



MT. PLEASANT, UTAH

SANITARY SEWER

IMPACT FEE FACILITY PLAN & IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS

MAY 15, 2023



EFG CONSULTING
2110 N DAPPLE DR, TOOELE, UT 84074
801.258.1926



IMPACT FEE FACILITY PLAN (IFFP) CERTIFICATION

JUB Engineers (JUB) and EFG Consulting (EFG) certify that the attached impact fee facilities plan:

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

IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS (IFA) CERTIFICATION

JUB and EFG certify that the attached impact fee analysis:

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

JUB and EFG Consulting make this certification with the following caveats:

1. All of the recommendations for implementations of the IFFP made in the IFFP documents or in the IFA documents are followed by City staff and elected officials.
2. If all or a substantial portion of the IFFP or IFA are modified or amended by the City, this certification is no longer valid.
3. All information provided to our team is assumed to be correct, complete, and accurate. This includes information provided by the City as well as outside sources.

JUB Engineering

EFG Consulting

Contents

Impact Fee Facility Plan (IFFP) Certification.....	2
Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) Certification.....	2
Section 1: Executive Summary.....	4
Section 2: Demand Analysis.....	5
Section 3: Level of Service.....	5
Section 4: Excess Capacity Analysis	5
Section 5: Capital Facility and Funding Analysis.....	5
Section 6: Impact Fee Calculation.....	7
Appendix A – Draft Impact Fee Enactment	8
Appendix B – Impact Fee Calculation.....	9

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this Impact Fee Facility Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) is to fulfill the requirements of the Utah Code Title 11 Chapter 36a (Impact Fee Act) to enable Mt. Pleasant City (City) to update its sanitary sewer impact fee for the entire City. The following is a summary of the IFFP inputs.

SERVICE AREA:

The service area for this IFFP and IFA will include the entire City.

DEMAND ANALYSIS:

The demand unit utilized in this analysis is equivalent residential connections (ERC). Future growth in the City for the sewer system is estimated to increase from 1,266 ERCs in 2022 to 1,655 ERCs in 2032 which is an increase of 389 ERCs.

LEVEL OF SERVICE:

The level of service (LOS) for sewer is provided in the following table.

Category	Requirement	Value
Collection	Average Flow	65 gallons/capita/day
	Peak Day Demand	170.95 gallons/capita/day
Treatment	Average Daily Inflow	0.23 MGD
	Peak Hourly Average	0.61 MGD

Mt. Pleasant City Sewer Collection and Treatment Master Plan, 2022

EXCESS CAPACITY:

Based upon the current LOS, the sewer system has excess capacity in collection. The collection excess capacity is estimated to serve 9,941 ERCs.

CAPITAL FACILITIES ANALYSIS:

The City anticipates the cost of future treatment projects to be \$2.6 million. Of this amount, approximately \$1.8 million will be associated with growth.

FUNDING OF FUTURE FACILITIES:

The City will use money collected from impact fees and monies in the sewer fund to fund the purchase of future treatment projects.

PROPOSED IMPACT FEE

Based upon the inputs described above and in the body of this report, the maximum allowable impact fee for sewer is \$1,557/ERC. The following is a multiplier for larger meters.

Sewer Impact Fee Schedule		
Residential (per unit)	ERC Multiplier	Impact Fee
	1	\$ 1,557
	0.75	\$ 1,168
Commercial (meter size)		
¾	1	\$ 1,557
1	2.5	\$ 3,893
1 1/2	5	\$ 7,785
2	8	\$ 12,457
3	15	\$ 23,356
4	25	\$ 38,927

SECTION 2: DEMAND ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section is to describe the demand unit and estimate future demand.

DEMAND UNITS & FUTURE DEMAND

Demand units are measured in equivalent residential connections (ERCs). The growth in ERCs was estimated assuming an approximate growth rate of 2.71 percent.

ERC Projections			
	2022	2032	New ERCs
Sewer ERCs	1,266	1,655	389
<i>Mt. Pleasant City Sewer Collection and Treatment Master Plan, 2022</i>			

SECTION 3: LEVEL OF SERVICE

The level of service (LOS) for sewer is provided in the following table.

Category	Requirement	Value
Collection	Average Flow	65 gallons/capita/day
	Peak Day Demand	170.95 gallons/capita/day
Treatment	Average Daily Inflow	0.23 MGD
	Peak Hourly Average	0.61 MGD

Mt. Pleasant City Sewer Collection and Treatment Master Plan, 2022

SECTION 4: EXCESS CAPACITY ANALYSIS

Based upon the current LOS, the sewer system has excess capacity in the collection system. The total cost of the existing collection system was \$4,492,107. The system capacity is 11,207 ERCs. Existing ERCs total 1,266, thus there is excess capacity to serve a remaining 9,941.

SECTION 5: CAPITAL FACILITY AND FUNDING ANALYSIS

CAPITAL FACILITIES ANALYSIS:

The City currently needs three treatment capital projects to serve existing deficiencies and meet future growth. The table below details the cost of these projects as well as the portion related to serving future growth.

Improvement Name	Cost	Year	% to Growth	Cost to Growth	ERCs Served
Rotary Drum Screen in Channel (New Building)	\$1,132,000	ASAP	42%	477,322	3,003
Septage Receiving Station - Custom	271,000	ASAP	42%	114,271	3,003
HDPE Lining - Cell #3	1,197,000	ASAP	100%	1,197,000	1,737
Total	\$2,600,000			\$1,788,593	

FUNDING OF FUTURE FACILITIES:

The City will use money collected from impact fees and monies in the sewer fund to fund the purchase of the needed treatment projects.

SECTION 6: IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Based upon the inputs herein, the maximum allowable impact fee for sewer is \$1,557/ERC. The following describes the calculation.

Excess Capacity	Total Cost	Total ERCS	Remaining ERCS	% Remaining	Remaining Value	Cost/ERC
Collection	\$4,492,107	11,207	9,941	89%	\$3,984,499	\$401
Total	\$4,492,107				\$3,984,499	\$401

Future Facilities	Total Cost	Total ERCS	Growth ERCS	% Growth	Growth	Cost/ERC
Rotary Drum Screen in Channel (New Building)	1,132,000	3,003	1,266	42%	\$477,322	\$377
Septage Receiving Station - Custom	271,000	3,003	1,266	42%	114,271	90
HDPE Lining - Cell #3	1,197,000	1,737	1,737	100%	1,197,000	689
Total	\$2,600,000				\$1,788,593	\$1,156

Total Impact Fee Per ERC for Sewer	\$1,557
---	----------------

Sewer Impact Fee Schedule		
Residential (per unit)	ERC Multiplier	Impact Fee
	1	\$ 1,557
	0.75	\$ 1,168
Commercial (meter size)		
¾	1	\$ 1,557
1	2.5	\$ 3,893
1 1/2	5	\$ 7,785
2	8	\$ 12,457
3	15	\$ 23,356
4	25	\$ 38,927

NON-STANDARD IMPACT FEES

For connections that can demonstrate a different demand on the system than assumed by ERC, the City reserves the right under the Impact Fee Act to use a multiplier to calculate the equivalent impact fee at \$1,557 per ERC.

APPENDIX A – DRAFT IMPACT FEE ENACTMENT

MT. PLEASANT CITY, UTAH

ORDINANCE NO. 2023-

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AN IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN AND IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS AND IMPOSING CERTAIN IMPACT FEES; PROVIDING FOR THE CALCULATION AND COLLECTION OF SUCH FEES; PROVIDING FOR APPEAL, ACCOUNTING AND SEVERABILITY OF THE SAME, AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS

WHEREAS, On [REDACTED], 2022, Mt. Pleasant City, Utah (the “City”) posted notice as to its intention to prepare an impact fee facilities plan (“IFFP”) and impact fee analysis (“IFA”) for sanitary sewer impact fees and invited all interested parties to participate in the impact fee preparation process, consistent with UCA Section 11-36a-501 and 11-36a-503;

WHEREAS, the City is a municipality in the State of Utah, authorized and organized under the provisions of Utah law and is authorized pursuant to the Impact Fees Act, Utah Code Ann. 11-36a-101 et seq. to adopt impact fees; and

WHEREAS, on May 23, 2023, the City posted notice of a public hearing on Utah’s Public Notice Website, the City’s Website, and at the City’s administrative building to consider the assumptions and conclusions of the Impact Fee Facilities Plans and the Impact Fee Analyses;

WHEREAS, the City Council (the “Council”) met in regular session on June 6, 2023, to convene a public hearing and to consider adopting the IFFP and IFA, imposing impact fees, providing for the calculation and collection of such fees, and providing for an appeal process, accounting and reporting method and other related matters; and

WHEREAS, on June 6, 2023, JUB Engineers, Inc. and EFG-Consulting LLC (collectively the “Consultants”) certified their work under UCA section 11-36a-306(1);

WHEREAS, on June 6, 2023, after considering the input of the public and stakeholders and relying on the professional advice and certification of the Consultants, the City adopted the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the IFFP prepared by the Consultants, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit “A” and incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, on June 6, 2023, the Consultants certified their work under UCA Section 11-36a-306(2);

WHEREAS, based on the input of the public and stakeholders and relying on the professional advice and certification of Consultants; and

WHEREAS, on May 23, 2023, a copy of the IFFP and IFA and the proposed Impact Fee Ordinance, along with a summary of the analyses that was designated to be understood by a lay person, were made available to the public and deposited at the City Office, and on the

City Website; and

WHEREAS, on **May 23, 2023**, the City posted notice of the date, time and place of the public hearing to consider the IFA in three public places and on the public notices website, and on the City Website; and

WHEREAS, on **June 6, 2023**, the Council held a public hearing regarding the IFA and the Impact Fee Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Consultants in connection with the City prepared a schedule of impact fees for each type of development activity that specifies the amount of the impact fee to be imposed for each type of system improvement. A copy of such Schedule of Fees is attached hereto as Exhibit “B” and incorporated herein by reference; and

WHEREAS, after careful consideration and review of the comments at the public hearing, the Council has determined that it is in the best interest of the health, safety and welfare of the inhabitants of the City to adopt the findings and recommendations of the IFFP and IFA to address the impacts of development upon the sanitary sewer system, to adopt the IFFP as proposed, to approve the IFA as proposed, to adopt the impact fees as proposed, to provide for the calculation and collection of such fees, and to provide for an appeal process, and an accounting and reporting method of the same.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council as follows:

Section 1. Findings. The Council finds and determines as follows:

1.1. All required notices have been given and made and public hearings conducted as required by the Impact Fees Act with respect to the IFFP, the IFA, and this Impact Fee Ordinance (this “Ordinance”).

1.2. Growth and development activities in the City will create additional demands on its infrastructure. The facility improvement requirements that are analyzed in the IFFP and the IFA are the direct result of the additional facility needs caused by future development activities. The persons responsible for growth and development activities should pay a proportionate share of the costs of the facilities needed to serve the growth and development activity.

1.3. Impact fees are necessary to achieve an equitable allocation to the costs borne in the past and to be borne in the future, in comparison with the benefits already received and yet to be received.

1.4. In enacting and approving the IFA including the impact fees recommended and this Ordinance, the Council has taken into consideration, and may consider on a case-by-case basis in the future, the future capital facilities and needs of the City, the capital financial needs of the City that are the result of the City’s future facilities’ needs, the distribution of the burden of costs to different properties within the City based on the use of the sewer systems of the City by

such properties, the financial contribution of those properties and other properties similarly situated in the City at the time of computation of the required fee and prior to the enactment of this Ordinance, all revenue sources available to the City, and the impact on future facilities that will be required by growth and new development activities in the City.

1.5. The provisions of this Ordinance shall be liberally construed in order to carry out the purpose and intent of the Council in establishing the impact fee program.

Section 2. Definitions.

2.1. Except as provided below, words and phrases that are defined in the Impact Fees Act shall have the same meaning in this Ordinance.

2.2. “Service Area” shall mean that geographic area consisting of the entire City.

2.3. “Project Improvement” does not mean system improvement and includes, but is not limited to, those projects identified in the plans for the benefit of growth.

2.4. “Utah State Impact Fees Act” shall mean Title 11, Chapter 36a, Utah Code Annotated or its successor state statute if that title and chapter is renumbered, recodified, or amended.

Section 3. Adoption.

The Council hereby approves and adopts the IFA including the recommended impact fees attached and the analyses reflected therein. The IFFP and the IFA are incorporated herein by reference and adopted as though fully set forth herein.

Section 4. Impact Fee Calculations.

4.1. *Impact Fees.* The impact fees imposed by this Ordinance shall have one or two components depending upon the fee; an equity buy-in and a future facilities impact fee. The Impact Fee shall be calculated as set forth below.

4.2. *Developer Credits/Developer Reimbursements.* A developer, including a school district or charter school, may be allowed to receive a credit against or proportionate reimbursement of impact fees if the developer dedicates land for a system improvement, builds and dedicates some or all of a system improvement, or dedicates a public facility that the City and the developer agree will reduce the need for a system improvement. A credit against impact fees shall be granted for any dedication of land for, improvement to, or new construction of, any system improvements provided by the developer if the facilities are system improvements to the respective utilities, or are dedicated to the public and offset the need for an identified future improvement.

4.3. *Adjustment of Fees.* The Council may adjust either up (but not above the maximum allowable fee) or down the standard impact fees at the time the fee is charged in order to respond to an unusual circumstance in specific cases and to ensure that the fees are imposed

fairly. The Council may adjust the amount of the fees to be imposed if the fee payer submits studies and data clearly showing that the payment of an adjusted impact fee is more consistent with the true impact being placed on the system.

4.4. Impact Fee Accounting. The City shall establish a separate interest-bearing ledger account for the cash impact fees collected pursuant to this Ordinance. Interest earned on such account shall be allocated to that account.

(a) Reporting. At the end of each fiscal year, the City shall prepare a report generally showing the source and amount of all monies collected, earned and received by the fund or account and of each expenditure from the fund or account. The report shall also identify impact fee fund by the year in which they were received, the project from which the funds were collected, the capital projects from which the funds were budgeted, and the projected schedule for expenditure and be provided to the State Auditor on the appropriate form found on the State Auditor’s Website.

(b) Impact Fee Expenditures. Funds collected pursuant to the impact fees shall be deposited in such account and only be used by the City to construct and upgrade the respective facilities to adequately service development activity or used as otherwise approved by law.

4.5. Refunds. The City shall refund any impact fee paid when:

(a) the fee payer has not proceeded with the development activity and has filed a written request with the Council for a refund within one (1) year after the impact fee was paid;

(b) the fees have not been spent or encumbered within six (6) years of the payment date; and

(c) no impact has resulted.

Section 5. Appeal.

5.1. Any person required to pay an impact fee who believes the fee does not meet the requirements of the law may file a written request for information with the Council.

5.2. Within two (2) weeks of the receipt of the request for information the City shall provide the person or entity with a copy of the reports and with any other relevant information relating to the impact fee.

5.3. Any person or entity required to pay an impact fee imposed under this article, who believes the fee does not meet the requirements of law may request and be granted a full administrative appeal of that grievance. An appeal shall be made to the Council within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of the action complained of, or the date when the complaining person reasonably should have become aware of the action.

5.4 The notice of the administrative appeal to the Council shall be filed and shall contain the following information:

(a) the person's name, mailing address, and daytime telephone number;

(b) a copy of the written request for information and a brief summary of the grounds for appeal; and

(c) the relief sought.

5.5 The City shall schedule the appeal before the Council no sooner than five (5) days and no later than fifteen (15) days from the date of the filing of the appeal. The written decision of the Council shall be made no later than thirty (30) days after the date the challenge to the fee is filed with the City and shall, when necessary, be forwarded to the appropriate officials for action.

Section 6. Recitals. The recitals set forth above are adopted and incorporated herein.

This Ordinance shall be effective as of **September 4, 2023** (90 days after its adoption by the Council as outlined in the Impact Fee Act).

, Mayor

Attested By:

, City Recorder

Exhibit A – IFFP & IFA

Exhibit B – Impact Fee Schedule

Future Facility Impact Fee Schedule		
Residential (per Unit)	ERC Multiplier	Impact Fee
Single Family	1.00	\$1,557
Multi-Family	0.75	\$1,168
Commercial (Meter Size)		
3/4	1	\$1,557
1	2.5	\$3,893
1 1/2	5	\$7,785
2	8	\$12,457
3	15	\$23,356
4	25	\$38,927

APPENDIX B – IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Sewer LOS

Category	Requirement	Value	System Wide Need	Units	/Capita
Collection	Average Flow	65 gallon per capita per day	240,370	gallons	65.00
	Peak Day Demand	170.95 gallons per capita per day	632,173	gallons	170.95
Treatment	Average Daily Inflow	0.23 MGD			
	Peak Hourly Average	0.61 MGD			

System Wide		
Current ERCs	1,266	
2032 ERCs	1,655	
New ERCs	389	2.71%
ERCs per Year	39	

Source: Mt. Pleasant City Sewer Collection & Treatment Master Plan, 2022

	2022	2032	
Population	3,698	4,834	2.71%
People per ERU	3	3	
ERUs	1,266	1,655	389

Source: Mt. Pleasant City Sewer Collection Master Plan, pg 12

Summary:

Collection Excess Capacity
 Treatment No Excess Capacity

Excess Capacity

Collection System

Year	System Utilization (q/Q)	Percent Utilization	
Existing (2022)	0.085	11.30%	
10-Year (2032)	0.126	16.80%	5.50%

Source: Mt. Pleasant City Sewer Collection Master Plan, Table1-2 - Collection System Pipe Utilization

Total Existing ERCs 1,266

Cost of Collection System 4,492,107
Total system capacity 11,207 9,941
Cost associated per ERC 400.82

Treatment System

None

Prioritized Future Collection Projects

Priority No.	Project Description	Recommended Timeframe	Project Cost	Estimated Number of Future ERUs until	
				Capacity	Cost per ERU
1	500 West Upsize	2032-2072	\$ 475,000	496	\$ 957.66
2	1000 South to Lagoons Upsize	2032-2072	\$ 250,000	1,423	\$ 175.69
Total			\$ 725,000		\$ 1,133

Source: Mt. Pleasant City Sewer Collection Master Plan, pg 49

Treatment Projects

Priority No.	Project Description	Project Type	Recommended Timeframe	Project Cost	% to Growth	Cost to Growth	ERCs served	Notes:
1	Rotary Drum Screen in Channel (New Building)	Condition	ASAP	\$ 1,132,000	42%	477,322	3,003	see notes below
2	Septage Receiving Station - Custom	Condition	ASAP	\$ 271,000	42%	114,271	3,003	see notes below
3	HDPE Lining - Cell #3	Condition/Capacity	ASAP	\$ 1,197,000	100%	1,197,000	1,737	existing lagoons at capacity but still functioning. Cell 3 will be 100% attributed to new growth (last 25-40 years?)
Total				\$ 2,600,000	69%	\$ 1,788,593		

Source: Mt. Pleasant City Sewer Collection Master Plan, pg 51

Treatment Projects past 10 years

4	Dredging Cell #1	Condition/Capacity	2032-2072	\$ 677,000	Cell #1 is currently composed of 26.5% sludge. This puts Cell #1 at risk for anaerobic/septic conditions. Dredging will recover the cell if it goes anaerobic/septic.
---	------------------	--------------------	-----------	------------	---

From: Gary Vance <gvance@jub.com>
 Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 3:38 PM
 To: cody <Cody@efg consulting.com>; cami@efg consulting.com
 Cc: Ethan Sunderland <esunderland@jub.com>; Christopher Slater <cslater@JUB.com>
 Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] FW: Mt Pleasant Treatment IF

Cody/Cami,
 Sorry for the delay in getting back to you on this.
 We identified 3 projects for the lagoon treatment system:
 New HDPE liner at Cell 3. The existing lagoons are at capacity but still function. Bringing on Cell 3 will be 100% attributed to new growth.
 New headworks screen. This is an existing deficiency. It will be sized to accommodate growth but I'm not sure new growth would need to pay for it. Currently there is no screen at all.
 New septage receiving station. This is an existing deficiency. Currently there is no septage receiving station, they just dump into an abandoned/dry lagoon cell (no treatment). The proposed project will receive septage up front of the new screen and treat the septage through the lagoons. It will be sized to accommodate growth but I'm not sure new growth would need to pay for it. Currently there is no septage treatment.
 Hope this helps, please let me know if you have additional questions.
 Thanks,
 Gary

From: Gary Vance <gvance@jub.com>
 Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2023 1:07 PM
 To: cami@efg consulting.com; Christopher Slater <cslater@JUB.com>
 Cc: cody <Cody@efg consulting.com>
 Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] FW: Mt Pleasant Treatment IF

The HDPE liner at Cell #3 will get them to 333,900 gal/day.
 1 ERU = 190 gal/day
 Total ERUs served for lining Cell #3 = 1737.
 Hope this helps, let me know if you need anything else.
 Thanks,
 Gary

Mt. Pleasant

Sewer Impact Fee

Excess Capacity	Purpose	Total Cost	Total ERCs	Remaining ERCs	% Remaining	Remaining Value	Cost/ERC
Collection	Collection	4,492,107	11,207	9,941	89%	3,984,499	401
Total		\$ 4,492,107				\$ 3,984,499	401

Future Facilities	Purpose	Total Cost	Total ERCs	Growth ERCs	% Growth	Remaining Value	Cost/ERC
Rotary Drum Screen in Channel (New Building)	Treatment	1,132,000	3,003	1,266	42%	477,322	377
Septage Receiving Station - Custom	Treatment	271,000	3,003	1,266	42%	114,271	90
HDPE Lining - Cell #3	Treatment	1,197,000	1,737	1,737	100%	1,197,000	689
Total		\$ 2,600,000				\$ 1,788,593	1,156

Future Facility Impact Fee Schedule			
Residential (per Unit)	ERC Multiplier	Impact Fee	
Single Family	1.00	\$	1,557
Multi-Family	0.75	\$	1,168
Commerical (Meter Size)			
	3/4	1	\$ 1,557
	1	2.5	\$ 3,893
	1 1/2	5	\$ 7,785
	2	8	\$ 12,457
	3	15	\$ 23,356
	4	25	\$ 38,927

SUMMARY OF IMPACT FEES

Sewer Impact Fee Schedule		
Residential (per unit)	ERC Multiplier	Impact Fee
	1	\$ 1,557
	0.75	\$ 1,168
Commercial (meter size)		
$\frac{3}{4}$	1	\$ 1,557
1	2.5	\$ 3,893
1 1/2	5	\$ 7,785
2	8	\$ 12,457
3	15	\$ 23,356
4	25	\$ 38,927