

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that the Mayor and City Council will hold a Work Session on Wednesday, August 21, 2013 in the Council Chambers, 45 West 100 South, beginning at 6:00 pm.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Dan Olson – Presentation on Irrigation Wheeling Request
2. Multi-Family Housing Review of Planning Commission Recommendations
3. Agenda Review
4. General Discussion

If you are planning to attend this Public Meeting and, due to a disability, need assistance in understanding or participating in the meeting, please notify the City Office ten or more hours in advance and we will, within reason, provide what assistance may be required.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned duly appointed City Recorder for the municipality of Santaquin City hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice and Agenda was e-mailed to the Payson Chronicle, Payson, UT, 84651.

S. B. Farnsworth

By: Susan B. Farnsworth, City Recorder

Posted:

City Offices
Post Office
Zions Bank

**MINUTES OF A COUNCIL WORK SESSION
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
AUGUST 21, 2013**

The meeting was called to order by Mayor James E. DeGraffenried at 6:00 p.m. Council Members attending: Matthew Carr, Kirk Hunsaker, and Rick Steele. James Linford arrived at 6:05 p.m. Keith Broadhead was excused.

Others attending: City Manager Ben Reeves, Community Development Director Dennis Marker, Public Safety Director Dennis Howard, Legal Counsel Brett Rich, Planning Commissioner Nick Miller and Dan Olson.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Dan Olson – Presentation on Irrigation Wheeling Request

Mr. Olson indicated that after the discussion of the June 19th Council Meeting he has drafted a proposal for delivery of his Summit Creek Water shares through the Pressurized Irrigation system. (See attachment "A" for Mr. Olson's proposal)

Mayor DeGraffenried indicated he also has "run the numbers". He said he has a fear that another resident with larger acreage would want the same consideration. Mr. Olson indicated he agrees with the Mayor's concerns.

Council Member Linford was told their current shares come out of the canyon instead out of the wells. He was told the water flow could not be monitored. But the amount of water delivered could be averaged out over the time of usage. Council Member Linford would like to have some control of the shares. Mr. Olson indicated the City could add anything into the agreement. Mr. Olson was asked what his financial gain would be. Mr. Olson indicated there is not any gain other than he was able to retain the water shares and receive his water at his home location.

Council Member Steele requested Mr. Olson contact the Summit Creek shareholders to see who might be interested in participating. Mr. Olson indicated it is difficult to make any proposal to the shareholders until the Council Members indicated the direction they would like to go.

Council Member Carr indicated we as a City need to protect the assets of the City. He is in favor of the proposal as long as the City is protected.

Council Member Hunsaker also voiced his support of the proposal.

It was suggested Legal Counsel Rich be involved in the drafting of a contract. Council Member Linford would like to see the list of shareholders to see what the possible deficit to the revenue flow may be.

Multi-Family Housing Review of Planning Commission Recommendations

Director Marker said this Ordinance was previously presented to the Council Members and remanded back to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission held a Public Hearing at which they heard comment with regard to the loophole addressing the

requirement of a duplex being owner occupied. Parking requirements were also addressed and clarifications were made.

Agenda Review

Mr. Reeves reviewed the water report required by the state. Council Member Carr asked about the point system in the reports. Mr. Reeves will follow up with the Public Works Department before it is sent to the State.

City Manager Reeves reviewed the proposed pay scale associated with Resolution 08-04-2013, Wages for Wildland Emergency Services Response. Council Members Linford, Hunsaker, Steele and Carr were in favor of adopting Option "B" addressing the Wildland fire reimbursement rate. Reimbursement proposed in Option "A" would require the personnel to pay all taxes associated with payroll with Option "B", allowing for the City to pay their portion.


General Discussion

No general discussion was conducted.

At 6:55 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

Approved on September 11, 2013.


James E. DeGraffenried, Mayor


Susan B. Farnsworth, City Recorder

25 July 2013

This document is in follow up to council meeting on June 19, 2013

PROPOSAL to Santaquin City for Contracted use of Summit Creek Irrigation and Canal Company (SCI&CC) Shares into the existing Pressurized Irrigation system. This proposal is a suggestion that the City of Santaquin create a resolution to allow those share holders living in the Santaquin city boundaries to deliver their water shares to Santaquin City for dispersal within the Pressurized Irrigation system that is now in place.

July 24 2013 at 5pm I drove to the mouth of Pole Canyon to investigate the level of the water in the new PI (Pressurized Irrigation) pond and see what kind of usage, storage and room there might be to place extra water that could be used in the city PI system. My concern was that possibly the pond was already at capacity. My discovery was that the pond was extremely low and a concern that the water level produces enough head to keep the flow used in the nearer subdivisions immediately below the pond. With the proposed new subdivisions in the immediate area the use would increase dramatically and I would estimate that the water level would be at a critical level if more houses were added to this PI stream developed from the pond at Pole Canyon. Without some augmentation of this ponds capability the PI could suffer outages of water very easily in drought or low water years. By adding more homes the water will disappear faster even in normal precipitation years.

Using my personal property/home figures of usage for PI, I would like to attempt some figures that could be used as a guideline for a share(s) of water being utilized by the city in the PI system. By doing so, it is no different than shares presently used by some of the larger farmers who rent shares from small shareholders in the city that no longer want to use their shares. This proposal will effect a few, not many and will most likely not affect many of the property owners in the newer subdivisions since few have shares of SCI&CC.

My proposal has to do with diversion of creek shares since all of the Olson shares are provided by the creek and not the wells that SCI&CC utilize in their system. Since no Summit Creek well at present can provide water into the ditch that we currently utilize (Summit Creek ditch b1) this makes this stream in particular an easy divertible stream to the pond. By diversion of our shares into the city pond at the mouth of Pole canyon the water shares can be utilized throughout the system and wielded by Santaquin City means.

From my best guess (if we want a better count it will take some time to develop the shareholder and usage list) there are less than 500 shares that sit outside of the farmers use and many of those go unused or used partially because most shareholders are older, have 1 acre lots in town and do not garden or water their lawns as they did just 20 years ago. With older people-they do not like to get up at 1am and take a half hour turn of water. Keep in mind that the city and just a few farmers make the majority of the shareholders in the SCI&CC.

Calculations for use

Daniel and Cauleen Olson 630 East 450 South usage of PI at their residence. 1 Acre lot at this address

Usage May to mid June 2012 = 105K Gal
Usage June to mid July 2012 = 99K Gal
Usage May to mid June 2013 = 61K Gal
Usage June to mid July 2013 = 71K Gal

SCI&CC claims that a typical stream provides 4 cubic feet per second of water. That equates to a stream (1 cubic foot of water = 7.4805 gallons) @4cfs for 30 min for 1 share = 29.92 GPS (gallons per second), 1795.32 GPM, **53859.74 GP30Min** = ~54,000 gallons per share of SCI&CC water since a share lasts 30 minutes.

Worst case May to mid June in 2012 the use would be 105,000 gallons usage or 26250 gpweek. With an irrigation stream of 53,860 gallons per week the difference would be total water delivered to the Santaquin City pond of 215440 gpmonth or 4 week time frame and the Delta is in my case as compared to my actual high usage of 105,000 gallons on the worst month is 110440 gallons that the city could claim. My lot is a 1 acre lot equal to many within the main part of town. I am not watering as much this year as last and would like to look at the 110,000 gallons per month as a good number to use for the shareholders PI non-billed proposed value. It is actually 1/3 more than I am using this year and I am not really watering enough by the present look of my front and back lawns. However I could accelerate that usage and enjoy a few more things but keep around that 110,000 mark per water share. Keep in mind that I would like to offer an additional item to double the share and have an option to use 220,000 gallons per month if I wanted and grow a few fruit trees or something but still not use the stream on more than my one acre lot. This is an option for minor shareholders that own possibly 2 shares of SCI&CC water and want to utilize it and sign a contract with the city.

This then becomes a possibility of any shareholder of Summit Creek shares to grow a nice garden, irrigate their lawn and flowers using the allotment for beautifying the city and the city being able to make much more money on the water available. The city also ends up with (free) water to sell to other residents as well as make up for shortages in developments not serviced with enough water. (this statement assumes there are some developments that are close to maxing out)

For one share of water that a share holder delivers to Santaquin City PI, the city would have 110,000 gallons of water that they could wield and sell as well as provide for growth within the city thus supplying new subdivisions with precious PI. At current rates the city will make money doing so since the standard cost for PI will be paid even by those that use their water shares in this manner.

Proposal of shares and contracts to do so

The following are suggested usages and proposals to consider as this city ordinance or resolution is written and approved then codified into the proper format.

An owner can use up to 2 shares per city lot. The council must decide on how big a city lot is described. Main lots in town were 1 acre on average, maybe we should stay with that and adjust accordingly. (maybe even offer exceptions if business needs or wants to use water) Keep in

mind that with the 1 acre city lots -most had water shares and most 2 shares or less that they have had in the family for years.

This proposal and eventual ordinance must only be for residential use and within the city limits. It is not intended for Agricultural use however a business could look at the feeder line and adjust accordingly and maybe water up to 6 acres—or 1 block, 12 shares of water but this becomes a very gray area. A business or agricultural use could be something that the council might entertain with guidelines set up as a part of this ordinance.

List of Qualifications and Limitations:

1. Must be a resident within Santaquin City Limits.
2. Residential Use only. No agriculture----We might want to study the options for small use.
3. One Acre or less sized lots. As approved by the council. Some extenuating circumstances may need to be studied as there may be need to vary some with special circumstances that might apply.
4. City has the first right of refusal to purchase the water if the shareholder ever desires to sell. This gives the city a fair advantage of access to water that they may have been using through a PI contract and a means by which a family could decide to sell in the event of an end of life or other type of ownership situation. This gives the city a priority as well as the shareholder a responsibility in the agreement they would have with the city.
5. The share owner is responsible to pay any assessments to Summit Creek Irrigation and Canal Company. If these are not kept up, the city could have the rights to pay the assessment after a certain period and the ownership of the share defaults to the city.
6. The share owner will retain their voting rights with Summit Creek Irrigation and Canal Company. As long as they retain ownership of their shares and pay the assessment every year.
7. The shareholder will be allowed to use 110,000 gallons per month (1/2 of their share) for the base rate only. Shareholders pay the monthly base rate no matter what their usage is. Usage over 110,000 gallons will be billed at the current overage rates and that overage rate would change when all overage rates change—so that the contract does not lock in the shareholder to low rates in the future and encourage over usage not planned or foreseen. By allowing 2 shares per acre a homeowner could in fact grow a garden and beautify the area and should be able to stay within the use guideline.
8. The City would have the right to all excess water to sell or wield or to sell within the PI system with no claim by the owner. Even if the owner does not use the 110,000 gallons per month.
9. Suggestions of having a timed sprinkling system could be encourage or required in order to better utilize personal usage.
10. No bigger than a 1" service to anyone. (this may be too big and should be set in the resolution)
11. Each share transfer must be approved by the city council and a contract signed with the share owner. The reason for the contract is to ensure the long time use and assure that each individual user is committed to provide that water to the city PI system. This means the city can plan for 10 years (or some time whatever that may be) that this water is available for growth and usage.
12. The city will be required to meet with SCI&CC to formalize the plan and verify the diversion of the streams for the water diversion into the Pole Canyon Pond or wherever they

deem necessary. This may in fact be other wells or wherever the agreement is made between the two entities.

BENEFITS to the City

Immediate water available for PI and without the cost of buying shares. The city becomes a partner with shareholders that may never sell or rent their shares in any other way.

Planned Revenue source for an extended period of time for the city.

Beautification to the city as a whole with lots being able to utilize the water resource effectively.

Possibly this extra water will allow enough depth in the Pole Canyon pond to allow fish to live and an extra place for families to go and fish. This extra water at that location could possibly lead to a small park in the area that families could use for recreation of all sorts. (I am not sure the amount of acreage that Santaquin City owns adjacent to the pond but this could be considered)

Provides an option for new growth and water to maintain the planned PI usage of these new areas and additions to the current residential usage.

SUMMARY

This new ordinance can add to the city financial line, to beautification, can provide for growth and lessen the impact as we move forward in many aspects of the direction we are going. This is an important issue and will provide a means to grow, without it, new ways to provide water will always serve as a challenge. This will help in many ways as stated above.

One further thought I would like to add is in regards to organization, planning, use and resources for water. Every city will face tighter and tighter challenges as they grow. I suggest we develop a Santaquin City Water development Board that oversees, suggests, monitors and helps in the planning and reviews of all water projects. This can include everything from flood mitigation, aquifer recharge, introduction and use of effluent water, planned use of wells and reviews of any type of water plan as well as adding options that they could come up with. A committee like this can serve as a resource for the council, P&Z, building and plan review as well as studies and recommendations for recreation and other uses. This is a new idea but we never get any new results unless we try something new especially something that can help us prepare for the upcoming growth in the city. We have a finite amount of water and better utilization is a constant charge we are given.

Thanks

Dan Olson