitted to Workforce Services by December 1, 2019.

- Reporting will be due annually on December 1st going forward. As part of the annual review, staff will need to show that the City reviewed the goals and demonstrate why the goals do or do not work for Highland City.

- The four goals meet the reporting requirements for SB 34.

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:**

Notice of the Planning Commission meeting was published in the Daily Herald on
September 8, 2019 and posted on the state website September 5, 2019. Mailed notifications were sent to Mountainlands Association of Governments (MAG), State Planning Coordinator (GOPB office), and the Automated Geographic Reference Center (AGRC) on September 9, 2019.

Notice of the City Council meeting was published in the Daily Herald on September 29, 2019 and posted on the state website September 26, 2019. Mailed notification was on September 30, 2019. No written correspondence has been received.

**PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:**
The Planning Commission held a public meeting on September 24, 2019. There were no comments from the public regarding the proposed amendment. The Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the amendment.

**RECOMMENDATION AND PROPOSED MOTION:**
Staff recommends that the City Council approve the proposed amendment.

I move that the City Council accept the findings ADOPT Ordinance O-2019-XX approving the proposed amendment to the Highland City General Plan as recommended by Planning Commission.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
This action will not have a financial impact on this fiscal year’s budget expenditures.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Proposed Revisions – Council Member Ed Dennis
2. Ordinance
Response to Councilmember Ed Dennis Comments

Page 322 of 388

Reference 2019 population of 19,183 but use 2017 census statistics. Should they be consistent? The paragraph in question has been deleted. Census data routinely lags behind hence the difference in data dates. We felt it was important to use the best data we could. If/when the General Plan is updated we are hoping to use the 2020 Census data.

Highland 2017 MHI is 129,938 but all other references to MHI are 128,938 This was a typo. The number has been corrected.

Highland paid industry in Highland is “Utilities – $195,208” – seems unrealistic for Highland This data is from Labor Bureau 2019.

Page 324 of 388

Second paragraph lists 2017 estimated population may reach 22,833 – when actual population for 2019 is 19,183. Can the estimate for 2017 can be deleted? This has been deleted.

Page 325 of 388

2017 MHI is $128,938 – conflicts with page 322 Page 322 was a typo. It has been corrected.

Actual senior housing (assisted living center) isn’t in the designated Senior Housing zone and isn’t limited to seniors. Sky Estates includes senior housing but isn’t included in the zone either. We can add a sentence here that says “senior housing also exists in other zones.”

Page 326 of 388

The two projects listed under Land Use Analysis are designated as Senior Housing. Updated the wording to not only be senior housing.

Page 329 of 388

2017 MHI is $128,938 – conflicts with page 322 Page 322 was a typo. It has been corrected.

Page 330 of 388

2017 MHI is $128,938 – conflicts with page 322 Page 322 was a typo. It has been corrected.

Estimate 2026 population is 20,252 – page 324 the population estimate for 2027 is 24,304 and actual population in 2019 is 19,183. Looks like these estimates need to be trued up. These numbers are from the old plan and have been corrected. It’s one of the challenges in updating a specific chapter of the plan.

I hope that helps.

Ed
ORDINANCE NO. O-2019-XX

AN ORDINANCE OF THE HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL AMENDING THE HIGHLAND CITY GENERAL PLAN RELATING TO MODERATE INCOME HOUSING AS SHOWN IN FILENAME (GP-19-01).

WHEREAS, all due and proper notices of public hearings and public meetings on this Ordinance held before the Highland City Planning Commission (the “Commission”) and the Highland City Council (the “City Council”) were given in the time, form, substance and manner provided by Utah Code Section 10-9a-205; and

WHEREAS, the Commission held public hearing on this Ordinance on September 24, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a public meeting on this Ordinance on October 15, 2019.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE Highland City Council as follows:

SECTION 1. That the Highland City General Plan is hereby amended as shown on “Exhibit A”, attached and incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 2. That the Mayor, the City Administrator, and the City Recorder are hereby authorized and directed to execute all documents and take all steps necessary to carry out the purpose of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately after posting.

SECTION 4. If any provision of this Ordinance is for any reason held by any court of competent jurisdiction to be unenforceable, such provision or portion hereof shall be deemed separate, distinct, and independent of all other provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Highland City Council, November 12, 2019.

HIGHLAND CITY, UTAH

Rodney W. Mann, Mayor

ATTEST:

COUNCIL MEMBER YES NO
Brian Braithwaite □ □
Ed Dennis □ □
Tim Irwin □ □
Kurt Ostler □ □
Scott Smith □ □

Cindy M. Quick, MMC, City Recorder
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Executive Summary
Adopted February 19, 2008
**Affordable Housing**

An Affordable Housing Moderate Income Housing element is a required component of a comprehensive general plan as outlined by Utah State Code Section 10-9a-403 Part 4 with the intent of “facilitating reasonable opportunities for a variety of housing, including moderate-income housing.” Within this context, affordable housing addresses the demographic forces shaping needs and the current stock and cost of housing, as well as possible solutions for filling the demand for moderate-income housing in Highland City.

**FAIR SHARE HOUSING**

An affordable housing analysis tool that assumes each municipality in a given county in the State of Utah should have the same percentage of the affordable housing units as their percentage of total households.

**Moderate Income Housing**

“Moderate income housing” means housing occupied or reserved for occupancy by households with a gross household income equal to or less than 80% of the median gross income for households of the same size in the county in which the city is located.

---

**Executive Summary**

1.0 Introduction and Background

The Highland City General Plan (2007) is a guiding document adopted by the community to help identify future land uses, transportation and traffic ideas, and other elements that make up the community. The General Plan generally has a life of 5 to 10 years. When the Highland City General Plan (2007) is adopted, zoning ordinances, development guidelines, and other implementation tools should be revised and updated accordingly.

The Highland City General Plan (2007) documents existing conditions, analyzes important community issues, and proposes future visions and growth directions. Understanding key demographic trends is critical for preparing the plan. Some of the key demographic profiles of the community (updated 2019) follow:

- As of February 2007, Highland City’s population was estimated at 14,600. It is estimated that by the year 2017 the population of Highland City will reach 22,833 and 24,304 by 2027.
- As of late 2006 the average household income in Highland City was $94,510 much greater than the county average of $50,553.
- Highland City is composed mainly of owner-occupied single-family dwellings.
- As of 2006 there were an estimated 2,123 jobs located within Highland City.
- Highland’s estimated population in 2019 is 19,183 according to the most recent United States census estimates. Highland is the 43rd largest city in Utah based on official 2017 estimates from the US Census Bureau.
- As of 2017 the median household income in Highland City was $128,938 much greater than the county median income of $78,937.
- As of 2017 there were an estimated 6,986 jobs located in Highland City. The largest industries in Highland are Retail Trade (980 people), Health Care & Social Assistance (815 people), and Educational Services (774 people), and the highest paying industries are Utilities ($195,208), Wholesale Trade ($127,917), and Information ($121,944).

In order for the Highland City General Plan (2007) to remain a vital, living document, interim adjustments may be necessary. However, amendments should only be considered semi-annually, at special meetings devoted entirely to that process, and not within a year of adoption.
Utah State Code section 10-9a-403 Part 4 requires that an affordable Moderate-Income housing element be included in every General Plan. This plan addresses the requirements outlined in Utah State Code section 10-9a-403 Part 4 to create a housing plan that “facilitate[s] reasonable opportunities for a variety of housing, including moderate income housing.” In order to meet these requirements, the demographic forces shaping housing needs, the current stock and cost of housing found in Highland City, as well as possible solutions for filling the demand for moderate-income housing, are analyzed in greater detail in Chapter 6 of this plan.

The following policy options are recommended to facilitate Highland City’s ability to provide reasonable opportunity for a variety of housing, including moderate income, while still maintaining the existing character of the City:

- Allow for the creation of neighborhood enhancing accessory dwelling units, and examine land use regulations for any barriers in implementation.
- Permit additional open space housing development that considers a variety of single family configurations.
- Permit senior housing facilities in a selected area or areas, and consider parking reductions for such developments.
- Adopt reasonable design guidelines for medium/high density housing based on neighborhood community character.
- A mixed-use zone should be created within the Town Center and on the state school site in the southeast corner of Highland City to accommodate a mix of commercial uses and several types of housing, including affordable housing.
- Second- and third-story housing should be allowed in the Town Center with streetlevel retail.
- Examine the regulations in mixed-use zones in the land use code to provide for a variety of housing types.
- Examine any potential programs or partnerships with the Mountainlands Association of Governments (MAG) for the creation of moderate-income housing opportunities.

Highland should be proactive in promoting affordable housing in areas such as the Town Center and the State School Site.
Community Profile and Demographics

The following is a review of key demographic conditions in Highland City. These provide a snapshot of how the community is structured, how it has changed over the years, and what can be anticipated in the future.

Population

While transitioning out of an agricultural community, Highland City’s rural legacy has influenced the physical and demographic composition of the City. In 2000, families in Highland City continued to be some of the largest in the state and also the youngest. Highland City’s median age was 20.9 years old—far younger than the state median of 27.1. The average household size was 4.53 in 2000 compared to the statewide average of 3.13. As of February 2007 Highland City’s population was estimated at 14,600. It is estimated that by the year 2017 the population of Highland City will reach 22,833 and 24,304 by 2027. As of the 2000 Census Highland City’s population was 97.5 percent white.

Socioeconomic

As of late 2006 the average household income in Highland City was $94,510—much greater than the county average of $50,553. This is due in part to higher educational attainment in Highland City. As of the 2000 census, 98 percent of the population age 25 and older had completed high school and 46 percent had a bachelor’s degree or higher. In comparison, only 91 percent of the Utah County population age 25 and older had completed high school and only 32 percent had achieved a bachelor’s degree or higher.

Housing Units

Highland City was home to 1,864 housing units in 2000. As of January 2007 there were 3,150 occupied units. Highland City is composed mainly of owner-occupied single-family dwellings. Ninety-five percent of Highland City’s housing is owner occupied. According to Wasatch Front Multiple Listing Service data, the median sale price for single-family homes between January 2003 and March 2006 was $310,000. Only one percent of the housing in Highland City is attached.
Highland City had a total of 4,320 housing units in 2017. Owner occupied units comprised 4,206 of those total units with 426 being renter occupied units. The median household income in Highland City was $128,938 in 2017. The Utah County Area Median Income (AMI) was $78,937.00 significantly lower than average for the Highland City. Monthly housing costs for owner occupied units was estimated at $1,900. Median gross rent in 2017 was $1,750. Average household size was 4.27 and 4.55 for rental units. The median home value in 2019 in Highland is $585,900. Highland home values have gone up 8.7% over the past year and Zillow predicts they will rise 5.0% by 2020.

**Senior Housing**

Senior housing uses are currently limited to the Town Center located south of SR-92 (also referred to as 11000 N, or Canyon Road) and west of Alpine Highway (known as SR-74). There are two separate but similar architectural designs within similar development pattern however the scale is distinctly different. These projects were considered with the intent to provide affordable and well designed housing for the aging population in Highland City.

The senior housing zone allows for the construction of assisted living facilities in the community. It has been used to develop a 58 bed, 47,685 square foot memory care facility. Senior Housing has also been permitted in other zones in the City.

The roughly 91 acre Highland Town Center has been slow to develop. The site is only half-built, with approximately 43 acres of undeveloped land earmarked and/or approved for a variety of commercial/residential and mixed-use projects.

A detailed set of guidelines has been developed for both the Town Center and Highland Marketplace. These and other implementation tools are discussed in greater detail in Element 7 - Community Design.

**LAND USE ISSUES**

Early in the planning process, Highland City residents identified several issues related to land use. This input was provided both through a community survey and a series of Public Scoping Meetings. Members of the Highland General Plan Update Development Review Group provided additional input. Further insight was ascertained by reviewing existing plans and reports, and through on-site field investigations.

Some of the key land use issues in Highland City include the following:

- Highland City has been consciously developed as a low-density, large-lot community;
- Current and past planning has allowed relatively limited residential options, focusing on large-lot, one-acre single family uses;
- Some development of half-acre lots has been allowed, together with some development on smaller lots in Open Space Bonus Density Overlay Residential neighborhoods has also been allowed;
- Access to moderate-income housing opportunities is limited;
- Preserving the traditional form of the City is important to many residents;
- There is a general desire to preserve, protect, and enhance established residential neighborhoods;
- There is limited desire to provide a wider range of housing options for older and younger residents. For example, senior housing development in the Town Center and PO Zone have recently been approved, and consideration in the Town Center and property south of the Lone Peak High School for mixed use opportunities has been discussed;
- Maintaining a low-density profile is a concern to some residents;
- The provision of parks in exchange for residential density is somewhat controversial, particularly for residents near envisioned projects;
- There is desire for enhanced community services (library, community center, meeting places, etc.).
- Maintenance of animal rights is supported;
- There is some concern that some public services are limited at present;
- There is strong desire for connected trails and trail access points in the City;
- There is a general desire for sports fields and parks;
• There is some concern for the preservation of agricultural land;
• There is some support for a balance between various uses, residential and commercial in particular;
• Some residents would like to see zoning changes implemented which support a comprehensive land use vision for Highland City;
• The limited development opportunities of a community fast approaching build-out should be carefully implemented;
• There is a general desire to preserve open space, support pedestrian connections, and provide a better mix of uses;
• Land use decisions should be integrated with transportation needs in order to create a more functional and better-balanced community; and
• There is a desire to maintain traditional agricultural uses on large-lot sites including animals and animal rights.

Land Use Analysis

Senior Housing uses are also limited at this time however, recent discussions have considered alternatives and opportunities to include these uses in Highland. Two projects that have been implemented in Highland include twin homes and mansion homes (3 unit dwellings appearing as one large home) within the Town Center.

Highland City could easily accommodate additional commercial uses in the future, although the size and location should be carefully considered. In general, commercial uses should be located in areas where they will best serve the populace. In all cases, commercial development should be implemented according to strict design guidelines to help define the imagined result. Office uses and higher-density residential uses should be encouraged as part of larger, mixed-use commercial projects. One potential mixed-use site to provide a range of commercial and residential options, including moderate-income housing opportunities, may be the State School site located on southeast edge of the community however this has not been decided at this time.

Land Use Vision

As illustrated on Map 2-3 and described below, future land uses should build upon the established residential pattern of the community, with subtle shifts to help meet the demand for a wider range of housing options. Concept highlights follow:
• Continuation of the well-established low-density, single-family development pattern;
• Consider Open Space Bonus Density Subdivision development as transitions between existing low-density and higher-density uses and as buffers between municipal boundaries;
• Development of infill properties according to the scale and use of surrounding areas;
• Completion of the Highland Town Center as a mixed-use place, with the possibility of commercial uses located at ground level and residential uses above. This will provide a wider range of housing options and improve access to moderate-income housing;
• Public uses (community buildings, for example) should be located at Highland Town Center and larger infill sites as available;
• Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Trails facilities should be provided to meet future needs.
• Higher density, mixed-use residential/commercial uses are encouraged in the Town Center and may be considered for the State School site near the south/southeast edge of the community.
**Goal:** To promote a wider range of housing options to meet Highland City’s fair housing share of moderate-income housing.

**Policy:** Revise existing policy to allow higher density housing in diverse areas of the City.

Implementation Measure: Allow basement apartments to be occupied by no more than two (2) people per bedroom.

Implementation Measure: Allow mixed use development in the Highland Town Center, with commercial uses on the ground floor and higher density housing above.

Implementation Measure: Consider higher density alternatives, such as an integrated mixed use development, in master planned predetermined locations.

Implementation Measure: Consider Open Space Bonus Density Subdivision development as transitions between existing low-density and higher-density uses and as buffers between municipal boundaries.
Moderate Income Housing Element

Introduction and Background

The Moderate Income Housing Element is one of the required components of a general plan as outlined by Utah State Code Section 10-9a-403 Part 4. The community is required to create a plan to “facilitate reasonable opportunities for a variety of housing, including moderate-income housing.” This plan addresses the demographic forces shaping housing needs and outlines policies for addressing moderate-income housing in Highland City.

Demographic and Housing Data

The cost of housing in Highland City is high. The majority of Highland City’s housing stock is composed of owner-occupied single-family housing units. Highland City had a total of 4,320 housing units in 2017. Owner occupied units comprised 4,206 of those total units with 426 being renter occupied units.

Rent vs Own

89%

2017 HOMEOWNERSHIP
89.8%

2016 HOMEOWNERSHIP

In 2017, 89% of the housing units in Highland, UT were occupied by their owner. This percentage declined from the previous year's rate of 89.8%. The percentage of owner-occupation is higher than the national average of 63.9%. This chart from the Census Bureau shows the ownership percentage in Highland compared to neighboring communities.
Highland’s estimated population in 2019 is 19,183 according to the most recent United States census estimates. Highland is the 43rd largest city in Utah based on official 2017 estimates from the US Census Bureau.

As of 2017 there were an estimated 6,986 jobs located in Highland City. The largest industries in Highland are Retail Trade (980 people), Health Care & Social Assistance (815 people), and Educational Services (774 people), and the highest paying industries are Utilities ($195,208), Wholesale Trade ($127,917), and Information ($121,944).

The median household income in Highland City was $128,938 in 2017. The Utah County Area Median Income (AMI) was $78,937.00 significantly lower than the average for Highland City.

Monthly housing costs for owner occupied units was estimated at $1,900. Median gross rent in 2017 was $1,750.

Average household size was 4.27 and 4.55 for rental units.

The median home value in 2019 in Highland is $585,900. Highland home values have gone up 8.7% over the past year and Zillow predicts they will rise 5.0% by 2020.

There are 10,582 adults (1,317 of whom are seniors) in Highland as of 2018.

Highland Median Age
23.8 Total
22.9 Male
24.8 Female
Moderate Income Housing Requirements

The Utah State Code requires all municipalities to propose a plan for moderate-income housing as part of a General Plan. “Moderate-income housing” is defined as “housing occupied or reserved for occupancy by households with a gross household income equal to or less than 80 percent of the median gross income or “area median income (AMI)” for households of the same size in the county in which the City is located.

According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for housing to be considered affordable, no more than 30 percent of a household’s income should go towards paying for housing. The median household income in Highland City was $128,938 in 2017. The Utah County Area Median Income (AMI) was $78,937.00, significantly lower than average for the Highland City.

The intent of the statute passed in 2019 is to ensure that moderate-income households have a reasonable opportunity to live in Utah’s growing communities. Cities should provide reasonable opportunities for moderate income households to obtain housing in their municipality. Cities should also ensure that moderate-income households be able to benefit from and fully enjoy all aspects of neighborhood and community life.

PLANNING FOR POPULATION GROWTH

- UTAH’S POPULATION IS PROJECTED TO INCREASE BY 2.8 MILLION PEOPLE IN THE NEXT 45 YEARS.
- PROJECTED GROWTH IS MOST PREVALENT IN SALT LAKE AND UTAH COUNTY
- BY 2065, 28% OF THE STATE’S POPULATION WILL RESIDE IN UTAH COUNTY
- HIGHLAND’S POPULATION IS PROJECTED TO BE 20,252, BY 2026
The intent of the statute passed in 2019 is to ensure that moderate-income households have a reasonable opportunity to live in Utah’s growing communities. Cities should provide reasonable opportunities for moderate income households to obtain housing in their municipality. Cities should also ensure that moderate-income households be able to benefit from and fully enjoy all aspects of neighborhood and community life.

To better understand who moderate-income households are the table below has been included as a sampling of professions that qualify as moderate-income. This table includes the median income for the Provo-Orem Metropolitan Statistical Area, (MSA) as well as the monthly cost of housing that would be considered affordable for each household assuming 30 percent of gross monthly income goes to housing costs.

**HOUSING COSTS FOR WORKERS IN SELECTED OCCUPATIONS Provo-Orem MSA June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Average (Median) Annual Wages</th>
<th>(% of AMI)</th>
<th>Affordable Housing Costs per Month*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Teachers, Except Special Education</td>
<td>$28,310</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>$708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>$53,864</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Clerk</td>
<td>$30,340</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighters</td>
<td>$44,171</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretaries and Administrative Assistants</td>
<td>$51,380</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinists</td>
<td>$51,510</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$1,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Sales Agent</td>
<td>$51,900</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$1,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurses</td>
<td>$61,160</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>$1,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank loan Officer</td>
<td>$59,250</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$1,481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers to Moderate Income Housing

The high price of land is a major barrier to affordable housing in Highland. Highland is also close to being built out, under the current zoning strategy. A partial solution that may assist in reducing land costs could be to allow for higher density housing to offset the land cost per unit, however, this does not guarantee affordable housing. To achieve moderate income affordability, the City may have to require a developer to sell at affordable prices through some sort of agreement, given the market conditions.

Since Highland City has a unique character in comparison to Utah County as a whole it is unreasonable to assume the City will be home to the same percentage of affordable housing as is found in the overall county. To find a more accurate measure for affordable housing opportunity in Highland City, the Utah County percentage of affordable housing will be adjusted using the basic owner and renter-occupied housing rates found in the City. This methodology assumes that Highland City should reasonably provide the same opportunity for affordable housing by a percent for both owned and rental housing stock as is observed in the county as a whole.

The zoning ordinance does allow for accessory dwelling units which provide a partial solution to the affordable housing deficit. Consideration to examine potential barriers will be examined in the Goals and Policies section of this element.
GOALS AND POLICIES

With the zoning pattern already established and a mostly infill expectation for new development, support for alternative housing types is a difficult goal to achieve. The City can still find creative ways to make a reasonable allowance for affordable housing types that would be acceptable and even welcomed by residents. The City may choose to focus on solutions, such as basement accessory dwelling units, senior housing (some of which may include deed restrictions to maintain affordability) and multi-family housing mixed-use developments. The goals, policies, and implementation measures below build on these ideas.

Goal:

**Policy:** Proactively encourage the development of moderate income and senior housing as follows:

**Implementation Measure:** Examine regulations for Senior Housing projects in the land use code with the specific examination of parking requirements for such.

**Implementation Measure:** Review and consider updating the regulations in mixed-use zones in the land use code to provide for a greater variety of housing types.

**Implementation Measure:** Explore potential programs or partnerships with the Mountainlands Association of Governments (MAG).

**Implementation Measure:** Review and update the regulations for the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) within the land use code for potential modifications and incentives to encourage the creation of additional housing options for residents.

**Policy:** Maintain quality housing stock and the current aesthetic style of Highland City.

**Implementation Measure:** Adopt design guidelines for medium and higher density housing based on residents’ opinions and perceptions of the community character. The guidelines should not be cost prohibitive to affordable housing.
The City Council will consider a request by Scott Dunn for final plat approval of a 1-lot subdivision located at 5833 W 9600 N. The Council will take appropriate action.

The property is approximately 0.55 acres and located north of 5833 W 9600 N. The applicant is requesting to create a 1-lot subdivision.

The applicant currently owns 1.50 acres in Highland City. The applicant is requesting to have .55 acres along 9600 North remain with Highland and the back 1 acre to go to American Fork.

The property is designated as Low Density Residential on the General Plan Land Use Map. The current zoning is R-1-20. The R-1-20 District allows for one home per 20,000 square feet of land within the development. The minimum lot width is 115 feet.

1. The applicant is requesting approval of a 1-lot subdivision. The lot is 0.55 acres or approximately 23,846 square feet.
2. Access to the site will be from 9600 North.

Notice of the October 1, 2019 Development Review Committee meeting was mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the proposed site on September 16, 2019. Two residents attended the meeting.

Notice of the Planning Commission meeting was published in the Daily Herald on October 6, 2019 and posted on the state website October 3, 2019. Notification of the public hearing associated with this meeting was mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the proposed site on October 7, 2019. One written correspondence has been received in favor.
• The General Plan designation for this property is Low Density Residential. The surrounding properties are zoned R-1-40 and R-1-20. The proposed subdivision is in conformance with the General Plan and compatible with the surrounding uses.

• Access to the site will be from 9600 North and the existing home will remain.

• The standard ten (10) feet public utility easements have been included on the plat.

• The setbacks for each lot meets R-1-20 standards for setbacks of 30' for the front, 30' for the rear, and 15' for the sides.

• The lots frontage is 120.11’, which is above the 115’ requirement for R-1-20.

• Proposal meets all criteria for a 1-lot subdivision within the R-1-20 zone.

CONCLUSION:
With the proposed stipulations, the proposed Final Plat appears to meet the required findings for approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:
The Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 22, 2019. There were no comments from the public regarding the proposal. The Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the preliminary and final plat subject to the following stipulations:

1. The recorded plat conforms to the final plat date stamped July 10, 2019 except as modified by these stipulations.

2. All public improvements shall be installed as required by the City Engineer.

3. The civil construction plans shall meet all requirements as determined by the City Engineer.

RECOMMENDATION AND PROPOSED MOTION:
I move that the City Council accept the findings and recommend approval of the Final Plat subject to the three (3) stipulations recommended by the Planning Commission.

ALTERNATIVE MOTION:
I move that the City Council DENY Chidester Subdivision Final Plat subject to the following findings: (Council should state appropriate findings).

FISCAL IMPACT:
This action will not have a financial impact on this fiscal year’s budget expenditure.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Vicinity Map
2. Citizen Comment
3. Proposed Final Plat
Attachment 1:

Utah County Parcel Map

This cadastral map is generated from Utah County Recorder data. It is for reference only and no liability is assumed for any inaccuracies, incorrect data or variations with an actual survey.

Date: 9/10/2019
Attachment 2:

**Date:** November 7, 2019  
**Subject:** Email Correspondence

**Email from Jacqueline Woolley on October 23, 2019:**  
To the Planning Commission:  
We are FOR the Chidester Subdivision Plat A development. It would definitely add value to the neighborhood and provide additional taxes for the City of Highland to benefit from.

Sincerely,

Cole and Jacqueline Woolley
Narrative

The survey of the tract of land described herein was performed in accordance with the "American Land Title Association" and "American Society of Professional Land Surveyors" standards. The survey was conducted in July 2021.

The parcel is located in Section 11, Township 5 South, Range 1 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian. The survey was completed to facilitate the design of future improvements.

The boundary markers are to be set in conformance with the survey results.

Surveyor certification

[Signatures and seals]

Combined Description

[Survey details and coordinates]

Chidester

[Plat and survey details]

Hill Ridge Estates

[Boundary and topography survey details]

[Additional survey and legal descriptions]
The City Council will consider approving the City Council Annual Meeting Schedule for 2020. The Council will take appropriate action.

BACKGROUND:
Utah Code Annotated (UCA) 10-3-502(1) requires the City Council to approve by ordinance a time and place for holding regular meetings and hold regular meetings at least once each month.

Highland City Municipal Code 2.12.080 requires the City Council to hold regular meetings on such a schedule as it may establish from time to time.

UCA 52-4-202 requires all public entities which hold regular meetings that are scheduled in advance over the course of a year to provide a notice of their Annual Meeting Schedule.

Staff proposes that the City Council continues to hold their regular meetings on the first and third Tuesday of every month at 7:00 pm with the following exceptions:

- Only one meeting in November, on the 10th, as has been typically done in past years due to the Thanksgiving holiday, and as the first Tuesday in November is Election Day and state law prohibits holding Public Meetings on Election Day.
- Only one meeting in December, on the 1st, as has been typically done in past years due to the holiday season.

The City Council may modify the schedule to delete or add any meetings as desired. Any work sessions will be scheduled as needed, and special meetings may still take place from time to time, again, as needed. Meetings are typically held at Highland City Hall, Council Chambers at 7:00 p.m.

FISCAL IMPACT:
None.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Ordinance
WHEREAS, the City Council of Highland, Utah, has deemed it appropriate to adopt a meeting schedule for the year 2020; and

WHEREAS, per Utah Code 10-3-502(1), the City Council shall by ordinance prescribe the time and place for holding its regular meeting and the Council shall hold a regular meeting at least once each month; and

WHEREAS, per Utah Code 52-4-202 the Utah State Legislature has further required public bodies which hold regular meetings scheduled in advance over the course of a year to give public notice of the annual meeting schedule, and to include the date, time and place of such meetings.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of Highland, UT that the 2020 Annual Meeting Schedule for City Council be as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>14 and 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>4 and 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>3 and 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>7 and 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5 and 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>7 and 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>4 and 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1 and 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>6 and 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PASSED by the Highland City Council this 12th day of November, 2019.

HIGHLAND CITY, UTAH

__________________________
Rodney W. Mann
Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________
Cindy M. Quick, MMC
City Recorder

COUNCILMEMBER YES NO
Brian Braithwaite ☐ ☐
Ed Dennis ☐ ☐
Tim Irwin ☐ ☐
Kurt Ostler ☐ ☐
Scott Smith ☐ ☐
The City Council will consider a request to approve a general services agreement with Blaisdell, Church, & Johnson, LLC to serve as general civil counsel for the city and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Clerk to execute the necessary contract documents.

The City Council has selected the firm of Blaisdell, Church, & Johnson, LLC to serve as the general counsel for the city. Rob Patterson and Eric Johnson will be the primary contacts and attorneys for the City. The engagement is on an “as-needed” basis and may be terminated at any time. Specialty services will require City consent prior to the work beginning. Both attorneys will be attending City Council meetings until the City determines which lead attorney the City would prefer. The charge for both attorneys is $150 per hour.

Staff recommends that the City Council approve the general services agreement with Blaisdell, Church, & Johnson, LLC to serve as general civil counsel for the city and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Clerk to execute the necessary contract documents.

I move that the City Council approve the general services agreement with Blaisdell, Church, & Johnson, LLC to serve as general civil counsel for the city and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Clerk to execute the necessary contract documents.

I move that the City Council REJECT the general services agreement. (The Council should draft appropriate findings).
**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Funding for the agreement will come from account 10-49-31 Attorney: Professional and Technical Services.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. General Services Agreement Blaisdell, Church, & Johnson, LLC
October 31, 2019

Highland City
5400 W Civic Center Drive
Suite 1
Highland, UT 84003

Re: Engagement Agreement

Respected City Officials:

INTRODUCTION

Our law firm represents Utah cities and towns on all municipal legal matters. We are pleased to provide legal services to Highland City on general civil matters as assigned by the City. Rob Patterson and Eric Johnson will be the primary contacts and attorneys for the City’s legal matters, and may be contacted by City officials and personnel as desired and needed. We understand that this engagement is on an “as-needed” basis and may be terminated at any time. The effective date of this engagement agreement and the starting date for our representation of the City is October 31, 2019.

FEES SCHEDULE

1. Rates: The standard charges are $150 per hour for all attorneys. These rates include all general legal matters as well as civil litigation and civil enforcement of City code, but not specialty services such as bond counsel services or criminal prosecutions. Prior to doing any specialty services, we would first enter into a separate contract. Any increase to these rates, as may happen from time to time, will be done through notice and with the City’s consent. We may involve other attorneys and paralegals or clerks in our office in your matters as deemed appropriate in our sole discretion and judgment at rates equal to or lower than those set forth above.

2. Travel: For all travel, including City Council meetings, appointments, negotiations, court appearances, etc., we will charge only for actual time expended in travel, and we will request reimbursement only of any actual, out-of-pocket travel costs, such as airfare. We do not charge mileage for travel inside the state of Utah. We can appear at and attend any City Council meetings or other meetings or appointments as requested by the City.
3. **City Council Meetings:** Both Rob Patterson and Eric Johnson can appear at and attend City Council meetings as requested by the City. We will charge and bill only for one attorney’s time at City Council meetings, even if two attend.

4. **Costs & Expenses:** We do not charge for most out of pocket expenses, such as long-distance calls, copies, or mailing. We do not charge for anything we do in the office, such as secretarial services, stationary, postage, supplies, and equipment. The costs for which the City will be billed may include work beyond what we do in-office, such as process servers, court filing fees, regulatory fees, court reporters, electronic research, statutory witness fees, travel expenses (as described above), large copying/scanning projects by outside vendors, expert witness fees, consultants, investigators, and any other costs or fees arising from litigation.

5. **Billing & Invoices:** We generally bill on a monthly basis and expect clients to see that the invoice is paid in full within 30 days. The invoices will be from ETJLaw, Inc. The invoices detail the date of the billable time, the attorney billing the time, the time spent, the applicable billing rate, and the reason for the billed time/the work that was performed. All unpaid balances beyond 30 days will accrue interest at 10% per annum. It is our policy to suspend work if a client is 60 days past due in payment and to withdraw from representation if an account becomes 90 days past due.

### Liens

Legal fees and costs are secured by a lien on leases, mineral estates, water rights, real property, and personal property which are subject of or connected to the legal services provided, as provided in Utah Code § 38-2-7 and any successor section or as provided by common law.

### Client Duties

The City, though its officials, as the client, agrees to be candid with us. This is particularly important when representing a board, like the City Council, because at times the decision of the Council will not be unanimous. City officials and personnel will need to cooperate in the preparation for any administrative proceeding, trial, hearing, or any other litigation or administrative matter. City officials and personnel will need to appear on reasonable notice for meetings, court appearances, deposition, to pay our bills on time, and to comply with all reasonable requests made in connection with the preparation and presentation of these matters.

### Cooperation/Communication

Your cooperation in getting us information and in working with us on your matters can considerably expedite the matters and help reduce attorney fees. We will generally send you copies of all correspondence and pleadings sent or received. Call us if you have any questions. We anticipate reporting to the City on a regular basis, as frequently as desired, or when events in a case require a report.
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NO GUARANTEES OF OUTCOME

We have made no guarantees regarding the final outcome of your matters or about issues that may be decided by an administrative, legislative, or judicial entity prior to a final ruling. Statements that we have made or may make regarding the likely outcome or the range of possible outcomes are only our opinions based upon our experience and are not guarantees of a particular result.

SCOPE OF REPRESENTATION

The specific services for which we have been retained to represent the City are for general legal issues of the City, as assigned by City officers. Certain aspects of the services to be performed for you will involve our judgment as to technical matters, including administrative and litigation proceedings, court schedules, continuances, extensions of time, and the use of other attorneys and paralegals. These matters shall be entrusted to our judgment without the necessity of specific consultation with you.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Communications with us concerning your matters are generally privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure under attorney-client privilege rules. This privilege is not absolute, and we may be required to reveal information under certain circumstances, including if necessary to prevent a crime or fraud. Your privilege of confidentiality can also be lost if you discuss our communications with third parties. This engagement agreement and all information regarding your retention of our firm may be shared.

Sincerely yours,
BLAISDELL, CHURCH & JOHNSON, LLC

Robert A. Patterson

Eric Johnson

Accepted and agreed to this ______________________, 2019

Highland City

____________________________________
Title: ________________________________
The City Council will consider a request to approve a bid with Dream Carports, Inc. to proceed with the design and fabrication of the metal roof structure for the Salt Storage Facility, and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Recorder to execute the necessary contract documents for the project. The Council will take appropriate action.

City Staff worked with JUB engineers to design a salt storage facility on the corner of Park Drive and SR-92. The new site/structure will over double the amount of salt that we can store and make salt deliveries much safer for vehicles and pedestrians on Park Drive.

There are five main phases to the construction of the salt storage facility (excavation/grading, footings/foundation, concrete flatwork, roof structure, and fencing). To save money and do our best to stay within budget, city staff will be acting as the project manager by bidding the phases separately. This will allow the City staff to do the excavation work as well as save the mark up profit from a general contractor.

City staff invited 3 metal building manufactures to bid the project. The bids are as follows:

- Dream Carports, Inc. - $29,108.91 Total – Materials and installation
- Advanced Steel Building Systems – ($29,942.00 Materials) and ($9,600.00 installation) $39,542.00 Total
- Western Steel Buildings - $18,316.00 – Materials*
  *Western Steel does not provide installation. We were told that we would need to solicit bids to erect the building. We were also told the cost would be around $7/sq. ft. which is $11,200. $29,516.00 Total

After evaluating the bids, staff feels very comfortable moving forward with Dream Carports, Inc. This is the company that we already used to fabricate and install the fuel...
storage shed at our public work facility. They did a great job and were very professional to work with.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the City Council approve the contract with Dream Carports, Inc. to proceed with design and fabrication of the metal roof structure for the Salt Storage Facility for $29,108.81 and authorize the Mayor or City Administrator and City Clerk to execute the necessary contract documents for the project.

PROPOSED MOTION:
I move that the City Council APPROVE and AUTHORIZEx the Mayor to sign a contract with Dream Carports, Inc. to proceed with design and fabrication of the metal roof structure for the Salt Storage Facility for $29,108.81.

ALTERNATIVE MOTION:
I move that the City Council REJECT the bids for the metal roof structure for the Salt Storage Building. (The Council should draft appropriate findings).

FISCAL IMPACT:
The current salt storage budget is $145,000. The Council has already authorized concrete contracts for $96,846.12. The authorization of this contract will leave only $19,045.07 for remaining site grading costs, fencing, and any other unforeseen expenses. The building is currently underfunded, even with staff doing excavation and general contracting.
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GENERAL NOTES

1. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROPER INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ALL UTILITY EYES RELATED TO THE WORK SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS, WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROJECT.

2. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROPER INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE OF ALL UTILITY EYES RELATED TO THE WORK SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS, WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE TO ACCOMMODATE THE PROJECT.

3. ANY WORK DONE WITHIN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY MUST BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

4. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

5. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

6. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

7. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

8. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

9. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

10. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

11. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

12. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

13. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

14. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

15. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

16. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.

17. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY UTILITY DEPTHS, ELEVATIONS, AND OTHER INFORMATION ON ALL UTILITY DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS.
### POINT TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT</th>
<th>NORTHING</th>
<th>EASTING</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP-1</td>
<td>50,006.06</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>5,158.62</td>
<td>NORTHWEST CORNER OF SEC 31, T4S, R2E, SLB&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP-2</td>
<td>49,981.57</td>
<td>194,684.44</td>
<td>4,950.34</td>
<td>NORTHWEST CORNER OF SEC 31, T4S, R2E, SLB&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG-1</td>
<td>48,777.78</td>
<td>198,742.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NW BUILDING CORNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG-2</td>
<td>48,737.85</td>
<td>198,740.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NE BUILDING CORNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG-3</td>
<td>48,740.32</td>
<td>198,703.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>SW BUILDING CORNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG-4</td>
<td>48,760.25</td>
<td>198,703.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>SE BUILDING CORNER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The project control points were derived by holding the observed N.A.D. 83, U.S. Survey Foot, State Plane, Utah Central Zone values for each control point and scaling said values to ground about point 0,0 using a combined grid to ground scale factor of 1.0002903221 (0.999709762162). A false north of -7,279,659.23445 and a false east of -1,370,067.55501 was then applied. All distances are ground values.
- The basis of bearings was established using the observed N.A.D. 83 bearing of south 89°48'05" west along the line between control point number 1 and control point number 2. Said control points were found to be as shown on their respective monument reference sheets on file at the office of the Utah County Surveyor.
- Control point number 1 serves as the primary vertical control point (Benchmark) for this project using the V.R.S. derived N.A.V.D. 88, U.S. Survey Foot elevation of 5,158.62 (GEOID 128).
- The control point coordinates shown herein are based on actual field measurements and should be used for all construction purposes.

---

**Survey Control Notes:**
2. The project control points were derived by holding the observed N.A.D. 83, U.S. Survey Foot, State Plane, Utah Central Zone values for each control point and scaling said values to ground about point 0,0 using a combined grid to ground scale factor of 1.0002903221 (0.999709762162). A false north of -7,279,659.23445 and a false east of -1,370,067.55501 was then applied. All distances are ground values.
3. The basis of bearings was established using the observed N.A.D. 83 bearing of south 89°48'05" west along the line between control point number 1 and control point number 2. Said control points were found to be as shown on their respective monument reference sheets on file at the office of the Utah County Surveyor.
4. Control point number 1 serves as the primary vertical control point (Benchmark) for this project using the V.R.S. derived N.A.V.D. 88, U.S. Survey Foot elevation of 5,158.62 (GEOID 128).
5. The control point coordinates shown herein are based on actual field measurements and should be used for all construction purposes.

**Design by:**
**Drawn by:**
**Checked by:**

---

**J-U-B Retains All Common Law, Statutory, Copyright, and Other Reserved Rights of These Drawings, and the Same Shall Not Be Resused Without J-U-B's Prior Written Consent. Any Reuse Without Written Consent By J-U-B Will Be At Client's Sole Risk and Without Liability or Legal Exposure To J-U-B.**

---
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**B1** TYPICAL SEDIMENT BASIN WALL

- Typical horizontal reinforcing at top of wall
- Expansion joint
- Concrete base on grade, see plan
- #5 at 12" o.c. vert.
- #5 at 12" o.c. horiz.
- Approx. finished grade
- Roughen joint w/ ¼" amplitude
- 2'-6" compaction, untreated base course
- 2'-6" expansion joint filled

**B2** TYPICAL JOINT SEALANT DETAIL

- Joint sealant: 2-component, non-sag, polyurethane elastomeric sealant conforming to ASTM C920 & Federal Specification TT-S-00227E
- ½" expansion joint filler

**B3** TURNED DOWN SLAB DETAIL

- #4 horiz. rebar - continuous top and bottom

---
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S-001

GENERAL

A. These general structural notes and specifications supplement the project written

B. Where conflict of technical detail exists between the Project Drawings, the Contract

C. The Contractor is responsible for all distortion factors, since the drawings are based upon field conditions.

D. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

E. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

F. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

G. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

H. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

I. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

J. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

K. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

L. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

M. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

N. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

O. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

P. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

Q. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

R. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

S. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

T. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

U. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

V. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

W. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

X. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

Y. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.

Z. The Contractor shall ensure that all work is in accordance with the Appendix A of ACI 318.
GENERAL STRUCTURAL NOTES CONTINUED

Section 5.3.4 and ACI 318, Chapter 8:
0.2.1 For the top surfaces of walls, provide a "Scratched" finish per Section 5.3.4.2.8.

G. Placing of all reinforcing steel within concrete structures shall be in conformance with ACI 318.

H. Reinforcing steel hooks, laps, splices and other reinforcement details shall be in compliance with ACI 318. Details and Splicing of Concrete Reinforcement.

A. Placement of all reinforcing steel within concrete structures shall be in conformance with ACI 318. Details and Splicing of Concrete Reinforcement.

B. Reinforcing steel hooks, laps, splices and other reinforcement details shall be in compliance with ACI 318. Details and Splicing of Concrete Reinforcement.

C. Splicing links for reinforcement shall be in conformance with ACI 318.

D. Concrete protection for reinforcement. Unless noted otherwise on the drawings, all concrete protection for reinforcement shall be in accordance with ACI 318; Details and Splicing of Concrete Reinforcement.

0.1.1 Concrete not exposed to water, liquid or weather:
0.1.1.1 No. 5 or smaller bars: 0.75-inch
0.1.1.2 No. 6 or smaller bars: 1.00-inch
0.1.1.3 Concrete exposed to water, liquid or weather:
0.1.1.4 No. 5 or smaller bars: 1.00-inch
0.1.1.5 No. 6 or smaller bars: 1.50-inch

E. Concrete blocks or plastic-coated bar chairs shall be provided for support of all slab reinforcing steel. The minimum required size is ¾". Two are required bars plus or minus 2 inches in order to avoid drilling conflicts. Locate reinforcing steel so that it will not interfere with the drilling operations. Move reinforcing steel, if necessary, to avoid conflict with the forms or the sub-grade.

F. Concrete blocks or plastic-coated bar chairs shall be provided for support of all slab reinforcing steel. The minimum required size is ¾". Two are required bars plus or minus 2 inches in order to avoid drilling conflicts. Locate reinforcing steel so that it will not interfere with the drilling operations. Move reinforcing steel, if necessary, to avoid conflict with the forms or the sub-grade.

G. Provide dowels in footings and at construction joints to match vertical reinforcing bar sizes and spacing, unless otherwise noted on the drawings.

H. Where drilled in anchors are to be post-installed into concrete surfaces, take care to ensure that dowel holes are cut in a manner that will not interfere with the drilling operations. Move reinforcing steel, if necessary, to avoid conflict with the forms or the sub-grade.

I. All bar hooks, laps, splices and other reinforcing steel details shall be in accordance with the requirements of ACI 318.

J. Reinforcing steel hooks, laps, splices and other reinforcement details shall be in compliance with ACI 318. Details and Splicing of Concrete Reinforcement.

K. At all corners and wall intersections provide bent bars to match the horizontal lap splice; lap splices of deformed bars in tension zones shall be in accordance with ACI 315.

L. Chamfer all exposed corners and fillet all angles of the drawings.

M. Concrete blocks or plastic-coated bar chairs shall be provided for support of all slab reinforcing steel. The minimum required size is ¾". Two are required bars plus or minus 2 inches in order to avoid drilling conflicts. Locate reinforcing steel so that it will not interfere with the drilling operations. Move reinforcing steel, if necessary, to avoid conflict with the forms or the sub-grade.

N. All bar hooks, laps, splices and other reinforcing steel details shall be in accordance with the requirements of ACI 318.

O. Reinforcing steel hooks, laps, splices and other reinforcement details shall be in compliance with ACI 318. Details and Splicing of Concrete Reinforcement.

P. Concrete blocks or plastic-coated bar chairs shall be provided for support of all slab reinforcing steel. The minimum required size is ¾". Two are required bars plus or minus 2 inches in order to avoid drilling conflicts. Locate reinforcing steel so that it will not interfere with the drilling operations. Move reinforcing steel, if necessary, to avoid conflict with the forms or the sub-grade.
FOUNDATION PLAN

NOTES:
1. SEE FOOTING & FOUNDATION DETAILS ON SHEET (S-501) FOR STRUCTURAL FILL BENEATH FOOTINGS, IF REQUIRED.
2. SEE FOOTING & FOUNDATION DETAILS ON SHEET (S-502) FOR FOUNDATIONS.
3. SEE FOOTING & FOUNDATION DETAILS ON SHEET (S-502) FOR FOUNDATION WALLS.
4. SEE FOOTING DETAILS ON SHEET (S-502) FOR FOOTING WALLS.
5. SEE FOOTING DETAILS ON SHEET (S-502) FOR BASEMENT WALLS.
6. SEE FOOTING DETAILS ON SHEET (S-502) FOR CONCRETE WALLS.
7. SEE FOOTING DETAILS ON SHEET (S-502) FOR CONCRETE PIER.

MARKS & SYMBOLS

LEGEND:

MARK | DESCRIPTION
--- | ---
[ ] | FOUNDATION WALL
[ ] | CONCRETE WALL
[ ] | CONCRETE PIER
[ ] | FOOTING
[ ] | FOOTING WALL
[ ] | FOUNDATION WALL
[ ] | FOUNDATION

EXISTING FILL:

CONCRETE APRON:
SHOULD BE CONSTRUCTED ON THE OPEN SIDE OF THE STRUCTURE. WE RECOMMEND THE APRON CONSIST OF AT LEAST 6 INCHES OF CONCRETE, RUMPED AT LEAST 4 INCHES IN A MAXIMUM, 3 FT OF CONCRETE APRON.

CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE:
MUST EXTEND ONE FOOT WIDER THAN THE FOOTING ON BOTH SIDES.

FOOTINGS:
RECOMMEND THAT TYPE V CEMENT BE UTILIZED FOR FOOTINGS, SLABS, WALLS, AND APART FOR THE STRUCTURE DUE TO THE HIGH SALT CONCENTRATIONS.

STRUCTURAL FILL:
SHOULD BE UNDERLAIN BY AT LEAST 6 INCHES OF CONCRETE OVER AT LEAST 4 INCHES OF ROADBASE. COMPACTED ROADBASE SHOULD BE PLACED ON SUITABLE, UNDISTURBED, NATURAL GRAVEL SOILS.

FOUNDATIONS:
RECOMMEND A WELL-GRADED SANDY GRAVEL MATERIAL WITH NO LESS THAN 95% PASSING THE #200 SIEVE AND NO PARTICLES IN A MAXIMUM, 1/2 IN.

PLACEMENT OF THE SITE GRADING FILL FAR IN ADVANCE TO ALLOW POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL SETTLEMENTS TO OCCUR PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

BID SET:
J-U-B ENGINEERS, INC.
240 W. Center St.
Suite 200
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
Phone: 801.226.0393
www.jub.com

REVISION
DESCRIPTION

J-U-B ENGINEERS, INC.
240 W. Center St.
Suite 200
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
Phone: 801.226.0393
www.jub.com

EXERCISING THE RIGHTS OF THESE DRAWINGS, AND THE SAME MAY NOT BE REUSED WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY J-U-B. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

SALT STORAGE BUILDING
HIGHLAND CITY CORPORATION
FOOTING AND FOUNDATION PLAN

S-101
CONCRETE PIER SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIER MARK</th>
<th>PIER SIZE</th>
<th>VERTICAL REINFORCING</th>
<th>HORIZONTAL TIES</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP-1</td>
<td>WALL THICKNESS: 4&quot;</td>
<td>#4 @ 4&quot; O.C.</td>
<td>HORIZONTAL TIE AT 2'-0&quot; O.C. TOP &amp; BOTTOM OF PIER.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP-2</td>
<td>WALL THICKNESS: 4&quot;</td>
<td>#4 @ 4&quot; O.C.</td>
<td>HORIZONTAL TIE AT 2'-0&quot; O.C. TOP &amp; BOTTOM OF PIER.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCRETE PIER NOTES:
1. SEE FOUNDATION PLAN FOR PIER TYP CALLOUTS.
2. INSTALL (3) SETS OF TIES AT 2" C.C. AT TOP OF ALL PIERS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
3. SEE GENERAL STRUCTURAL NOTES FOR ALL OTHER REQUIREMENTS.

ANCHOR ROD LAYOUT

50-18-065
JTB
CJF
S-102

J-U-B SHALL RETAIN ALL COMMON LAW, STATUTORY, COPYRIGHT AND OTHER RESERVED RIGHTS OF THESE DRAWINGS, AND THE SAME SHALL NOT BE REUSED WITHOUT J-U-B'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT. ANY REUSE WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT BY J-U-B WILL BE AT CLIENT'S SOLE RISK AND WITHOUT LIABILITY OR LEGAL EXPOSURE TO J-U-B.
1. THESE NOTES SHALL BE USED FOR ALL SPLICES, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
2. TIES AND STIRRUPS SHALL NOT BE SPLICED.

### CONCRETE REINFORCING STEEL LAP SPLICE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR LOCATION</th>
<th>CONCRETE REINFORCING DEVELOPMENT &amp; SPLICE LENGTH (IN)</th>
<th>BAR SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERT. WALL BARS, NWC 4,000 psi</td>
<td>18 24 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORIZ. WALL BARS, NWC 3,000 psi</td>
<td>21 27 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOTING BOTTOM BARS, NWC 4,000 psi</td>
<td>15 20 9 15 20 9 18 24 10 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAB ON GRADE BARS, NWC 3,000 psi</td>
<td>15 20 10 17 22 10 21 27 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL STRUCTURAL NOTES

- TYPICAL VERT REINF. SEE OTHER DETAILS
- ADDITIONAL VERTICAL BAR AT INTERSECTION, TYPICAL (2) PLACES
- THICKEN FOOTING
- ADDITIONAL DIAGONAL BARS EACH FACE, EXCEPT AT FLOOR, ROOFS, AND CORNERS

### REINFORCING DETAIL FOR MISCELLANEOUS OPENINGS IN CONCRETE WALLS

- WHERE AREA ALONE VERTICALLY USE SPLICE PER GENERAL STRUCTURAL NOTES
- ADDITIONAL BARS EACH SIDE OF OPENING, BARS SHALL BE SAME SIZE AS STANDARD WALL REINFORCEMENT

---

**NOTES FOR MINIMUM COUPLER CAPACITY. WHERE MECHANICAL COUPLERS ARE USED, STAGGER**
**WCJ TYPICAL VERTICAL WALL CONSTRUCTION/CONTROL JOINT**

**NOTES:**
1. Refer to other details for all wall reinforcing requirements.
2. Refer to other details for permissible reinforcing steel lap splice lengths and locations.
3. Refer to details for permissible reinforcing steel lap splice lengths and locations.

**NOTES:**
1. Refer to foundation plans & other details for footing thickness, reinforcing requirements, slab thickness, "T" finish elevations, slope, and other requirements.
2. Refer to other details for permissible reinforcing steel lap splice lengths and locations.

---

**A1 PIPE BOLLARD DETAIL**

**SCALE:** D4 JOINT SEALANT DETAIL

**SCALE:** D3 CJ SLAB ON GRADE JOINT DETAIL

**SCALE:** B4 TYPICAL FOOTING CONSTRUCTION/CONTROL JOINT

**SCALE:** B3 WCJ TYPICAL VERTICAL WALL CONSTRUCTION/CONTROL JOINT

**SCALE:** D1 TYPICAL WALL DETAIL

**SCALE:** D3 CJ SLAB ON GRADE JOINT DETAIL

**SCALE:** D4 JOINT SEALANT DETAIL

---

**NOTES:**

1. Expansion Joint Filler, TYP. SEE (B2/S-502)
2. Exterior Finish Grade

**NOTES:**

1. Refer to Foundation plans & other details for footing thickness, reinforcing requirements, slab thickness, "T", finish elevations, slope, and other requirements.
2. Refer to other details for permissible reinforcing steel lap splice lengths and locations.

---

**NOTES:**

1. DO NOT SEAL JOINT WITH CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE, SEE PLAN
2. JOINT SEALANT SHALL BE 2 COMPONENT, NON-SAG, POLYURETHANE ELASTOMERIC SEALANT CONFORMING TO ASTM C920 AND FEDERAL SPECIFICATION TT-S-00227E
PURPOSE:
The City Council will hold a public hearing to consider a request to amend Article 3 Appeal Authority of the Highland City Development Code. The Council will take appropriate action.

BACKGROUND:
Staff has been working to update Article 3 Appeal Authority in the Development Code. The purpose of the update is to modernize the language to be consistent with State Law and be consistent with modern practice.

SUMMARY OF THE REQUEST:
1. Staff is proposing to amended Article 3 Appeal Authority to modernize the language to be consistent with State Law and modern practice.

2. The proposed amendment has been reviewed by the City Attorney.

ANALYSIS:
• The updates to the Municipal and Development Code for the Appeal Authority are needed to modernize the language to be consistent with State Law and modern practices.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:
Notice of the Planning Commission meeting was published in the Daily Herald on October 6, 2019 and posted on the state website October 3, 2019.

Notice of the City Council Public Hearing was published in the Daily Herald on October 27, 2019 and posted on the state website October 24, 2019. No written correspondence has been received.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:
The Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 22, 2019. There were no resident comments for the proposed amendment. The Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the text amendment.

RECOMMENDATION AND PROPOSED MOTIONS:
Staff recommends that the City Council accept the findings and APPROVE the proposed amendment.

I move that the City Council accept the findings and ADOPT the ordinance approving the amendment to Article 3 Appeal Authority of the Highland City Development Code.

ALTERNATIVE MOTION:
I move that the City Council DENY case TA-19-13 based on the following findings: (The Council will need to draft appropriate findings.)

FISCAL IMPACT:
This action will not have a financial impact on this year’s fiscal budget expenditures.

ATTACHMENT:
1. Proposed Ordinance
ORDINANCE NO. O-2019-xx
AN ORDINANCE OF THE HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL AMENDING HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE ARTICLE 3 APPEAL AUTHORITY AS SHOWN IN FILENAME TA-19-13.

WHEREAS, all due and proper notices of public hearings and public meetings on this Ordinance held before the Highland City Planning Commission (the “Commission”) and the Highland City Council (the “City Council”) were given in the time, form, substance and manner provided by Utah Code Section 10-9a-205; and

WHEREAS, the Commission held a public hearing on this Ordinance on October 22, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a public hearing on this Ordinance on November 12, 2019.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE Highland City Council as follows:

SECTION 1. That Article 3 Appeal Authority is hereby by amended as shown on “Exhibit A” attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

SECTION 2. That the Mayor, the City Administrator, the City Recorder and the City Attorney are hereby authorized and directed to execute all documents and take all steps necessary to carry out the purpose of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its first posting or publication.

SECTION 4. If any provision of this Ordinance is for any reason held by any court of competent jurisdiction to be unenforceable, such provision or portion hereof shall be deemed separate, distinct, and independent of all other provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Highland City Council, November 12, 2019.

HIGHLAND CITY, UTAH

ATTEST: Rodney W. Mann, Mayor
Cindy M. Quick, MMC, City Recorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCILMEMBER</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Braithwaite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Irwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Ostler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Article 3 Appeal Authority

2-301 Appeal Authority
The position of appeals hearing officer (the “Appeal Authority”) is created pursuant to authority granted by the Municipal Land Use, Development, and Management Act, UTAH CODE ANN. 10-9a-101 et seq. (the “Act”).

2-302 Appointment and Term
1. The Appeal Authority shall be appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the City Council.

2. The Appeal Authority shall serve at the pleasure of the City Council pursuant to a written agreement between the City and the Appeal Authority, which agreement’s terms shall automatically renew unless terminated for any reason by either party giving 30-day notice.

3. The Appeal Authority shall either be law trained or have significant experience with land use laws and the requirements and operations of administrative hearing processes.

4. The Appeal Authority shall be considered an independent contractor; and as such will enter into a yearlong contract for services in accordance with this ordinance. Terms for compensation and reimbursement will be determined and agreed upon in the aforementioned contract. The terms and conditions of the contract shall ultimately be approved by the City Council prior to any individual entering into an agreement with the City to serve as the Appeal Authority.

5. The Mayor may, from time to time and with the advice and consent of the City Council, appoint an Appeal Authority pro tempore on a temporary basis when necessitated by the absence, unavailability, incapacity, conflict of interest or disqualification of the regularly appointed Appeal Authority. Each Appeal Authority pro tempore shall, as a minimum, have qualifications which are similar to the regularly appointed Appeal Authority.

2-303 Powers and Duties
1. The Appeal Authority is the city’s appeal authority pursuant to section 10-9a-701 of the Act, and shall have the following powers and duties:

2. Hear and decide appeals where it is alleged that there is an error in any order, requirement, decision or determination made by a land use authority in the
enforcement or interpretation of this title or of any ordinance adopted pursuant thereto. Appeals may not be used to waive or modify the terms or requirements of this title.

3. Authorize variances from the terms of this title pursuant to the procedures and standards set forth in Utah State Code Section 10-9a-702 as amended.

2-304 Organization and Procedure

1. The Appeal Authority may adopt reasonable policies and procedures in accordance with City ordinances to govern the conduct of its meetings and hearings and for any other purposes considered necessary for the functioning of the position of Appeal Authority.

2. The Appeal Authority shall hold meetings as needed to consider matters within its purview under the City's land use ordinance. The Appeal Authority meetings shall be held as deemed necessary by the Appeal Authority. All meetings shall be properly noticed and held in accordance with the Open and Public Meetings Act set forth in Utah Code Annotated section 52-4-101 et seq.

3. The Appeal Authority shall respect the due process rights of each of the parties to an appeal or variance application and shall give all parties a reasonable opportunity to present written or oral arguments before making a decision.

4. Written minutes of all meetings of the Appeal Authority shall be prepared and filed in the Office of the City Recorder for review and access by the public in accordance with Utah State Law.

5. The decision of the Appeal Authority takes effect on the date when the Appeal Authority issues a written decision.

2-305 Variances

1. Any person or entity desiring a waiver or modification of the requirements of this title as applied to a parcel of real property that he or she owns, leases or holds some other beneficial interest may apply to the Appeal Authority for a variance from the terms of this title. The variance procedures in this section are intended to provide a narrowly circumscribed means by which relief may be granted from unforeseen particular applications of this title that create unreasonable hardships.

2. The Appeal Authority may approve, conditionally approve, or deny, upon application, such variances from the terms of this title as set forth in Utah State Code Section 10-9a-702 as amended.
3. Variance applications shall be made in the Community Development Department on an application form with required documentation and accompanied with the appropriate fees as required. After the Zoning Administrator has determined that the application is complete, a public meeting shall be scheduled with the Appeal Authority.

4. The Appeal Authority shall set a meeting on the appeal as soon as practicable after receiving and reviewing the appeal. The Zoning Administrator shall notify the applicant of the date, time, and place of the public meeting at least 3 business calendar days before the meeting and notify them of any final action on a pending application.

5. The decision of the Appeal Authority takes effect on the date when the Appeal Authority issues a written decision. The Appeal Authority shall decide all variances brought before it within a reasonable time.

2-306 Appeals

1. An applicant or any person adversely affected by the land use authority's decision administering or interpreting a land use ordinance may, within the applicable time period, appeal that administrative decision to the appeal authority by alleging that there is error in any order, requirement, decision, or determination made by the land use authority in the administration or interpretation of the land use ordinance. Planning Commission recommendations to the City Council are not subject to appeal and therefore may not be appealed to the Appeal Authority. Legislative actions are not subject to appeal.

2. An appeal shall be made in writing within ten (10) days of the administrative decision by the city land use authority and shall be filed with the Community Development Department on an application form with required documentation and accompanied with the appropriate fees as required.

3. The appeal shall specify the decision appealed, the alleged error made in connection with the decision being appealed, and the reasons the appellant claims the decision to be in error, including every theory of relief that can be presented in district court. The appellant has the burden of proving the decision appealed is incorrect. Only information and claims that were previously presented as part of the land use application, hearings, or process may be submitted.

4. An appeal filed with to the Appeal Authority shall stay all further proceedings concerning the matter about which the appealed order, requirement, decision, determination, or interpretation was made until such time a decision is rendered by the Appeal Authority.
5. Upon receipt of an appeal of an administrative decision, the Appeal Authority shall schedule and hold a public meeting in accordance with the standards and procedures set forth in this Section. Notification of the date, time and place of the hearing shall be given to the appellant, the respondent (i.e., the land use applicant) and the city at least 7 seven calendar days before the public meeting.

6. All appeals shall be heard within 180 days after the filing of the appeal. Appeals not heard within this time frame due to the appellant’s failure to expeditiously pursue its appeal will be considered void and withdrawn by the appellant.

7. The Appeal Authority shall determine the correctness of the land use authority's interpretation and application of the plain meaning of the land use regulations and interpret and apply a land use regulation to favor a land use application unless the land use regulation plainly restricts the land use application. The Appeal Authority shall uphold the decision unless it is not supported by substantial evidence in the record or it violates a law, statute, or ordinance in effect when the decision was made. Only information and claims that were previously presented as part of the land use application, hearings, or process is to be considered by the Appeal Authority. The appeals hearing officer shall render a written decision on the appeal. Such decision may reverse or affirm, wholly or in part, or may modify the administrative decision.

2-307 Appeals from Appeal Authority Decisions

The City or any person adversely aggrieved by a decision of the Appeal Authority may have and maintain a plenary action for relief therefrom in any court of competent jurisdiction, provided the petition for such relief is presented to the court within thirty (30) calendar days after the date of such decision. Only information and claims that were previously presented as part of the land use application, hearings, or process is to be considered by the Court.
The City Council will consider the adoption of a resolution indicating the intent of Highland City to adjust a common boundary with Lehi City. The Council will take appropriate action.

BACKGROUND:
Staff has been working with Lehi City for over a year on the Dry Creek Lake project. Northern Utah County Water Conservancy District owns the property with the current Dry Creek Dam and Debris Basin, which portions of said property are situated within Lehi and Highland. The District is rehabilitating the Dam to meet current engineering standards and minimum dam safety requirements. Lehi is in the process of converting the Debris Basin into a permanent water storage facility to be used with Lehi’s pressure irrigation system. They will also be adding recreational facilities to the Reservoir to be made available to the general public.

In July of 2016, Lehi City and Highland entered into a cooperative agreement regarding Dry Creek Reservoir and surrounding properties. The following is a section from that agreement regarding the common boundary between the cities.

2. City Boundaries: Lehi and Highland agree to establish the center line, starting at middle of inlet to Reservoir and continuing through middle of Reservoir to the middle of Dam of existing outlet the length of the reservoir as the common boundary between the Cities, as shown on the attached map in Exhibit B. Lehi also agrees to establish their city boundary pertaining to newly acquired property from Autumn Ridge Farm LLC deeded property to Highland, to now have newly acquired Highland property be in Highland boundaries. It is understood that each city will need to hold public hearings on the issue and prepare resolutions and documentation for recording for the common boundary to be finalized.

The proposed boundary will now follow the center of the reservoir as described.

FISCAL IMPACT:
This action will not have a fiscal impact to the City.
RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that City Council adopt the resolution to adjust a common boundary with Lehi City per the cooperative agreement.

PROPOSED MOTION:
I move that City Council adopt the resolution indicating the intent of Highland City to adjust a common boundary with Lehi City and set a date of January 14, 2019 for a public hearing on the matter.

ALTERNATIVE MOTION:
I move that City Council deny the resolution indicating the intent of Highland City to adjust a common boundary with Lehi City. (The Council should draft appropriate findings).

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Resolution
2. Highland/ Lehi Common Boundary Map
3. July 2019 Agreement
RESOLUTION NO. R-2019-XX

A RESOLUTION STATING HIGHLAND CITY’S INTENT TO ADJUST ITS COMMON BOUNDARIES WITH LEHI CITY, AUTHORIZING A PUBLIC HEARING THEREON AND PROVIDING FOR NOTICE OF SAID HEARING.

WHEREAS, Utah Code Ann. § 10-2-419 establishes a procedure for adjustment of the common boundaries between adjacent municipalities.

WHEREAS, Highland City shares certain common boundaries with Lehi City.

WHEREAS, Lehi City and Highland City each desire that certain property be transferred from one municipal jurisdiction to the other as outlined in the attached map.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Highland City that:

1. This resolution is passed indicating that the City Council desires and intends to adjust the common municipal boundaries with Lehi City in the locations set forth in Exhibit A.

2. The Highland City Recorder is directed to publish notice of the proposed municipal boundary adjustment once a week for three successive weeks in a newspaper of general circulation within the City.

3. The notice shall state the date, time and place of the public hearing which is January 14, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall.

5. The notice shall state that the City Council will adjust the boundaries unless, at or before the public hearing, written protests to the adjustment are filed by the owners of the private real property that:
   A. Is located within the area proposed for adjustment;
   B. Covers at least 25% of the private land area within the area proposed for adjustment; and
   C. Is equal in value to at least 15% of the value of all private real property within the area proposed for adjustment.

6. The area proposed for inclusion (annexation) within Lehi City will be automatically withdrawn from each local district providing fire protection, paramedic and emergency services.

7. The area proposed for inclusion (annexation) within Highland City will be automatically withdrawn from each local district providing fire protection, paramedic and emergency services.

8. The first publication of the notice shall be within 14 days of the City Council’s adoption of this resolution.

9. The provisions of this Resolution shall take effect upon its passage and publication as required by law.

ADOPTED by the City Council of Highland City, Utah this 12th day of November, 2019.
HIGHLAND CITY, UTAH

Rodney W. Mann
Mayor

ATTEST:

Cindy M. Quick, CMC, MMC
City Recorder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCILMEMBER</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Braithwaite</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Dennis</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Irwin</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Ostler</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott L. Smith</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

I, TRAVIS TRANE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAT IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, INFORMATION AND IN MY PROFESSIONAL OPINION.

LEGEND

PROPOSED LEHI/HIGHLAND BOUNDARY
EXISTING LEHI CITY BOUNDARY
BOUNDARY

NARRATIVE

FROM THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 1, EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN;

RESURVEY PLAT FOUND IN THE COUNTY SURVEYOR'S OFFICE.

ACCEPTANCE BY COUNTY SURVEYOR

This plat has been reviewed by the County Surveyor and is hereby certified as true and correct.

LEHI CITY MAYOR

APPROVED THIS __ Day of __, 2019

HIGHLAND CITY MAYOR

APPROVED THIS __ Day of __, 2019

BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT LEHI / HIGHLAND

DRY CREEK LAKE BOUNDARY LINE
ADJUSTMENT LEHI / HIGHLAND
LOCATED IN SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 1, EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN.

SCALE: 1" = 240'
COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN LEHI CITY AND HIGHLAND CITY REGARDING DRY CREEK RESERVOIR AND SURROUNDING PROPERTIES

THIS COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT is made this ___ day of ____________________, 2019 between Lehi City (hereinafter “Lehi”), a municipal corporation of the State of Utah, and Highland City (hereinafter “Highland”), also a municipal corporation of the State of Utah, referred to singly as “each City” or together as “the Cities.”

Recitals

WHEREAS, Northern Utah County Water Conservancy District (District) is the owner of the Dry Creek Dam (hereinafter “Dam”) and Debris Basin, a portion of which is situated in or abuts Lehi and Highland, and the District is rehabilitating the Dam to meet current engineering standards and minimum dam safety requirements; and

WHEREAS, Lehi desires to convert the Debris Basin into a permanent water storage facility (Reservoir) to be used with Lehi’s secondary water system and to add recreational facilities to the Reservoir to be made available to the general public (the Project), and has entered into a Cooperative Agreement with District to accomplish the same; and

WHEREAS, Highland owns property southwest of the Dam as shown in the attached Exhibit A that needs parking and access to 1200 East; and

WHEREAS, Lehi needs to build a 42-inch irrigation pipeline from the Reservoir along the north side of Dry Creek to 1200 East Street to serve its secondary water system; and

WHEREAS, Lehi and Highland desire a trail along Dry Creek connecting 1200 East to the Murdock Canal Trail; and

WHEREAS, Lehi needs to improve 1200 East to meet current standards and better serve the public; and

WHEREAS, Autumn Ridge Farm LLC owns property along 1200 East needed for Lehi to make the 1200 East Street improvements; and

WHEREAS, the Cities desire to address their responsibilities and understandings regarding the Project, pipeline, trail, access, 1200 East Street, and the Cities’ mutual boundary through the reservoir;

NOW, THEREFORE, subject to the recitals, terms, and conditions of this Agreement, the Parties agree as follows.

1. **Reservoir Operation and Maintenance:** Lehi shall be responsible for operating, maintaining the reservoir and the trail and dry ground around the Dry Creek Reservoir to
the wood fence on the east side, but not including the wood fence, which will be maintained by property owner. If signage is provided wherein the Districts and Utah Department of Natural Resources name appears, Lehi is not opposed to the District including Highland City name on the sign. If at any time a park entrance or usage fee is instituted, Highland residents will be treated the same as Lehi resident pertaining to entrance or usage fee for use of the Reservoir or Project area.

2. **City Boundaries**: Lehi and Highland agree to establish the center line, starting at middle of inlet to Reservoir and continuing through middle of Reservoir to the middle of Dam of existing outlet the length of the reservoir as the common boundary between the Cities, as shown on the attached map in Exhibit B. Lehi also agrees to establish their city boundary pertaining to newly acquired property from Autumn Ridge Farm LLC deeded property to Highland, to now have newly acquired Highland property be in Highland boundaries. It is understood that each City will need to hold public hearings on the issue and prepare resolutions and documentation for recording for the common boundary to be finalized.

3. **Deeding of Property**: In exchange for Lehi obtaining a warranty deed from Autumn Ridge Farm LLC in favor of Highland City for 1.46 acres for possible future use as a parking area for a Highland City park, Highland will deed 3.127 acres to Autumn Ridge Farm LLC.

4. **Easement for Pipeline, Trail, and Access Road**: Highland agrees to execute a 30-foot permanent non-exclusive easement (hereafter “Easement”) and an adjacent 20-foot temporary construction easement in favor of Lehi with 20-foot temporary easement expiring December 31, 2021. Lehi agrees to execute a permanent non-exclusive easement in favor of Highland over Utah County parcel 41:672:0326(see Exhibit #A) Lehi will construct a 42-inch irrigation pipeline (hereafter “Pipe”) from the Dam to 1200 East Street. The Pipe and 10-foot asphalt trail (Hereafter “10-foot Trail”) will be built and paid for by Lehi. 10-foot Trail will be designed as to not hinder Highland building a 28-foot road, possible future parking area, road, utilities or other park amenities needed by Highland from 1200 East Street. Lehi will submit construction drawing as to placement of Pipe, Easement and 10-foot Trail to Highland engineer for review, with Highland signing in agreement of placement. Highland agrees to maintain 10-foot Trail after it is built by Lehi. Lehi agrees to build 10-foot Public Trail on top of Pipe within Easement, with 10-foot Trail being installed by December 31, 2021, with Highland thereafter owning the 10-Foot Trail. Lehi will limit its removal of Highland trees when constructing and installing Pipe and 10-foot Trail. Lehi is not opposed to granting Highland a road curb cut off of the paved road, from Reservoir access road going up to 3200 North, allowing Highland to access the south side of the Dam area, by the Murdock trail. Highland understands that it needs to be granted access over District property, wherein Highland will do with separate agreement with District.

5. **Cash Payment**: Lehi agrees to pay Highland four hundred thousand dollars ($400,000.00) at closing.
6. **Closing:** All documents and money shall be held at a mutually agreed upon title company until such time as all the property transfers are complete and satisfied. Upon closing, the deeds and property transfers shall be recorded at the county recorder’s office.

7. **Interlocal Act Provisions:** The Cities agree that this Agreement does not create an interlocal entity.

8. **Responsibility and Indemnification:** Lehi shall be responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of the features it installs at the Reservoir, including the trail surrounding the Reservoir, and Pipe, from Dam to 1200 East Street. Lehi shall indemnify and hold Highland harmless from any and all claims arising from Lehi’s negligent, reckless, or intentional conduct.

9. **Emergency Response:** Even though the municipal boundary between the communities will be in the center of the reservoir, Lehi City shall be primarily responsible for providing emergency response services up to the wood fence on the east side of the reservoir.

10. **Binding Agreement:** This Agreement shall be binding upon the parties and may not be assigned without prior written approval of the other party.

11. **Captions:** The headings used in this Agreement are inserted for reference purposes only and shall not be deemed to define, limit, extend, describe, or affect in any way the meaning, scope, or interpretation of any of the terms or provisions of this Agreement or the intent hereof.

12. **Counterparts:** This Agreement may be signed in any number of counterparts with the same effect as if the signatures upon any counterpart were upon the same instrument. All signed counterparts shall be deemed to be one original.

13. **Severability:** The provisions of this Agreement are severable, and should any provision hereof be void, voidable, unenforceable, or invalid, such void, voidable, unenforceable, or invalid provision shall not affect the other provisions of this Agreement.

14. **Waiver or Breach:** Any waiver by any Party of any breach of any kind or character whatsoever by the other, whether such be directed or implied, shall not be construed as a continuing waiver of, or consent to, any subsequent breach of this Agreement.

15. **Amendment:** This Agreement may not be modified except by an instrument in writing signed by the Parties.

16. **Interpretation and Enforcement:** The laws of Utah shall govern interpretation of this Agreement. If any term of this Agreement is deemed unenforceable, the remainder of the Agreement shall stay in full force and effect. Whether or not suit is filed, if services of an attorney are required by any party to secure performance under this Agreement, the non-defaulting Party shall be entitled to reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.
17. **Notice:** Any notice or other communication required or permitted to be given hereunder shall be deemed to have been received:

   a. Upon personal delivery or actual receipt thereof; or
   b. Within three (3) days after such notice is deposited in the United States mail, certified mail postage prepaid and addressed to the Parties at their respective addresses.

18. **Exhibits and Recitals:** The Recitals set forth above and all exhibits to this Agreement are incorporated herein to the same extent as if such items were set forth herein in their entirety within the body of the Agreement.

19. **Agreement:** This Agreement contains the entire agreement between the Parties and no statements, promises, or inducements made by any Party that are not contained in this written agreement shall be binding or valid.

20. **Performance:** Each Party agrees to undertake and perform all further acts that are reasonably necessary to carry out the intent and purposes of this Agreement at the request of the other Parties.

21. **Compliance:** The failure of any Party to insist upon strict compliance of any of the terms and conditions, or failure or delay by either party to exercise any rights or remedies provided in this Agreement, or by law, will not release another Party from any obligations arising under this Agreement.

22. **No Joint Venture:** This Agreement does not create any type of agency relationship, joint venture, or partnership between the Parties.

23. **Authority:** Each Party represents that it has the authority to enter into this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have caused these presents to be executed by their duly authorized officers as of the day and year first above written.

**LEHI CITY**

Attest:

Title: City Recorder  
Date: _____________________

Title: Mayor  
Date: _____________________
Cooperative Agreement Between Lehi City and Highland City

HIGHLAND CITY

Attest:

__________________________________   ___________________________________
Title: City Recorder     Title: Mayor
Date: _____________________    Date: ______________________

APPROVED AS TO FORM

____________________________________  _________________________________
Ryan Wood, Lehi City Attorney   Highland City Attorney
Highland City deeds
additional ±1.667 Acres to
Autumn Ridge Farm LLC

Temporary Construction Easement
30' wide permanent waterline easement.

10' wide multi-use trail (paved).

18' wide Highland Park access (paved).

Highland Quit
Claim of any
potential gap
in property

Autumn Ridge Farm LLC deeds property to Highland City
(Proposed Highland Park parking area)

End of Highland Park
access road pavement

Highland City deeds property
to Autumn Ridge Farm LLC

Exhibit A
The results of the Highland City Market Analysis will be presented to the Council for information and discussion.

The Highland City Market Analysis was prepared to assist the City with the evaluation of current economic trends within the City and determine supportable commercial development. The analysis is organized based on a demographic overview, analysis of taxable sales, analysis of market conditions, identifying barriers to entry and formulating a SWOT summary.

As part of the study, the Funding Analysis from the Comprehensive Financial Sustainability Plan completed in early 2019, related to the General Fund was updated to reflect the increased expenditures and revenue related to Lone Peak Public Safety and the removal of any Capital or Operational and Maintenance expenditures already completed or implemented.

Fred Philpot from LYR&B will present the results of the study and answer questions.
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SECTION 1: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This analysis is designed to assist Highland City (City) with the evaluation of current economic trends within the City and determine supportable commercial development. The analysis is organized based on a demographic overview, analysis of taxable sales, analysis of market conditions, identifying barriers to entry and formulating a SWOT summary. The following summarizes the major findings of this analysis.

HIGHLAND DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

The City has favorable demographic statistics. The median adjusted gross income (MAGI) in Highland is much higher than Utah County or the State of Utah average. A comparison of 2017 data illustrates that Highland is higher than most all other cities in the State of Utah. In addition, approximately 68 percent of Highland’s population has an associate degree or higher, compared to Utah County with 50 percent and the State of Utah at 42 percent.

SALES TAX ANALYSIS

Despite historic growth in taxable sales, Highland’s taxable sales per capita is one of the lowest in the benchmark comparison, ranking 16 out of the 17 communities. Existing taxable sales within the City are concentrated in the Town Center area. Highland’s greatest retail strength is the Food & Beverage category, accounting for 15 percent of total taxable sales. Services represent 25 percent of the City’s total taxable sales. Food services and drinking places represent the largest spending category in this group. Similar to services, a quarter of Highland’s taxable sales are industry related. Most of the taxable sales in this group are related to telecommunications sales which represents the largest spending category. Taxable sales data illustrates that the existing market is focused on neighborhood scale retail and personal services.

A leakage analysis illustrates the City is leaking in all major categories relative to the State of Utah average spending. The per capita spending in Highland is approximately $5,230, compared to the State average of $28,182. The total taxable sales leaking to other communities is estimated at $435M. Assuming a sales tax levy of 0.5 percent based on point of sale, this equates to a loss of $2.1M in tax revenues.

MARKET CONDITIONS

The lack of commercial concentration is further illustrated when evaluating the distribution of land uses in the City. Current parcel data illustrates a concentration of residential development, with almost 90 percent of the market value and 87 percent of the taxable value associated with single family residential property types.

Future commercial expansion will be limited by existing competitive market sites. There are several competitive market sites surrounding Highland City, including neighborhood scale retail just west of the City’s boundaries, within Cedar Hills along 4800 West, and in the adjacent communities of American Fork and Lehi. Alpine also completed an analysis for neighborhood scale retail along Highway 74 (5300 West). This site includes nearly 30 acres of property intended for general neighborhood scale retail. Specifically, the market analysis completed by Alpine City calls for a neighborhood center anchored by a 45,000 square foot grocer. However, the future commercial site is not currently in a Community Reinvestment Area (CRA) and indications from the City suggest there may not be community support or demand for this site to develop commercially.

A two-mile buffer of the competitive market sites illustrates limited growth potential within the northeast portion of Utah County. Future commercial growth will continue to follow rooftops which are shifting concentration toward the west. The City’s population is projected to continue to increase through 2050, reaching 24,250 persons. However, the population in Utah County will shift from a concentration on the east side of the valley to the west, with Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs experiencing substantial growth.

SUPPORTABLE COMMERCIAL ANALYSIS

To determine the supportable commercial zoning within Highland, this analysis evaluates future taxable sales growth, per capita spending by sector, and general commercial zoning
ratios from other communities. Using two different methodologies, this analysis provides an estimate of supportable acreage by the following categories: general retail, industry, services, and total commercial acreage.

The first methodology employed in this analysis utilizes an estimated per capita spending of $5,230 in Highland. Assuming a new population of 4,418 residents within the City, the total supportable retail commercial zoning is estimated at approximately 13 acres. This assumes a median sales volume of $200 per square foot of gross leasable area (GLA) and a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.2.

Employing an alternative methodology produces higher supportable acreage. A comparison of zoned commercial land per capita for other communities produces an average 0.026 acres per capita, with a high of 0.071 in Lindon and a low of 0.003 in Alpine. As discussed in Section 3, many of these communities have a much higher sales capture rate, resulting in higher commercial acreages. Using Highland’s current total per capita of commercial and industrial acreage, excluding the Alpine Country Club, which is approximately 150 acres, results in a total of approximately 10 acres of new supportable commercial property, similar to the analysis utilized in the first methodology.

**FUTURE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

It is likely that commercial growth will develop around existing neighborhood scale retail, which provides personal services, food services, gas and lodging and general retail purchases. It is expected that the area will continue to see development in small scale office development as well. With a population of less than 20,000 residents and competition from neighboring communities, expansion will be limited.

Potential commercial expansion zones have been identified in Figure 4.6. Approximately 160 acres have been identified as potential commercial areas, which may exceed what is supportable. While these areas provide opportunities for the consideration of commercial expansion, the City should evaluate the cost/benefit of proposed commercial developments.
SECTION 2: DEMOGRAPHICS

In recent years, the State of Utah has experienced robust growth in both population and employment opportunities. As of April 2017, the State unemployment rate was measured at 3.1 percent, compared with the national average of 4.4 percent. Population and employment characteristics are helpful indicators of overall economic health. As economies expand, typically population increases and unemployment rates decline, which is true of both the Utah and national economy. Comparing population and employment trends is helpful in understanding the local economy.

Economic markets are heavily influenced by demographics, socioeconomics (income levels), education, availability of land, industry, infrastructure investment, and the existing workforce. This section focuses on many of these measurements to understand the current market characteristics that are causing the underlying economy to thrive or decline.

HISTORIC POPULATION

Highland City has experienced an increase in population, surpassing the State and the County based on an annual percentage increase. While the City has experienced a higher growth rate, the population increase in terms of actual people is relatively small compared to the County. The City has grown by approximately 3,315 persons, or an average annual growth of 2.78 percent, from 2010 to 2017. The table below shows a comparison of similarly sized and neighboring communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>9,617</td>
<td>9,747</td>
<td>9,849</td>
<td>10,016</td>
<td>10,114</td>
<td>10,191</td>
<td>10,319</td>
<td>10,371</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fork</td>
<td>26,662</td>
<td>27,082</td>
<td>27,384</td>
<td>27,827</td>
<td>28,182</td>
<td>28,250</td>
<td>28,707</td>
<td>29,527</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Fort Town</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hills</td>
<td>9,852</td>
<td>9,951</td>
<td>10,058</td>
<td>10,188</td>
<td>10,269</td>
<td>10,325</td>
<td>10,344</td>
<td>10,344</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Mountain</td>
<td>22,220</td>
<td>23,169</td>
<td>23,657</td>
<td>24,631</td>
<td>25,977</td>
<td>27,098</td>
<td>28,949</td>
<td>32,204</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Ridge</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>2,998</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>3,757</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield (Town)</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa (Town)</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>15,642</td>
<td>16,057</td>
<td>16,439</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>17,431</td>
<td>17,852</td>
<td>18,510</td>
<td>18,957</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>48,156</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>51,343</td>
<td>54,153</td>
<td>56,023</td>
<td>58,095</td>
<td>60,743</td>
<td>62,712</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindon</td>
<td>10,096</td>
<td>10,241</td>
<td>10,389</td>
<td>10,524</td>
<td>10,645</td>
<td>10,748</td>
<td>10,879</td>
<td>10,968</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapleton</td>
<td>8,089</td>
<td>8,294</td>
<td>8,484</td>
<td>8,775</td>
<td>9,044</td>
<td>9,186</td>
<td>9,474</td>
<td>9,773</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>88,720</td>
<td>89,634</td>
<td>90,602</td>
<td>91,555</td>
<td>91,580</td>
<td>94,012</td>
<td>97,111</td>
<td>97,839</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson</td>
<td>20,630</td>
<td>18,956</td>
<td>19,164</td>
<td>19,391</td>
<td>19,540</td>
<td>19,551</td>
<td>19,818</td>
<td>19,892</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
<td>13,729</td>
<td>14,140</td>
<td>14,493</td>
<td>14,957</td>
<td>36,966</td>
<td>37,855</td>
<td>38,586</td>
<td>38,845</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>112,917</td>
<td>115,218</td>
<td>115,574</td>
<td>116,395</td>
<td>116,639</td>
<td>114,862</td>
<td>116,822</td>
<td>117,335</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>6,464</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>6,754</td>
<td>6,922</td>
<td>7,217</td>
<td>7,436</td>
<td>7,799</td>
<td>8,210</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>18,048</td>
<td>19,035</td>
<td>21,066</td>
<td>22,627</td>
<td>24,209</td>
<td>25,184</td>
<td>26,661</td>
<td>29,608</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
<td>35,170</td>
<td>35,895</td>
<td>36,340</td>
<td>37,022</td>
<td>37,549</td>
<td>37,968</td>
<td>38,778</td>
<td>39,443</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
---
Springville 29,811 30,400 30,746 31,351 31,566 32,343 33,054 33,294 1.59%
Vineyard Town 113 149 203 432 652 3,356 4,164 6,210 77.24%
Woodland Hills 1,369 1,394 1,416 1,440 1,458 1,472 1,512 1,548 1.77%

Source: U.S. Census Population Estimates

**Figure 2.1: Highland City Population**

**Population Statistics 2010-2017**

**Highland**
- Average Annual Growth = 2.90%
- Total Increase = 3,315
- % of County Increase = 2.8%

**Utah County**
- Average Annual Growth = 2.32%
- Total Increase = 89,861
- % of State Increase = 26.6%

**State of Utah**
- Average Annual Growth = 1.66%
- Total Increase = 337,948
AGE
The City’s demographics relative to age have shifted from 2010 to 2017. 2010 data illustrates a younger population, with a concentration in the zero to 19 years of age and 35 to 44. In 2017, the concentration has shifted to the age brackets of 10-19 and 35 to 49. Noticeable shifts also occurred in the age range of 60 to 74, with 2017 data showing a higher percent of total in this range. However, a comparison of the median age illustrates the City is still slightly younger than the County on average. As the population ages and educational attainment increases, the City may experience an increase in income levels and buying power.

HOUSEHOLDS
The total number of households in Highland as of the 2017 American Community Survey is 4,320. Of the total housing units, 97.4 percent are occupied with 2.6 percent unoccupied. Utah County has approximately 95.3 percent housing occupancy rate, compared to the State at 89.7 percent.

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS AND NEW COMMERCIAL VALUATION
The Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute tracks building permit activity across the State and maintains the Ivory-Boyer Construction Database. Highland showed a rebound from recessionary conditions, with permit activity steadily increasing through 2017. However, 2018 showed a decrease in residential building permit activity by 51 percent. In contrast, new non-residential value added to the City increased from 2017 to 2018 by 28 percent.
Historic building activity illustrates the potential recessionary cycle that may affect Utah and the nation within the next few years. From 1998 to 2007, Highland experienced robust development, primarily in residential rooftops with small-scale commercial development. In 2008 and 2009, the City experienced a dramatic decrease in development, followed by a rebound in 2010 that has lasted through 2017.
INCOME
Utah median adjusted gross income (MAGI) represents an individual's total gross income minus specific tax deductions. MAGI in Highland is much higher than the County or State average. A comparison of 2017 data illustrates that Highland is higher than most all other cities in the State.
EDUCATION
According to the US Census 2017 ACS 2013-2017 five-year estimates, approximately 68 percent of Highland’s population has an associate degree or higher, compared to Utah County with 50 percent and the State of Utah at 42 percent.

EMPLOYMENT
As of April 2017, the unemployment rate in Utah County was 2.9 percent as shown in Figure 2.8. This is much lower than the national average unemployment rate of 4.4 percent. The State of Utah’s unemployment rate is far more favorable at 3.1 percent.
SECTION 3: ANALYSIS OF TAXABLE SALES

Taxable sales within Highland provide an important metric to assess the general economic health of the City. A sales gap (or “leakage”) analysis is used to identify economic development opportunities for a community by evaluating the total purchases made by residents inside and outside the community (hence, the term “leakage” for sales lost outside the community). This type of analysis first identifies sales within the State of Utah for each major NAICS code category and then calculates the average sales per capita in each NAICS category. Per capita sales in the City are compared to average per capita sales statewide in order to estimate what portion of resident purchases are being made within City boundaries, and what amount is leaving the City. The resident purchases being made outside of the City represent an opportunity to recapture some of these lost sales. The analysis divides taxable sales into three major categories: retail sales, industry sales and sales related to services.

HISTORIC TAXABLE SALES

Total taxable sales increased by an average of 6.7 percent from 2012 through 2017. A comparison of tax data for similarly sized cities (relative to population) shows a positive trend in taxable sales growth for all communities (see Table 3.2). Several communities have experienced double digit increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: Historic Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ogden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ogden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Salt Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Mountain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Population Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2: Historic Taxable Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ogden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the growth in taxable sales, Highland’s taxable sales per capita is one of the lowest in the benchmark comparison, ranking 16 out of the 17 communities. Highland taxable sales by location are illustrated in Figure 3.1.

**Table 3.3: Historic Taxable Sales per Capita**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hills</td>
<td>$4,837</td>
<td>$5,042</td>
<td>$5,483</td>
<td>$5,935</td>
<td>$6,085</td>
<td>$6,346</td>
<td>$6,318</td>
<td>$6,665</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>$2,589</td>
<td>$2,754</td>
<td>$2,730</td>
<td>$2,931</td>
<td>$3,094</td>
<td>$3,410</td>
<td>$4,297</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindon</td>
<td>$33,777</td>
<td>$38,129</td>
<td>$39,948</td>
<td>$44,145</td>
<td>$45,956</td>
<td>$50,436</td>
<td>$50,010</td>
<td>$57,401</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ogden</td>
<td>$14,517</td>
<td>$15,266</td>
<td>$16,582</td>
<td>$18,221</td>
<td>$19,525</td>
<td>$20,733</td>
<td>$21,584</td>
<td>$22,636</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>$11,595</td>
<td>$11,694</td>
<td>$12,908</td>
<td>$14,526</td>
<td>$14,507</td>
<td>$15,420</td>
<td>$16,562</td>
<td>$18,052</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>$4,012</td>
<td>$4,176</td>
<td>$4,421</td>
<td>$4,508</td>
<td>$4,728</td>
<td>$4,969</td>
<td>$4,969</td>
<td>$5,290</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham City</td>
<td>$10,641</td>
<td>$10,332</td>
<td>$10,880</td>
<td>$10,799</td>
<td>$11,785</td>
<td>$12,746</td>
<td>$14,541</td>
<td>$15,839</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ogden</td>
<td>$5,111</td>
<td>$5,207</td>
<td>$5,473</td>
<td>$5,856</td>
<td>$6,693</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$8,159</td>
<td>$8,616</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson</td>
<td>$10,448</td>
<td>$10,957</td>
<td>$11,386</td>
<td>$11,249</td>
<td>$11,655</td>
<td>$12,376</td>
<td>$12,854</td>
<td>$13,557</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Salt Lake</td>
<td>$14,559</td>
<td>$15,310</td>
<td>$17,027</td>
<td>$18,521</td>
<td>$19,189</td>
<td>$19,273</td>
<td>$18,453</td>
<td>$21,773</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>$9,274</td>
<td>$9,343</td>
<td>$9,887</td>
<td>$10,314</td>
<td>$10,751</td>
<td>$10,995</td>
<td>$11,195</td>
<td>$11,336</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>$6,435</td>
<td>$8,311</td>
<td>$9,496</td>
<td>$11,107</td>
<td>$13,590</td>
<td>$15,631</td>
<td>$18,209</td>
<td>$19,789</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>$6,762</td>
<td>$7,457</td>
<td>$7,299</td>
<td>$7,481</td>
<td>$7,272</td>
<td>$7,644</td>
<td>$8,187</td>
<td>$8,811</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Mountain</td>
<td>$1,490</td>
<td>$1,595</td>
<td>$1,735</td>
<td>$1,818</td>
<td>$2,308</td>
<td>$2,658</td>
<td>$2,980</td>
<td>$3,738</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah County</td>
<td>$11,125</td>
<td>$11,800</td>
<td>$12,757</td>
<td>$13,028</td>
<td>$13,469</td>
<td>$14,224</td>
<td>$14,698</td>
<td>$15,759</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah</td>
<td>$14,913</td>
<td>$15,663</td>
<td>$16,653</td>
<td>$17,036</td>
<td>$17,596</td>
<td>$18,069</td>
<td>$18,560</td>
<td>$19,676</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State Tax Commission - Calendar Year Taxable Sales
Figure 3.1: Illustration of 2017 Highland Taxable Sale by Location
**Retail Taxable Sales**

Existing taxable sales within the City are concentrated in the Town Center area. Highland's greatest retail strength is the Food & Beverage category, accounting for 15 percent of total taxable sales, followed by sales at Non-Store Retailers, Wholesale Trade-Durable Goods, Miscellaneous Retail Trade.

**Table 3.4: Retail Spending by Percent of Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Material &amp; Garden Equip</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Accessories</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Appliance</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Home Furnishing</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Station</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Personal</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Retail Trade</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Store Retailers</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Good</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade-Durable Goods</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade-Electronic Markets</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade-Nondurable Goods</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services Taxable Sales**

Services represent 25 percent of the City’s total taxable sales. Food services and drinking places represent the largest spending category in this group. Industries in the Food Services and Drinking Places subsector are varied. Some provide food and drink only, while others provide various combinations of seating space, waiter/waitress services, and incidental amenities, such as limited entertainment.

**Table 3.5: Services Spending by Percent of Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support, Waste Management &amp; Remediation Services</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, And Recreation</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies &amp; Enterprises</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services, Except Public Administration</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, &amp; Technical Services</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate, Rental, &amp; Leasing</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Industry Taxable Sales**

Nearly a quarter of the Highland’s taxable sales are industry related. Each of the industry taxable sales categories, excluding construction, have a negative AAGR. Information sales represent the largest spending category. Information includes publishing, motion picture and sound recording, telecommunications, and data processing firms. Most of the taxable sales in Highland are related to telecommunications.

**Table 3.6: Industry Taxable Sale as Percent of Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing &amp; Hunting</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, &amp; Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Warehousing</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SALE LEAKAGE ANALYSIS

The table below provides a general overview of leakage and retention by major category. Negative numbers estimate the approximate leakage of taxable sales from Highland City to other communities. When leakage is occurring, the capture rate is below 100 percent, indicating the City is not collecting the average sales expected based on a per capita basis relative to the State average. While not present for Highland, positive numbers indicate that Highland City is attracting more than the State average relative to that category, suggesting shoppers from outside the City are attracted to the area for certain types of purchases or that there is a high concentration of this type of spending. This is reflected in the capture rate as a number above 100 percent.

Table 3.7: Retail Sales Leakage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Highland Direct Taxable Sales</th>
<th>Per Capita Spending</th>
<th>Utah Income Adjusted Per Capita Spending</th>
<th>Capture Rate</th>
<th>Per Capita Sale Leakage</th>
<th>Total Leakage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Material &amp; Garden Equip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Accessories</td>
<td>$1,406,208</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$862</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>($788)</td>
<td>($14,933,359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Appliance</td>
<td>$1,692,204</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>($401)</td>
<td>($7,605,423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>$14,876,198</td>
<td>$785</td>
<td>$2,182</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>($1,398)</td>
<td>($26,495,194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Home Furnishing</td>
<td>$749,440</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$486</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>($447)</td>
<td>($8,464,768)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise</td>
<td>$1,660,311</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>$3,162</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>($3,074)</td>
<td>($58,276,812)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Personal</td>
<td>$1,369,318</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$267</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>($194)</td>
<td>($3,683,737)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Retail Trade</td>
<td>$3,098,507</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$781</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>($618)</td>
<td>($11,711,115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle</td>
<td>$992,154</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$2,239</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>($3,106)</td>
<td>($60,406,270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstore Retailers</td>
<td>$6,815,194</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$666</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>($306)</td>
<td>($5,802,909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Good</td>
<td>$1,032,280</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$503</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>($449)</td>
<td>($8,512,047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade-Durable Goods</td>
<td>$3,115,078</td>
<td>$164</td>
<td>$1,916</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>($1,752)</td>
<td>($33,212,425)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade-Electronic Markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade-Nondurable Goods</td>
<td>$259,581</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$352</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>($338)</td>
<td>($6,412,734)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services &amp; Drinking Places</td>
<td>$12,507,152</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$2,285</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>($1,626)</td>
<td>($30,817,467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services-Except Public Administration</td>
<td>$2,286,187</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td>$763</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>($642)</td>
<td>($12,176,948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail</td>
<td>$57,189,777</td>
<td>$3,017</td>
<td>$21,446</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>($18,429)</td>
<td>($349,367,787)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Highland Direct Taxable Sales</th>
<th>Per Capita Spending</th>
<th>Utah Income Adjusted Per Capita Spending</th>
<th>Capture Rate</th>
<th>Per Capita Sale Leakage</th>
<th>Total Leakage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing &amp; Hunting</td>
<td>$3,236,367</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$433</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>($263)</td>
<td>($4,978,635)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$6,616,083</td>
<td>$349</td>
<td>$1,061</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>($712)</td>
<td>($13,497,766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$883,876</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$1,164</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>($1,118)</td>
<td>($21,187,181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, &amp; Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Warehousing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Total</td>
<td>$22,942,524</td>
<td>$1,210</td>
<td>$4,066</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>($2,855)</td>
<td>($54,129,689)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City is leaking in all major categories relative to State average spending. The per capita spending in Highland is approximately $5,230, compared to the State average of $28,182. The total taxable sales leaking to other communities is estimated at $435M. Assuming a sales tax levy of 0.5 percent based on point of sale, this equates to a loss of $2.1M in tax revenues.

A comparison of communities of similar size and those slightly smaller than Highland shows capture rates that are more positive. South Ogden, Centerville and Hurricane all have capture rates above 100 percent. Factors that will influence a community’s capture rate include total population, proximity to major freeways or roadway, population within a 360-degree trade area, geographic isolation and competitive market sites. These factors will be explored further in the market analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.8: Taxable Sales Capture Rates Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Capita Leakage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Income Adjusted
SECTION 4: MARKET ANALYSIS

EXISTING MARKET CONDITIONS
The following section will address existing market conditions within the City including property taxation, land uses and zoning, historic average annual daily trips on major City roadways, an illustration of competitive market sites, projected growth within Highland, supportable commercial zoning and potential barriers to future economic growth.

PROPERTY TAX COMPARISON
Utah’s municipal tax rate setting process is designed to achieve budget neutrality. An entity’s prior year budgeted revenue serves as the baseline for current year certified tax rate calculations. According to the Utah State Tax Commission:

The county assessor and State Tax Commission provide valuation information to the county auditor, including changes in value resulting from reappraisal, new growth, factoring and legislative adjustments. The State Tax Commission and the county auditor calculate certified tax rates and the county auditor provides taxing entities with valuation and certified tax rate information. The certified tax rate provides a taxing entity with the same amount of property tax revenue it received in the previous tax year plus any revenue generated by additional growth in its taxable value. When this information is received, taxing entities compute and adopt proposed tax rates. If an entity is proposing a property tax revenue increase, it may only adopt a tentative or proposed tax rate. The exact requirements to increase property tax revenue vary depending on whether the entity is a calendar year or a fiscal year entity. These procedures are discussed in more detail in Standard 10.9 “Truth in Taxation”.

In order to adopt a tax rate that exceeds the Certified Tax Rate, an entity must go through what is known as the “Truth-in-Taxation” process. Truth-in-Taxation statutes require that entities proposing a tax increase must advertise the increase and hold a public hearing. The Certified Tax Rate or the proposed rate, if adopted, is applied to all taxable value within the boundaries of the taxing entity. For a historic overview of Utah’s property tax system see: https://propertytax.utah.gov/media/historic-overview.pdf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>10,371</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.001179</td>
<td>0.001305</td>
<td>0.001388</td>
<td>0.001478</td>
<td>0.001611</td>
<td>0.001773</td>
<td>0.001916</td>
<td>0.001870</td>
<td>0.001226</td>
<td>0.001121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fork</td>
<td>29,527</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.002077</td>
<td>0.002082</td>
<td>0.002261</td>
<td>0.002362</td>
<td>0.002540</td>
<td>0.002750</td>
<td>0.002812</td>
<td>0.002794</td>
<td>0.002630</td>
<td>0.002423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Fort Town</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.000617</td>
<td>0.000924</td>
<td>0.001037</td>
<td>0.001099</td>
<td>0.001163</td>
<td>0.001279</td>
<td>0.001268</td>
<td>0.001244</td>
<td>0.001131</td>
<td>0.001280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hills</td>
<td>10,334</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.001923</td>
<td>0.002024</td>
<td>0.002186</td>
<td>0.002315</td>
<td>0.002410</td>
<td>0.002873</td>
<td>0.003183</td>
<td>0.003153</td>
<td>0.002994</td>
<td>0.002768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Mountain</td>
<td>32,204</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.000924</td>
<td>0.001101</td>
<td>0.001081</td>
<td>0.001118</td>
<td>0.001192</td>
<td>0.001130</td>
<td>0.001668</td>
<td>0.001636</td>
<td>0.001510</td>
<td>0.001400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Ridge</td>
<td>3,757</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.001841</td>
<td>0.001949</td>
<td>0.002180</td>
<td>0.002356</td>
<td>0.002360</td>
<td>0.002526</td>
<td>0.002715</td>
<td>0.002621</td>
<td>0.002494</td>
<td>0.002343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield (Town)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.000976</td>
<td>0.001043</td>
<td>0.001012</td>
<td>0.000918</td>
<td>0.000801</td>
<td>0.001634</td>
<td>0.001665</td>
<td>0.001808</td>
<td>0.001921</td>
<td>0.001895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa (Town)</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.001045</td>
<td>0.001045</td>
<td>0.000902</td>
<td>0.000949</td>
<td>0.000972</td>
<td>0.001045</td>
<td>0.001024</td>
<td>0.000957</td>
<td>0.000953</td>
<td>0.000993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen (Town)</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.000637</td>
<td>0.000678</td>
<td>0.000799</td>
<td>0.000855</td>
<td>0.000885</td>
<td>0.000922</td>
<td>0.000936</td>
<td>0.000981</td>
<td>0.000980</td>
<td>0.000978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>18,957</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.001327</td>
<td>0.001428</td>
<td>0.001494</td>
<td>0.001568</td>
<td>0.001681</td>
<td>0.001886</td>
<td>0.002005</td>
<td>0.002004</td>
<td>0.001948</td>
<td>0.001804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>62,712</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.001678</td>
<td>0.001830</td>
<td>0.002005</td>
<td>0.002090</td>
<td>0.002172</td>
<td>0.002432</td>
<td>0.002585</td>
<td>0.002519</td>
<td>0.002370</td>
<td>0.001789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindon</td>
<td>10,968</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.001392</td>
<td>0.001451</td>
<td>0.001630</td>
<td>0.001741</td>
<td>0.001862</td>
<td>0.002043</td>
<td>0.002107</td>
<td>0.002080</td>
<td>0.001873</td>
<td>0.001686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapleton</td>
<td>9,773</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.002523</td>
<td>0.002729</td>
<td>0.002729</td>
<td>0.002729</td>
<td>0.003052</td>
<td>0.003466</td>
<td>0.003639</td>
<td>0.003570</td>
<td>0.003416</td>
<td>0.003085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>97,839</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001281</td>
<td>0.001346</td>
<td>0.001550</td>
<td>0.001652</td>
<td>0.001716</td>
<td>0.001871</td>
<td>0.001921</td>
<td>0.001879</td>
<td>0.001739</td>
<td>0.001676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payson</td>
<td>19,892</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.001280</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.001280</td>
<td>0.001279</td>
<td>0.001280</td>
<td>0.001268</td>
<td>0.001353</td>
<td>0.001380</td>
<td>0.001323</td>
<td>0.001272</td>
<td>0.001213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
<td>38,845</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.001884</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.002029</td>
<td>0.001775</td>
<td>0.001875</td>
<td>0.001997</td>
<td>0.002237</td>
<td>0.002315</td>
<td>0.002256</td>
<td>0.002085</td>
<td>0.001943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>117,335</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001888</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.002089</td>
<td>0.002239</td>
<td>0.002377</td>
<td>0.002775</td>
<td>0.002956</td>
<td>0.003032</td>
<td>0.002843</td>
<td>0.002394</td>
<td>0.002307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>8,210</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.001524</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.001633</td>
<td>0.001697</td>
<td>0.001839</td>
<td>0.001896</td>
<td>0.002020</td>
<td>0.002106</td>
<td>0.002003</td>
<td>0.001336</td>
<td>0.001228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santaquin</td>
<td>11,652</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.001644</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.001734</td>
<td>0.001909</td>
<td>0.002075</td>
<td>0.002176</td>
<td>0.002408</td>
<td>0.001817</td>
<td>0.001830</td>
<td>0.001272</td>
<td>0.001213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>29,608</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.001731</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.001822</td>
<td>0.001994</td>
<td>0.002083</td>
<td>0.002233</td>
<td>0.002761</td>
<td>0.003054</td>
<td>0.003120</td>
<td>0.002744</td>
<td>0.002436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
<td>39,443</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000955</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.000955</td>
<td>0.001031</td>
<td>0.001091</td>
<td>0.001123</td>
<td>0.001221</td>
<td>0.001186</td>
<td>0.001134</td>
<td>0.0001076</td>
<td>0.0001076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>33,294</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.001914</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.002087</td>
<td>0.002262</td>
<td>0.001896</td>
<td>0.002054</td>
<td>0.002159</td>
<td>0.002190</td>
<td>0.002103</td>
<td>0.002213</td>
<td>0.001538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Town</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.003957</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.004015</td>
<td>0.003446</td>
<td>0.002878</td>
<td>0.002816</td>
<td>0.002740</td>
<td>0.002758</td>
<td>0.002249</td>
<td>0.001815</td>
<td>0.001695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Hills</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.004337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004613</td>
<td>0.004839</td>
<td>0.004615</td>
<td>0.005262</td>
<td>0.006272</td>
<td>0.005519</td>
<td>0.005469</td>
<td>0.005213</td>
<td>0.004530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total Highland tax rate is made up of levies by Utah County, Multicounty and County Assessing, Alpine School District, Highland City, the Northern Utah Water Conservancy Water District and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. As shown in Figure 4.1, the Alpine School District has historically accounted for approximately 70 percent of the tax rate. The Highland City municipal tax rate as a percent of the total tax rate has fluctuated historically between 12.7 percent and 16.4 percent as shown in Figure 4.2.

**Figure 4.1: Historic Total Tax Rate for Highland City**
LAND USE AND ZONING ANALYSIS
The distribution of land uses in the City illustrate a concentration of residential development, with almost 90 percent of the market value and 87 percent of the taxable value attributed to single family residential property types. There are approximately 600 acres of vacant land, primarily in residential zones, as shown in Figure 4.3:

Table 4.2: Distribution of Land Use Types within Highland City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>% of Total Market Value</th>
<th>Taxable Value</th>
<th>% of Total Taxable Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>184.12</td>
<td>$51,526,300</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>$51,526,300</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial with Residential Exemption</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>$6,670,100</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>$3,668,555</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>$279,800</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>$153,890</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>697.00</td>
<td>1,597.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Condos</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>$3,940,800</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>$3,940,800</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>$10,658,300</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>$10,406,390</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Unit Development</td>
<td>286.00</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>$91,854,100</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>$50,519,755</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>4,241.00</td>
<td>2,609.47</td>
<td>$2,384,735,000</td>
<td>89.52%</td>
<td>$1,318,842,749</td>
<td>87.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>443.00</td>
<td>597.02</td>
<td>$99,488,100</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>$63,119,816</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Commercial</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>39.72</td>
<td>$14,642,100</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>$13,661,050</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blank)</td>
<td>183.00</td>
<td>106.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>5,932.00</td>
<td>5,159.56</td>
<td>$2,663,794,600</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$1,515,839,305</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.3: Vacant Land Overlay with City Zoning


**HISTORIC AADT GROWTH**

Highway 92 and Highway 74 serve as the major roadways within the City. Average Annual Daily Trips (AADT) along these roadways range from 21,000 trips on Highway 92 and 15,000 trips on Highway 74. The trips decrease to 10,000 trips east of 4800 W and continue to decline as you enter American Fork Canyon.

*Figure 4.4: Average Annual Daily Trips*
**Competitive Market Sites**

There are several competitive market sites surrounding Highland City, including neighborhood scale retail just west of the City’s boundaries, within Cedar Hills along 4800 West, and in the adjacent communities of American Fork and Lehi. Alpine completed an analysis to develop neighborhood scale retail along Highway 74 (5300 West). This site includes nearly 30 acres of property intended for general neighborhood scale retail. Specifically, the market analysis completed by Alpine City calls for a neighborhood center anchored by a 45,000 square foot grocer. However, the future commercial site is not currently in a Community Reinvestment Area (CRA) and indications from the City suggest there may not be community support or demand for this site to develop commercially.

*Figure 4.5: Competitive Market Sites*
A two-mile buffer of the competitive market sites illustrates limited growth potential within the northeast portion of Utah County. Future commercial growth will continue to follow rooftops which are shifting concentration toward the west, as discussed in the following paragraphs.
GENERAL GROWTH WITHIN THE CITY AND REGION
The City’s population is projected to continue to increase through 2050, reaching 24,250 persons. However, the population in Utah County will shift from a concentration on the east side of the valley to the west, with Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs experiencing substantial growth.

**Figure 4.7: Illustration of Population Growth by Traffic Area Zone (TAZ) Data in Utah County (2020 – Left, 2050 – Right)**

**Table 4.3: Utah County Population Projection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>10,371</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>12,594</td>
<td>12,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Fork</td>
<td>29,527</td>
<td>40,752</td>
<td>48,846</td>
<td>51,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hills</td>
<td>10,334</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>10,288</td>
<td>10,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Mountain</td>
<td>32,204</td>
<td>65,038</td>
<td>99,064</td>
<td>141,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>18,957</td>
<td>21,257</td>
<td>23,375</td>
<td>24,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehi</td>
<td>62,712</td>
<td>88,555</td>
<td>110,747</td>
<td>124,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindon</td>
<td>10,968</td>
<td>13,105</td>
<td>13,564</td>
<td>13,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapleton</td>
<td>9,773</td>
<td>16,480</td>
<td>19,726</td>
<td>21,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orem</td>
<td>97,839</td>
<td>105,540</td>
<td>117,630</td>
<td>127,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payson</td>
<td>19,892</td>
<td>29,218</td>
<td>39,728</td>
<td>61,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Grove</td>
<td>38,845</td>
<td>46,029</td>
<td>47,679</td>
<td>48,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.4: Projected Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>GROWTH (2017-2050)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>2,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Utah County</td>
<td>297,911</td>
<td>405,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mountainlands Association of Governments (MAG) 2019 Draft Traffic Area Zone Data

Employment is also expected to increase in Highland. However, the total growth is marginal compared to the County. Future employment data indicates that Utah County will experience a shift in the location of the workforce. Eagle Mountain, Lindon, Payson and Saratoga Springs will all see an increase in the percentage of total employment. It is important to note that this data represents employment populations within a community and not the amount of workforce living within a community.

Figure 4.8: Proportionate Share of Employment By Community, 2017 and 2050

- Highland
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SUPPORTABLE COMMERCIAL ZONING
To determine the supportable commercial zoning within Highland, this analysis evaluates future taxable sales growth, per capita spending by sector, and general commercial zoning ratios from other communities. Using two different methodologies, this analysis provides an estimate of supportable acreage by the following categories: general retail, industry, services, and total commercial acreage.

The first methodology employed in this analysis utilizes estimated per capita spending of $5,230 in Highland. Assuming a new population of 4,418 residents within the City, the total supportable commercial zoning is estimated at approximately 13 acres. This assumes a median sales volume of $200 per square foot of gross leasable area (GLA) and a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Based on State Per Capita Spending</th>
<th>General Retail</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Spending (State Income Adjusted)</td>
<td>$3,017</td>
<td>$1,210</td>
<td>$351</td>
<td>$653</td>
<td>$5,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Population</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>4,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spending at BO</td>
<td>$13,328,292</td>
<td>$5,346,841</td>
<td>$1,548,918</td>
<td>$2,883,298</td>
<td>$23,107,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Sales Volume Per Sq. Ft. of GLA</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportable SF</td>
<td>66,641</td>
<td>26,734</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>14,416</td>
<td>115,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial Floor to Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Supportable (Based on State per Capita Spending)</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>13.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employing an alternative methodology produces higher supportable acreage. A comparison of zoned commercial land per capita for other communities produces an average 0.026 acres per capita, with a high of 0.071 in Lindon and a low of 0.003 in Alpine. However, as discussed in Section 3, many of these communities have a much higher sales capture rate, resulting in higher commercial acreages. Using Highland’s current total per capita of commercial and industrial acreage of 0.01, the total supportable acreage is estimated at 44 acres, based on new population growth (0.01 multiplied by 4,418 persons). The zoning analysis for Highland is skewed substantially due to the inclusion of the Alpine Country Club, which is approximately 150 acres. Removing this property results in a total of approximately 10 acres of new supportable commercial property.

| Table 4.6: Comparison of Commercial Acres Per Capita from Selected Cities |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 2017 Population            | Zoned Commercial Acreage | Industrial Acreage | Total | Commercial Acreage Per Capita | Industrial Acreage Per Capita | Total Per Capita |
| Highland                   | 18,957          | 191             | -    | 191                          | 0.010                        | -               | 0.010           |
| North Salt Lake            | 20,507          | 351             | 1,239| 1,590                        | 0.017                        | 0.060           | 0.078           |
| Alpine                     | 10,371          | 26              | 10   | 36                           | 0.002                        | 0.001           | 0.003           |
| Cedar Hills                | 10,334          | 22              | -    | 22                           | 0.002                        | -               | 0.002           |
| Lindon                     | 10,968          | 427             | 349  | 776                          | 0.039                        | 0.032           | 0.071           |
| Payson                     | 19,892          | 213             | 169  | 381                          | 0.011                        | 0.008           | 0.019           |
| North Ogden                | 19,465          | 64              | 7    | 71                           | 0.003                        | 0.000           | 0.004           |
| South Ogden                | 17,101          | 259             | -    | 259                          | 0.015                        | -               | 0.015           |
| Centerville                | 17,657          | 228             | 124  | 352                          | 0.013                        | 0.007           | 0.020           |
| Woods Cross                | 11,362          | 153             | 260  | 413                          | 0.013                        | 0.023           | 0.036           |
| Average                    |                 |                 |      |                              |                              | 0.026           |
It is likely that commercial growth will develop around existing neighborhood scale retail, which provides personal services, food services, gas and lodging and general retail purchases. It is expected that the area will continue to see development in small scale office development as well, as shown in the comparison of average retail development requirements in Table 4.7. With a population of less than 20,000 residents and competition from neighboring communities, expansion will be limited.

### Table 4.7: Typical Retail Development Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Center</th>
<th>Leading Tenant</th>
<th>Typical Gross Leasable Area (GLA)</th>
<th>General Range in GLA</th>
<th>Usual Minimum Size in Acres</th>
<th>Approximate Minimum Population Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>30,000 – 100,000</td>
<td>3 – 10</td>
<td>3,000 – 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Supermarket, drugstore/pharmacy, discount department store, mixed apparel</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>100,000 – 400,000</td>
<td>10 – 30</td>
<td>40,000 – 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>One or two full-line department stores</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>300,000 – 900,000</td>
<td>10 – 60</td>
<td>150,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Regional</td>
<td>Three or more full-line department stores</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>600,000 – 2,000,000</td>
<td>15 – 100 or more</td>
<td>300,000 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the City has discussed the potential expansion of retail related opportunities, the City’s ability to stimulate this type of development may be limited by population and competition from adjacent markets such as Lehi, American Fork, Pleasant Grove and Alpine. The US Census Bureau’s estimate of retail e-commerce sales as percent of total quarterly retail sales continues to rise, increasing from nearly four percent in 2009 to over 10 percent in 2019.2

Official retail sales numbers by the Census Bureau show a steady growth in sales from non-store retailers like Amazon, eBay, QVC and Alibaba.3 This will likely result in a shift from location-based retail to online purchases. Highland’s location, limited interstate access and small population will make it challenging to attract distribution centers that service this type of retail spending. Lower population levels or continued sales leakage will result in less commercial acreage within the community. However, if the City allows for greater densities, resulting in an increase in buying power and capture rates, the area could see higher levels of commercial development. Methods to promote increased commercial development include:

- Allow for more residential development and population growth;
- Provide development incentives;
- Promote niche markets that will capture sales from surrounding communities;
- Remove barriers to entry; and,
- Promote other types of commercial development (industrial, tech, office, etc.).

It is important to note that with increased population and development there will be an increase in public safety expense that may negate the benefits.

### Potential Commercial Zones

The potential commercial expansion zones have been identified in Figure 4.9. Approximately 160 acres have been identified as potential commercial areas, which likely exceeds what is supportable. While these areas provide opportunities for the consideration of commercial expansion, the City should evaluate the cost/benefit of proposed commercial developments. This evaluation may also include compatibility with the existing land use objectives of the City. For example, the City may not wish to shift from development focused around the Town Center to corridor commercial, as this may result in increased congestion within the City.

---

3 Source: 2015 Annual Retail Trade Report https://www.census.gov/retail/index.html
BARRIERS TO ENTRY
Some commercial development may be impacted by factors that serve as barriers toward unconstrained commercial growth within the community. These barriers may include City ordinances, development costs, or geographic challenges. Future commercial development in Highland may be hindered by these types of barriers. The following paragraphs discuss some of the barriers to entry that may exist within the City.
**Sunday Closure**

In 2012, Highland residents voted to keep businesses closed on Sundays. According to Highland municipal code 5.04.170 “Hours of Operation”, the hours of operation for all Highland City businesses is limited to Monday through Saturday during the hours of six a.m. until twelve a.m. (midnight). There are arguments for and against Sunday closure regulations. One day off a week may improve employee morale, foster a sense of community caring and encourage greater demand to visit retailers when open. However, there may be a substantial loss in revenue for some industries. Some businesses may view this ordinance as a barrier to entry.

**Land Cost**

Another barrier to entry may be the cost of land. A comparison of the total market value of land within Utah County versus Highland City may illustrate the land value disparity. The total market value of all land within Utah County is approximately $25.7B. With a total of 1.3M acres of land, this equals nearly $20K per acre. This data may be impacted by higher ratios of undevelopable, exempt, government, forest or other lower valued lands that are not as prevalent within a City. Highland’s estimated market land value per acre is $183K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.8: Comparison of Market Land Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development Cost: Impact Fees**

Many communities within Utah assess impact fees to offset the cost of needed infrastructure related to growth. Total impact fees vary from community based on level of service, age of infrastructure, proportional allocation of buy-in to new facilities, and the inclusion of financing mechanisms and inflation. While impact fees can be a barrier to limiting economic growth, municipalities have tools to mitigate this impact. These include waiving or reducing impact fees, establishing redevelopment areas to fund infrastructure, or allowing development to provide information that may result in a reduced fee.

**Location**

The City is located at the crossroads of two major roadways: Highway 92 and Highway 74. Average Annual Daily Trips (AADT) along these roadways range from 21,000 trips on Highway 92 and 15,000 trips on Highway 74. However, the City is not adjacent to a major interstate. Proximity to a regional transportation network allows communities to attract larger developments like distribution centers or industrial centers, which in turn stimulate job growth and spending.

**Lower Population and Rooftops**

While the City’s population is projected to continue to increase through 2050, reaching 24,250 persons, the population in Utah County will shift from a concentration on the east side of the valley to the west, with Eagle Mountain and Saratoga Springs experiencing substantial growth.
SECTION 5: SWOT ANALYSIS

Based on the preceding sections, the following SWOT Analysis provides a strategic planning tool for the City to examine the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (“SWOT”) that bolster or stifle economic development. The SWOT Analysis considers both internal and external factors that affect the City and highlights both positive and negative conditions that affect the City’s ability to sustain and attract businesses and create a vibrant community.

KEY FINDINGS
The following illustrates the key findings of the SWOT Analysis process:

ILLUSTRATION 5.1: SWOT ANALYSIS SUMMARY

**STRENGTHS**
- High Incomes and Education
- Infrastructure Capacity
- Developed Town Center Core
- Sunday Closure

**WEAKNESS**
- Lack of Developable Commercial Land
- Removed from I-15 Corridor
- Higher Land Costs
- Sunday Closure

**OPPORTUNITIES**
- Infill with Neighborhood Scale Retail
- Expansion in Personal Services
- Single Family and Multifamily-Housing

**THREATS**
- Competitive Neighborhood Commercial
- Limited Growth Potential
SECTION 6: PROPERTY TAX AND FUNDING ANALYSIS

Limited commercial development will likely result in static or marginal increases in long term sales tax revenue trends. As a result, the City may need to pursue alternative revenue sources to mitigate funding gaps. In 2018, the City completed a Comprehensive Financial Sustainability Plan (“CFSP”) related to the City’s General Fund in order to address potential structural deficiencies in the City’s financial operations. This analysis was updated in 2019 to account for changes in public safety expenses and revisions to new operations and maintenance ("O&M") and capital needs. In addition, the additional public safety fee revenue was included in the analysis and forecasted into the future. While a full update was not completed at this time, the update provides insight into the trajectory of the General Fund based on current budget estimates. It is the intent of the City to complete a full revision of the General Fund CFSP every two to three years. The CFSP includes modeling and forecasting of revenues, expenditures, capital improvement needs and tax rate analysis to ensure sufficient revenues to cover all operations and capital needs while maintaining a fund balance of 20 percent of General Fund revenues.

A baseline scenario analysis provides a review of projected revenues under the existing tax levy relative to proposed expenses. This scenario illustrates that the City would not be able to maintain a fund balance of 20 percent of the General Fund revenues over the next five years. Based on input from City staff and Council members, the City ultimately focused on the following scenarios to generate additional General Fund revenues to address the funding deficit:

- **Baseline Scenario – No Tax Increase**
- **Scenario 1**: Tax increase each year from 2021 through 2025;
- **Scenario 2**: Tax increase in 2021 and 2023 and 2025;
- **Scenario 3**: Tax increase in 2021 and 2024;
- **Scenario 4**: Tax increase each year to fund inflation only (no new O&M or new capital); and,
- **Scenario 5**: Tax increase each year to fund inflation and new O&M (no new capital).

The proposed rate increases, shown below, are designed to fund the proposed Capital Improvement Plan (“CIP”), necessary operations and maintenance (“O&M”) and other expenses forecasted within the planning horizon, as well as ensure an adequate fund balance. Each scenario assumes an annual four percent increase in general sales and use tax and a three percent annual increase in utility franchise tax.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.1: PROPOSED INCREASE IN PROPERTY TAX REVENUES BY SCENARIO</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>FY2023</th>
<th>FY2024</th>
<th>FY2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Scenario – No New Taxes</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Property Tax Revenues (Scenario 1) – Funding Inflation, New O&amp;M &amp; Capital</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.89%</td>
<td>12.89%</td>
<td>12.89%</td>
<td>12.89%</td>
<td>12.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Property Tax Revenues (Scenario 2) – Funding Inflation, New O&amp;M &amp; Capital</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>22.74%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>22.74%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>22.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Property Tax Revenues (Scenario 3) – Funding Inflation, New O&amp;M &amp; Capital</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30.17%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30.17%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Property Tax Revenues (Scenario 4) – Funding Inflation Only (No New O&amp;M or New Capital)</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Property Tax Revenues (Scenario 5) – Funding Inflation &amp; New O&amp;M (No New Capital)</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Sales and Use Tax</strong></td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Franchise Tax</strong></td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILLUSTRATION OF FUND BALANCE BY SCENARIO**

Each scenario is designed to achieve a fund balance of 20 percent at FY2025, as shown in Figure 6.1.
The CFSP illustrates the City’s need for a diverse tax base. The City’s lower per capita taxable sales and the limited supportable commercial zoning suggest the City will need to rely more on property tax revenues in the future, rather than continued economic development. Based on continued changes to public safety cost allocations and local priorities, the analysis of the General Fund should be updated regularly to determine sustainability.

ADDITIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FINANCING TOOLS

There are a wide variety of tools and incentives are available to help achieve economic development goals. Below is a brief description of several resources available to the City.

Redevelopment Areas – Tax Increment Financing
Tax increment financing (“TIF”) is the most widely used tool for economic development in the State of Utah. The creation of CRAs, or historically URA, EDA or CDAs, provides a source of financing redevelopment through the creation of tax increment. Redevelopment agencies negotiate with taxing entities to share a portion of the property tax that is generated by new development in a certain area for a specific length of time.

Tax Increment Revenue Bonds
Tax Increment Revenue Bonds allow redevelopment agencies to pledge tax increment funds to repay the debt service. The projected tax increment is often discounted by the bond market, as the tax increment is the only source to repay the bonds, and project areas have little to no tax increment at the beginning of a new project. These bonds are generally more difficult to sell, due to the risk of repayment.

Industrial Development Bonds
Industrial Development Bonds have a $10 million cap per issue for small manufacturing facilities and a $150 million total annual state allocation cap. These bonds have strict
regulations regarding business types that are eligible; a qualified 501(c)(3) can use them for a wider variety of projects. For credit worthy borrowers, this can result in a reduction in the interest rate of up to 2.00 per annum, which during the course of a 10-20 year financed capital improvement can be millions of dollars of savings.

**Revolving Loan Funds and Grants**
A revolving loan fund is a source of money from which loans are made for small business development projects. A loan is made to a business and as repayments are made, funds become available for future loans to other businesses. This tool is mainly used to finance local, expanding, or small businesses within the community.

The funds used to create a revolving loan fund may have rules governing the program design. For example, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has specified rules for Community Development Block Grants. Matching grants or revolving loan funds have been very successful in various communities throughout Utah. Dilapidated areas within the City may benefit from creating a revolving loan fund that would encourage the upgrade of facades and other building renovations. Most businesses see increased traffic from improvements to their properties.

**Community Development Block Grants**
Community Development Block Grants can be used for development in parts of the community that qualify as low- and moderate-income areas. These funds may also be used for projects that remove impediments of access for elderly and the disabled.

**Business Improvement Districts**
A business improvement district (BID) is a public-private partnership that allows for additional taxes to be collected from businesses within a designated area. The taxes generated by a BID are used for public improvements based on the concept that well-maintained public spaces will increase commerce. BIDs are managed by nonprofit corporations created by the district. BIDs allow businesses to share the costs to increase business activity within the community through joint ventures including 1) joint marketing, 2) ad campaigns, 3) events in the district area, and 4) planning for parking and facility improvements. The City may contribute through facilitation of meetings at municipal buildings, advertising on municipal websites, etc.

**Sales Tax Incentives**
For strong destination retail anchors, the City may offer a sales tax incentive for a period of time. The City should consider sales tax incentives on a case-by-case basis. This should only be considered for a major tax-generating retailer or to retain a current major tax-generating business.

**Special Assessment Bonds**
Special Assessment Bonds allow a governmental entity to designate a specific area which will be benefited by public improvements and levy a special assessment, like a tax lien, to finance the public improvements. This assessment is then used to repay the debt service. Usually, only the property owners receiving the benefit from the improvements are assessed the costs.

Special Assessment Bonds may not be created if 50 percent or more of those liable for the assessment payment protest its creation. These bonds usually have a higher interest rate than the other bonds discussed in this section. All improvements must be owned by the issuer and repayment cannot exceed twenty years. The main advantage to these bonds is: 1) no bond election required, 2) only benefited owners pay for the improvements, and 3) limited risk to the City.

**Municipal Building Authority Lease Revenue Bonds (“MBA”)**
Cities, counties, and school districts are allowed to create a non-profit organization solely for the purpose of accomplishing the purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving, and financing the cost of a project on behalf of a public body that created it. Normally, MBA bonds are used to construct municipal buildings, however MBA bonds have been used to finance parks and recreation facilities as well. The legal limitation on MBA bonds issued is 40 years.
Sales Tax Revenue Bonds
Sales tax revenues can be utilized as a sole pledge for the repayment of debt. These bonds do not require a bond election and are often used for the acquisition and construction of any capital facility owned by the issuing entity. The bond market usually requires a higher debt service ratio of at least two or three times the revenue to debt.
APPENDIX A: GENERAL FUND CFSP ASSUMPTIONS

It is important to note that the General Fund CFSP is based on the following assumptions related to unfunded O&M and capital needs:

UNFUNDED OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE NEED

In addition to baseline expenditure growth assumptions, this analysis considered unfunded operational expenses anticipated from each department. Through meetings with City staff, the following cost have been identified as unfunded operation and maintenance expenses. These expenses represent needs from administration, emergency services, open space, parks, police, and streets and roads through the planning horizon. Table A.1 outlines the new operation and maintenance needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urgency Level</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Proposed Increase to GF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Seasonal Employee Hourly Increase</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$29,760.00</td>
<td>$29,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Maintenance Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Playground Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Open Space Improvements</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Playground Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$17,000.00</td>
<td>$17,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Maintenance Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Seasonal Employee Hourly Increase</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$18,240.00</td>
<td>$18,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>2 FTE’s</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$102,336.00</td>
<td>$115,180.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Trail Maintenance</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>2 New Employees</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$78,000.00</td>
<td>$80,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Streets and Roads</td>
<td>New FTE split between Streets and Storm</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$67,500.00</td>
<td>$67,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Streets and Roads</td>
<td>New Vehicle split between Streets and Storm</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Streets and Roads</td>
<td>Speed Limit Signs</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$612,836.00</td>
<td>$628,020.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNFUNDED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Capital project costs may be paid through cash reserves, impact fees or debt financing. In this analysis, several projects are identified that must be constructed through 2025 and beyond. Table A.2 summarizes the total proposed capital improvement estimated construction costs. These cost are in addition to the existing capital improvement funds allocated in the General Fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urgency Level</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>General Plan Update</td>
<td>One Time</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Streets and Roads</td>
<td>4 Snowplow Trucks</td>
<td>One Time</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$654,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Additional Cost to Park Maintenance Building</td>
<td>One Time</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>General Fund Vehicle Replacement</td>
<td>One Time</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgency Level</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>New light for book drop</td>
<td>One Time</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Building Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>One Time</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$107,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Other Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>One Time</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,719,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on feedback from the City Council, the above O&M and capital expenses were averaged through fiscal year 2025. An average of $125,604 new O&M expense has been added to the City's O&M budget based on highest priority line items, compounded through 2025. Further, the City identified an average of $252,645 of capital expense needed annually as shown in Table A.3.

**Table A.3: Cumulative O&M Expense & Capital Improvement Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2021</th>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>$125,604</td>
<td>$251,208</td>
<td>$376,812</td>
<td>$502,416</td>
<td>$628,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$252,645</td>
<td>$252,645</td>
<td>$252,645</td>
<td>$252,645</td>
<td>$252,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$378,249</td>
<td>$503,853</td>
<td>$629,457</td>
<td>$755,061</td>
<td>$880,665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>