



# HARRISVILLE CITY

363 W. Independence Blvd · Harrisville, Utah 84404 · 801-782-4100  
www.cityofharrisville.com

MAYOR:  
Michelle Tait

COUNCIL MEMBERS:  
Grover Wilhelmsen  
Steve Weiss  
Blair Christensen  
Max Jackson  
Karen Fawcett

## CITY COUNCIL AGENDA March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2025

[Zoom Meeting Link](#)

Meeting ID: 876 5992 9509

Passcode: 357932

### 7:00 PM City Council Meeting

Presiding: Mayor Michelle Tait  
Mayor Pro Tem: Steve Weiss

1. **Call to Order** [Mayor Tait]
2. **Opening**
  - a. Pledge of Allegiance [Council Member Fawcett]
3. **Consent Items**
  - a. Approval of meeting minutes for February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2025 as presented.
4. **Employee Recognition**
5. **Oath Of Office**
  - a. Oath Of Office
6. **Business Items**
  - a. **Public Hearing Notice** – to receive input from the public for and/or against Ordinance 563; amending Park Impact Fees. [Jennie Knight]
  - b. Discussion/possible action to adopt Ordinance 563; amending Park Impact Fees. [Jennie Knight]
  - c. 750 W. Complex City Hall/Public Safety financial discussion. [Marcus Keller]
7. **Public Comment** – (3 Minute Maximum)
8. **Mayor/Council Follow-up**
9. **Closed Executive Session** – For the purposes described in UCA 52-4-205(1)(a); strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonable imminent litigation.
10. **Adjournment**

The foregoing City Council agenda was posted and can be viewed at City Hall, on the City's website [www.cityofharrisville.com](http://www.cityofharrisville.com), and at the Utah Public Notice Website at <http://pmn.utah.gov>. Notice of this meeting has also been duly provided as required by law.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Harrisville will make reasonable accommodations for participation in the meeting. Requests for assistance may be made by contacting the City Recorder at (801) 782-4100, at least three working days before the meeting.

Posted: By: Jack Fogal, City Recorder.

**MINUTES  
HARRISVILLE CITY COUNCIL  
February 11, 2025  
363 West Independence Blvd  
Harrisville, UT 84404**

---

**Minutes of a regular Harrisville City Council meeting held on February 11th, 2025 at 7:00 P.M. in the Harrisville City Council Chambers, 363 West Independence Blvd., Harrisville, UT.**

**Present:** Mayor Michelle Tait, Council Member Karen Fawcett, Council Member Grover Wilhelmsen, Council Member Blair Christensen, Council Member Max Jackson  
Council Member Steve Weiss.

**Excused:**

**Staff:** Jennie Knight, City Administrator, Justin Shinsel, Public Works Director, Jack Fogal, City Recorder, Mark Wilson, Chief of Police, Brody Flint, City Attorney, Bryan Fife, Parks and Recreation Director, Detective Jason Keller, Jill Hunt, City Treasurer, Sgt. Alicia Davis, Officer Jake Holmes, Sgt. Nick Taylor, Sgt. John Millaway, Officer Todd Fowers, Dennis Moore, Assistant Chief of Police, Officer Chris Paradis, Officer Michael Duffy, Officer Tyler Vincent, Officer Landon Silverwood, Officer Alex Moua.

**Visitors:** Arnold Tait, Robert Wood, Steven Hood, Makaila Holmes, Carlos Aguilar, Deanna Aguilar, Nathan Averill (via zoom), Kevin Karras (via zoom).

**1. Call to Order.**

Mayor Tait called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance.

**2. Opening Ceremony.**

Council Member Jackson opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. Consent Items**

- a. Approval of Meeting Minutes for January 14, 2025 and January 28, 2025 as presented.**

**Motion:** Council Member Christensen made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for January 14, 2025 and January 28, 2025 as presented, second by Council Member Weiss.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen, Yes  
Council Member Weiss, Yes  
Council Member Christensen, Yes  
Council Member Jackson, Yes  
Council Member Fawcett, Yes

The motion passed unanimously

**b. Advice and consent to ratify Mayor’s appointment for the Weber Mosquito Abatement District Board.**

Mayor Tait explained Council Member Wilhelmsen has served on the Board in the past and has volunteered to serve again.

**Motion:** Council Member Jackson made a motion to ratify the Mayor’s appointment of Grover Wilhelmsen for the Weber Mosquito Abatement District Board, second by Council Member Fawcett.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

- Council Member Wilhelmsen, Yes
- Council Member Weiss, Yes
- Council Member Christensen, Yes
- Council Member Jackson, Yes
- Council Member Fawcett, Yes

The motion passed unanimously

**4. Oath Of Office**

- a. Jack Fogal conducted the Oath of Office for Jake Holmes

**5. Business Items.**

**a. Discussion/possible action to accept the FY 2024 Audit Report.**

Rob Wood with HBME explained the financial audit this year was very interesting. There were thirty-six journal entries that needed correction. The state auditors will look at the independent auditor’s report that was sent to Council. He does not feel there are any intentional issues. The city has bonded in the past few years with a \$6,000,000 bond for the public works building and \$9,000,000 for a new city hall building. Included in the packet is a summary of statement net position. Business type activities broke even on the enterprise funds. Last year the Garbage fund had a deficit. This year the Enterprise Funds are all running as an operational break even. It is important that as the city receives increases for the cost it is passed on to keep the balance close to zero. Long term debt is being paid down, the bonds have decreased approximately \$400,000. There was a \$1,300,000 increase in governmental activities. There is a detailed breakdown of current assets and liabilities included in the packet. Restricted cash such as bond money and impact fees are a significant portion of the city’s assets. Main liabilities are the bonds and your pension liabilities. URS has done a good job managing pensions and pension liabilities are low. The General Fund is required by law to have a fund balance on anything assigned or unassigned between 5% and 35%. Currently the city is at 33.99%. It is a great position to be in. Capitol Project Fund had a loss of almost \$2,400,000. This change was expected due to expending bond funds for the public works building. All of the city’s proprietary funds should be self-sustaining from billing. Currently the city is compliant and all funds are self-sustaining. There are no compliance issues and you are compliant with all state laws and regulations for reporting. There was one internal control finding. It is on financial reporting and financial controls. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired did the loss of Jessica Hardy hurt us. Mayor Tait stated it did but Jill Hunt stepped up and has done a great job filling in. She was asked to fill a role that was new to her and had to figure it out. Rob Wood has been helping her learn some tips and tricks. Rob Wood stated he is not writing any findings as a “gotcha” moment. They were written to help the city address issues and learn. Jill Hunt has done a great

job stepping up to learn what was needed for the role. He would love to assist Jill Hunt in learning more. There are some items that need to be changed but they can be fixed. He would be happy to provide some recommendations for additional training resources. Mayor Tait stated she thinks we need to find someone to help Jill Hunt with the duties. Council Member Wilhelmsen agreed. Mayor Tait stated we will have staff look at what is needed. She thanked Rob Wood and Jill Hunt for all the work they did for the audit.

**Motion:** Council Member Jackson made a motion to accept the FY 2024 Audit Report, second by Council Member Wilhelmsen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen, Yes  
Council Member Weiss, Yes  
Council Member Christensen, Yes  
Council Member Jackson, Yes  
Council Member Fawcett, Yes

The motion passed unanimously

**b. Discussion/possible action to modify Spring/Fall Clean-Up for Garbage Services.**

Jennie Knight explained this is a follow-up discussion from the Council Retreat on January 28. Staff would like to continue the discussion regarding Spring/Fall Clean-Up. Staff would like Council to provide direction. Council Member Jackson stated when he helps his son take items to the Bountiful drop off, they check ID to make sure he is a resident. He suggested doing the clean-up at the new public works building, so we can lock up the dumpsters at night and check residency. Council Member Fawcett inquired if there are any limits to how many loads someone can bring. Jennie Knight stated we do not have a limit, and we have not been monitoring how many loads people drop off. Mayor Tait advised we may need to approve overtime to monitor the event. Council Member Weiss stated he would like someone to monitor the event so we can make sure things are not dumped that should not be. Council Member Wilhelmsen commented he likes the idea of monitoring the clean-up. It would show we are trying to keep the costs low for our residents. We need to have some checks and balances. He would support some overtime to make sure this is done right. This is a positive for residents but non-residents abuse it. He believes it should not be shut down, but we need controls. Council Member Christensen inquired if it has gotten worse. Bryan Fife advised it has gotten much worse. We have been receiving large items such as refrigerators, mattresses, and construction materials. Council Member Fawcett reminded Council this event costs approximately \$15,000 a year. Could this money be better used in other areas. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired how many dumpsters are used. Bryan Fife answered the dumpster numbers do not matter; we are charged based on weight. Jennie Knight stated we can provide green waste only and not garbage. We could still monitor the event at the public works building. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired when would a decision need to be made. Bryan Fife stated we would need an answer by mid-March. Justin Shinsel stated all other agencies he has worked for closely monitor and control the clean-ups. Bryan Fife reported we have never tracked this event before but from his observations the bulk of materials left is garbage. It would significantly reduce costs to only provide green waste. Council Member Weiss stated he believes providing only green waste would be the best option. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired will this lead to more people leaving trash around their house. Justin Shinsel stated we have less of an issue with the

garbage around homes, more of trash being thrown into empty fields. He has heard of some cities giving their residents a one-time dump pass. The major consensus from staff is if it continues it needs to be monitored. Council Member Wilhelmsen stated if we cannot monitor the trash let's cut it back to green waste only. Council Member Fawcett summarized that we eliminate the garbage dumpsters, only provide green waste dumpsters, and approve some overtime to monitor the event appropriately. Mayor Tait stated if we vote now, it gives staff time to set up the event and provide notice in the newsletter. Council Member Wilhelmsen inquired how other cities get a discounted rate for a one-time dump pass. Justin Shinsel stated he is unsure currently but will look into it and report back.

**Motion:** Council Member Weiss made a motion to provide green waste dumpsters only during Spring/Fall Clean Up and to approve the overtime needed to monitor the event appropriately, second by Council Member Christensen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen, Yes  
Council Member Weiss, Yes  
Council Member Christensen, Yes  
Council Member Jackson, Yes  
Council Member Fawcett, Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

**c. Discussion/possible action to surplus miscellaneous items.**

Jennie Knight explained staff is asking to surplus three refrigerators that were replaced with Covid Cares Act money. These were replaced to be in compliance with covid guidelines. They are at the cabin not being utilized.

**Motion:** Council Member Wilhelmsen made a motion to surplus three refrigerators, second by Council Member Fawcett.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen, Yes  
Council Member Weiss, Yes  
Council Member Christensen, Yes  
Council Member Jackson, Yes  
Council Member Fawcett, Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

**d. 2025 City Goals.**

Jennie Knight reported on the 2024 City Goals. The park impact fee analysis will be presented in March. Ben Lomond Views development is moving forward. The project was sold at the end of 2024. The new developer has provided the city with a modified plat. There was a preconstruction meeting held and we should see dirt moving. Flag Ship homes is the new developer. The third goal was hiring a planner but the contracted planner is working well for the city. We will see at the end of the fiscal year how much it cost. Economical and commercial

development is requested to be continued in 2025. Transparency and communication was another goal. We are working with John Gilfoil on a new website to be more transparent. Utility rate analysis has been requested to be continued in 2025. The public works building will be completed shortly. Our Moderate-Income Housing Plan was accepted and we are in compliance. The business license study was completed and adopted. Staff's suggestion for 2025 goals are; adopt an attainable housing ordinance, complete Transportation Plan projects using federal appropriation funds, create a Capital Improvement Plan, re-evaluate and look at strategies for our General Plan and Affordable Housing to ensure compliance with the state, General Obligation Bond Election for the public safety building. Council Member Jackson inquired what would happen if we were out of compliance with our Moderate-Income Housing Plan. Are there fines or daily fees. Brody Flint stated he is unsure what the daily fee is, but it is directly tied to our transportation funds. If you are not compliant your roads will be a lot more expensive. Justin Shinsel stated it is your class B and C funds. Brody Flint explained if you are compliant, you can receive priority funding for transportation projects. Jennie Knight explained there is a daily fee that goes to the Olene Walker Fund but is unsure of the dollar amount. Council Member Fawcett inquired can we post on our website about what would happen if we are not complaint. Jennie Knight stated we can do that.

## **6. Public Comment**

Mayor Tait opened the public comment period.

No public comment was offered.

Mayor Tait closed the public comment period.

## **7. Mayor/Council Follow-up**

Council Member Christensen thanked staff and especially Jill Hunt for their hard work with the audit.

Council Member Weiss reported on the senior luncheon. Justin Shinsel presented to the group. They had a great time.

Justin Shinsel explained we are optimistic that we can move into the new public works building in 30 days. His team has been working with the Ben Lomond developer to get it started.

Bryan Fife explained with the lack of snow his team has been able to work in the parks and get projects done. Boys' basketball is going great with no issues.

Mayor Tait inquired how much are our class B and C road funds a year. Justin Shinsel stated this year it is approximately \$400,000. Brody Flint stated he looked up the fee for non-compliance with the Moderate-Income Housing Plan. The first year of non-compliance will cost \$250 per day, a second year of non-compliance raises the fee to \$500 per day.

## **8. Closed Executive Session -** For the purposes described in UCA 52-4-205(1)(a); for discussion of the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual.

**Motion:** Council Member Weiss made a motion to enter a Closed Executive Session for the purposes described in UCA 52-4-205(1)(a); for discussion of the character, professional

competence, or physical or mental health of an individual, second by Council Member Wilhelmsen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen, Yes  
Council Member Weiss, Yes  
Council Member Christensen, Yes  
Council Member Jackson, Yes  
Council Member Fawcett, Yes

The motion passed unanimously

**Motion:** Council Member Jackson made a motion to close a Closed Executive Session for the purposes described in UCA 52-4-205(1)(a); for discussion of the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual, second by Council Member Christensen.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen, Yes  
Council Member Weiss, Yes  
Council Member Christensen, Yes  
Council Member Jackson, Yes  
Council Member Fawcett, Yes

The motion passed unanimously

### **9. Adjournment**

**Motion:** Council Member Weiss motioned to adjourn the meeting, second by Council Member Fawcett.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

Council Member Wilhelmsen, Yes  
Council Member Weiss, Yes  
Council Member Christensen, Yes  
Council Member Jackson, Yes  
Council Member Fawcett, Yes

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 P.M.

---

**MICHELLE TAIT**  
Mayor

**ATTEST:**

---

**Jack Fogal**  
City Recorder  
Approved this 11th day of March, 2025

DRAFT



**HARRISVILLE CITY  
ORDINANCE 563**

**TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE AMENDED**

**AN ORDINANCE OF HARRISVILLE CITY, UTAH, AMENDING SECTION 10.30.040  
RELATING TO IMPACT FEES AS PROVIDED HEREIN; ADOPTING THE IFFP AND  
IFA PREPARED BY THIRD PARTIES; SEVERABILITY, AND PROVIDING AN  
EFFECTIVE DATE.**

**WHEREAS**, Harrisville City (hereafter “City”) is a municipal corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Utah;

**WHEREAS**, Title 11, Chapter 36a of the Utah Code Annotated authorized municipalities in the State of Utah to prepare an Impact Fee Analysis;

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with state law, the appropriate notices have been given;

**WHEREAS**, the City has retained Zions Public Finance to prepare the Impact Fee Analysis (hereinafter “IFA”) and the applicable Impact Fee Facilities Plan (hereinafter “IFFP”);

**WHEREAS**, the City desires to impose its impact fees in compliance with state law;

**WHEREAS**, the City Council held is public hearing on March 11, 2025 on this impact fee enactment;

**WHEREAS**, the Council deems it to be in the best interest of the health safety, and welfare of the residents to enact impact fees;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the City Council of Harrisville City, Utah, as follows:

**Section 1. Amendment.**

Section 10.30.040 is hereby amended to read as follows:

**10.30.040 Adoption Of IFFP And IFA**

3. Parks. The Parks IFFP dated ~~September 2015~~ January 2025, and IFA dated ~~September 2015~~ January 25, as prepared by the respective consultants is hereby adopted with the impact fee rates specified therein. The impact fees adopted herein are hereby enacted as a condition of the issuance of a building permit but the City for any development activity which creates additional demand and need for public facilities.

**Section 2: Severability.**

If a court of competent jurisdiction determines that any part of this ordinance is unconstitutional or invalid, then such portion of this Ordinance, or specific application of the ordinance, shall be severed from the remainder which remainder shall continue in full force and effect.

**Section 3. Effective Date**

This Ordinance is effective immediately ninety (90) days from the date of publication or posting.

**PASSED AND APPROVED** by the City Council on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2025

\_\_\_\_\_  
**MICHELLE TAIT**, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**JACK FOGAL**, City Recorder

**RECORDED** this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2025.

**PUBLISHED OR POSTED** this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2025.

**CERTIFICATE OF PASSAGE AND PUBLICATION OR POSTING**

According to the provision of UCA §10-3-713, 1953 as amended, I, the municipal recorder of Harrisville City, hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was duly passed and published, or posted at 1) City Hall 2) 2150 North, and 3) Harrisville Cabin on the above reference dates.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**City Recorder** **DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

# HARRISVILLE CITY



## DRAFT PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN



## Executive Summary

Harrisville City (the “City”) is anticipated to experience high growth in the coming years. This growth is due to an unusually large number of developments in various stages of approval. For example, new developments from the closure of the Ben Lomond golf course are expected to create over 600 new housing units alone.

TABLE 1: PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH SUMMARY, 2024-2034

Year	Population
2024	7,166
2034	9,923
<b>Population Growth 2024-2034</b>	<b>2,757</b>
<b>Population Growth (%)*</b>	<b>38.47%</b>

*Source: Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute, U.S. Census Bureau 2023 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Harrisville City, ZPFI*  
 \*Percentage is calculated using the total 2024 population.

Service levels are measured in terms of improved system park acres per 1,000 City residents.<sup>1</sup> The existing level of service (ELOS) is measured by dividing the total number of existing eligible park acres by the City’s 2024 population. That calculation is then multiplied by 1,000 to reach the targeted metric of acres per 1,000 persons.

Harrisville would like to maintain its ELOS into the future. The resulting ELOS and proposed level of service (PLOS) are outlined in the table below:

TABLE 2: EXISTING AND PROPOSED LEVELS OF SERVICE

	Existing LOS	Proposed LOS	Excess Capacity
Park Land and Improvements (acres per 1,000 persons)	5.73	5.73	0

No excess capacity was identified in any current system parks or facilities. In order to maintain the proposed level of service into the future, the City will acquire more acres of improved park space. If additional park space isn’t acquired, the service level would drop from 5.73 to 4.14 acres per 1,000 persons.

TABLE 3: IMPACTS TO SERVICE LEVELS DUE TO NEW DEVELOPMENT IF NO IMPROVEMENTS ARE MADE

	Acres per 1,000 persons 2024	Acres per 1,000 persons 2034
Park Land and Improvements	5.73	4.14

The cost of acquiring the park land and improvements to maintain the proposed level of service is anticipated to be \$6,037,471.59.

The anticipated costs are to be paid by considering various revenue sources (including grants, bonds, interfund loans, and impact fees). Detailed information regarding the funding mechanisms considered are found in the body of this impact fee facilities plan (IFFP).

<sup>1</sup> The IFFP shows different figures than the General Plan. This difference occurs because (1) the IFFP establishes the service level based on the 2024 population, whereas the Parks, Recreation, and Trails General Plan establishes its metrics based on 2016 figures which were used when the plan was prepared by *Rural Community Consultants* and subsequently adopted by the City on October 8, 2019.

## Utah Code Legal Requirements

---

Utah law requires that communities prepare an Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) before preparing an Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) and enacting an impact fee. Utah law also requires that communities give notice of their intent to prepare and adopt an IFFP. This IFFP follows all legal requirements as outlined below. The City has retained Zions Public Finance, Inc. (ZPFI) to prepare this Impact Fee Facilities Plan in accordance with legal requirements.

### *Notice of Intent to Prepare Impact Fee Facilities Plan*

---

A local political subdivision must provide written notice of its intent to prepare an IFFP before preparing the Plan (Utah Code §11-36a-501). This notice must be posted on the Utah Public Notice website. The City has complied with this noticing requirement for the IFFP.

### *Preparation of Impact Fee Facilities Plan*

---

Utah Code requires that each local political subdivision, before imposing an impact fee, prepare an impact fee facilities plan. (Utah Code 11-36a-301).

Section 11-36a-302(a) of the Utah Code outlines the requirements of an impact fee facilities plan which is required to identify the following:

- (i) identify the existing level of service
- (ii) establish a proposed level of service
- (iii) identify any excess capacity to accommodate future growth at the proposed level of service
- (iv) identify demands placed upon existing facilities by new development activity at the proposed level of service; and
- (v) identify the means by which the political subdivision or private entity will meet those growth demands.

Further, the proposed level of service may:

- (i) exceed the existing level of service if, independent of the use of impact fees, the political subdivision or private entity provides, implements, and maintains the means to increase the existing level of service for existing demand within six years of the date on which new growth is charged for the proposed level of service; or
- (ii) establish a new public facility if, independent of the use of impact fees, the political subdivision or private entity provides, implements, and maintains the means to increase the existing level of service for existing demand within six years of the date on which new growth is charged for the proposed level of service.

In preparing an impact fee facilities plan, each local political subdivision shall generally consider all revenue sources to finance the impacts on system improvements, including:

- (a) grants
- (b) bonds
- (c) interfund loans
- (d) impact fees; and

- (e) anticipated or accepted dedications of system improvements.

*Certification of Impact Fee Facilities Plan*

---

Utah Code 11-36a-306 states that an impact fee facilities plan shall include a written certification from the person or entity that prepares the impact fee facilities plan. This certification is included at the conclusion of this analysis.

## Impact Fee Facilities Plan

Harrisville City (the “City”) updated its General Plan in 2019. The General Plan’s component on Parks, Recreation, and Trails, along with updated input from the City, forms the basis for this Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP).

The City has determined that there is one service area citywide and that there is no excess capacity in its parks and improvements in 2024. Only residential development is considered to create demand for parks, trails, and recreation facilities, and therefore, only residential growth has been considered in the determination of impact fees.

The IFFP considers only system facilities in the calculation of impact fees. For the City, this has been determined to mean community and regional parks and trail systems. Local parks and trails are considered project improvements and have not been included in the calculation of impact fees.

### Existing Service Levels, Proposed Service Levels, and Excess Capacity

*Utah Code 11-36a-302(1)(a)(i)(ii)(iii)*

#### Growth in Demand

Based on the most recent decennial census, Harrisville City had a 2020 population of 7,036 and has an estimated 2024 population of 7,166. However, the City is anticipated to experience high growth within the study period of 2024-2034. This growth is due to a large number of developments, in various stages of approval, that are anticipated to be completed in the next ten years. For example, the new development resulting in the closure of the Ben Lomond golf course is expected to create over 600 new housing units alone.

In contrast, it is anticipated that future commercial growth will not place any additional demand on park or trail facilities. Therefore, this demand analysis considers only future population growth. Residential growth is projected as follows:

TABLE 4: PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH, 2024-2034

Year	Population	Population Growth
2024	7,166	
2025	7,284	118
2026	7,402	118
2027	7,961	559
2028	8,520	559
2029	9,079	559
2030	9,599	520
2031	9,679	80
2032	9,760	81
2033	9,841	81
2034	9,923	82
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,757</b>

*Source: Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute, U.S. Census Bureau 2023 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Harrisville City, ZPFI*

Population projections are for 2,757 new residents between 2024 and 2034.

## Existing Service Levels

### Parks and Improvements

Harrisville City currently has 41.08 improved system acres that include a variety of recreation facility improvements. System parks within the City include Millennium Park, Harrisville Park, Independence Park, and Martin Harris Bicentennial Park & Cabin. The table below lists the total improved acres for all parks in Harrisville City. Project parks and improvements, such as neighborhood parks or trails solely within a development, are not counted as part of Harrisville City’s park system. The City’s existing system parks are shown in the table below:

TABLE 5: SYSTEM PARKS

Park Description	Park Acres
Millennium Park	8.14
Harrisville Park	16.40
Independence Park	13.00
Martin Harris Bicentennial Park & Cabin	3.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>41.08</b>

The existing level of service for parks, for the purpose of calculating impact fees, is 5.73 acres per 1,000 residents, calculated by dividing the 41.08 eligible park acres by the 2024 population of 7,166.

TABLE 6: EXISTING AND PROPOSED LEVELS OF SERVICE (LOS) FOR SYSTEM PARKS

	Improved Acres	Existing LOS	Proposed LOS
Park Land with Improvements (acres per 1,000 persons)	41.08	5.73	5.73

Improvements within the system parks, in terms of current level of investment, are summarized in the table below:

TABLE 7: EXISTING SYSTEM PARK IMPROVEMENTS

Park	Number	Cost Per Unit	Total Cost
Acres	41.08	\$150,000.00	\$6,162,000.00
Sod and Irrigated Acres	34.57	\$113,256.00	\$3,915,259.92
Asphalt SF (Parking Stalls)	120,620.15	\$12.50	\$1,507,751.88
Trails/Walking Paths	7,180.03	\$45.00	\$323,101.35
Pavilions/Boweries	1	\$175,000.00	\$175,000.00
Picnic Tables	35	\$1,285.00	\$44,975.00
Benches	8	\$800.00	\$6,400.00
Standard Restrooms	3	\$120,000.00	\$360,000.00
Fencing (lf)	6,920.28	\$20.00	\$138,405.60
Playgrounds	2	\$94,000.00	\$188,000.00
Drinking Fountain	3	\$1,200.00	\$3,600.00
Fire Pits	1	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
Parks storage and office	1	\$800,000.00	\$800,000.00
Storage Sheds	3	\$50,000.00	\$150,000.00
Lighting	24	\$4,000.00	\$96,000.00



Park	Number	Cost Per Unit	Total Cost
Tennis Courts	2	\$60,000.00	\$120,000.00
Ball Diamonds	1	\$60,000.00	\$60,000.00
Basketball Courts	1	\$65,000.00	\$65,000.00
Volleyball / Sand	1	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Frisbee Golf	1	\$5,513.00	\$5,513.00
Splash Pads	1	\$255,000.00	\$255,000.00
Pond	1	\$75,000.00	\$75,000.00
Cabin	1	\$953,600.00	\$953,600.00
Concrete Stage	1	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$15,692,606.75</b>
<b>Total (excluding land)</b>			<b>\$9,530,606.75</b>
<b>Total Park Acres</b>			<b>41.08</b>
<b>Cost of Improvements per Acre (excl. land)</b>			<b>\$232,001.14</b>

\*Walking paths are found within the parks and are considered a park amenity. They are separate and distinct from the City's trail system.

The table is used to determine an existing standard for system parks. With 41.08 existing system park acres, the average cost of improvements is \$232,001.14 per acre (total cost of improvements divided by total system acres).

In order to maintain the existing service level, the City will need to acquire 15.80<sup>2</sup> additional acres of improved park land over the next 10 years. The estimated cost of purchasing park land is \$150,000 per acre, for a total cost (land and improvements) per acre of \$382,001.14.<sup>3</sup>

## Trails

Although there are 1.36 miles of paths<sup>4</sup> and sidewalks that connect some of the City's system parks, there are currently no trail miles in Harrisville City. The City and its General Plan have expressed and continue to express a strong desire to create a trail system to better serve the needs of its residents. However, due to the lack of trails and the prohibition of using impact fees to raise the current level of service, trails are not considered in this analysis.

## Proposed Service Levels

The City has determined that all parks are at capacity. The use of system parks is especially high during the baseball, softball, tennis, splash pad, and soccer season, often leading to limited parking availability. Additionally, the Martin Harris Cabin is booked (with the exception of January and February) most weekends and some weekdays.

The City seeks to maintain its current level of park services. Based on current park use by residents, recreation sports leagues, and a growing number of residents, the City does not have excess

<sup>2</sup> Calculated by taking the existing LOS (5.73 acres per 1,000 persons) and multiplying it by the anticipated population growth divided by 1,000 (2,757 ÷ 1,000).

<sup>3</sup> Further details and commentary of these calculations are found in the City's Impact Fee Analysis (IFA).

<sup>4</sup> City trails are distinct from City paths. City trails are defined as walkways and bikeways that are (1) located outside of parks, (2) are owned and maintained by the City, and (3) serve the entire community. In contrast, paths refer to walkways and bikeways that are located within system parks.

capacity. Therefore, the desired level of park service is identified as 5.73 acres per 1,000 persons, which is the current level of service.

**Identify Excess Capacity**

There is currently no excess capacity in any of the City’s recreation system, including parks and its related facilities.

**Identify Demands Placed on Existing Public Facilities by New Development Activity at Proposed Level of Service**

*Utah Code 11-36a-302(1)(a)(iv)*

Existing park service levels would decline, due to new development activity, from the existing service level of 5.73 acres per 1,000 persons to 4.14 acres per 1,000 residents by 2034 if no improvements are made. A summary of this calculation is presented in the table below:

TABLE 8: PARK LAND AND IMPROVEMENT SERVICE LEVEL IMPACTS FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY, 2024-2034

Year	Population	Population Growth	Land Acres per 1,000 Persons if No New Facilities <sup>5</sup>
2024	7,166		5.73
2025	7,284	118	5.64
2026	7,402	118	5.55
2027	7,961	559	5.16
2028	8,520	559	4.82
2029	9,079	559	4.52
2030	9,599	520	4.28
2031	9,679	80	4.24
2032	9,760	81	4.21
2033	9,841	81	4.17
2034	9,923	82	4.14
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,757</b>	

**Proposed Means for Meeting the Demands Placed Upon Existing Public Facilities by New Development**

*Utah Code 11-36a-302(1)(a)(v)*

The City will need to acquire additional park lands and improvements to maintain its existing service levels and accommodate future growth. Impact fees will be used to maintain the existing service levels for parks.

The figures in the following table were calculated by multiplying the existing service levels by the cost for each line item by the projected growth in demand over the next ten years.

<sup>5</sup> Calculated by taking the current amount of improved park acres (41.08) and dividing it by the population in a given year divided by 1,000.

Table 9: Cost of New Construction Due to New Growth, 2024-2034

Description	Amount
Cost of Park and Land Improvements	\$15,692,606.75
2024 Population	7,166
Existing Cost per Capita	\$2,189.87
Population Growth, 2024-2034	2,757
<b>Land and Improvements Needed</b>	<b>\$6,037,471.59</b>
<b>Park land and Improvements, Cost per Capita</b>	<b>\$2,189.87</b>

## Consideration of All Revenue Sources

*Utah Code 11-36a-302(2)*

### General Obligation (GO) Bonds

Generally, this revenue approach is used for facilities that are widely desired across the community and that benefit all property owners. GO bonds are backed by a City's taxing power. If GO bonds were issued to pay for the demands placed on purchased parks and recreation facilities by new growth, existing property owners would be paying for the impacts of growth. Therefore, GO bonds are not viewed as an equitable means of financing the future parks and recreation facilities related to new growth.

### Special Assessment Areas (SAA) Bonds

SAA bonds place an assessment on real property. Generally, these assessments are levied for specific infrastructure improvements in specific geographic areas and are tied to demand – i.e., lot size, frontage, etc. Because new development will take place in different locations throughout Harrisville, special assessment areas are not seen as a preferred means of financing new park facilities.

### Grants

Grant monies are an ideal means for the City to fund future parks and recreation growth. However, the availability of grant funds has been greatly reduced over the past few years and it is not likely that the City would be able to fund its future demand based on this revenue source.

### Impact Fees

Impact fees are a reasonable means of funding growth-related infrastructure. An Impact Fee Analysis is required to accurately assess the true impact of a particular user upon the City's infrastructure and to preclude existing users from subsidizing new growth. Impact fees are calculated based upon the portion of the cost of capital infrastructure that relates to growth. This method also considers current deficiencies and does not place a burden on future development to solve those deficiencies.

### Anticipated or Accepted Dedications of System Improvements

Any item that a developer funds must be included in the IFFP if a credit against impact fees is to be issued and must be agreed upon with the City before construction of the improvements.

## Certification

---

Zions Public Finance, Inc. certifies 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; or
  - 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; and
  
3. complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.

# HARRISVILLE CITY



## DRAFT PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS



## Executive Summary

Harrisville City (the “City”) has determined its proposed level of service for Parks, Recreation, and Trails in its 2025 Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP). The impact fee for Parks, Recreation, and Trails (and its respective calculations) are outlined in this Impact Fee Analysis (IFA).

The City is anticipated to experience high growth in the coming years. This growth, resulting from new development, will create more demand for City parks and recreation.

TABLE 1: PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH SUMMARY, 2024-2034

Year	Population
2024	7,166
2034	9,923
<b>Population Growth 2024-2034</b>	<b>2,757</b>
<b>Population Growth (%)*</b>	<b>38.47%</b>

*Source: Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute, U.S. Census Bureau 2023 ACS 5-Year Estimates, Harrisville City, ZPFI*  
*\*Percentage is calculated using the total 2024 population.*

Both the existing and proposed levels of service are 5.73 acres per 1,000 persons. Calculations and further analysis of these concepts and figures are available in the IFFP.

TABLE 2: EXISTING AND PROPOSED SERVICE LEVELS

	UNITS		
	Existing	Proposed	Excess Capacity
Park Land and Improvements (acres per 1,000 persons)	5.73	5.73	0.00

All parks are currently at capacity. Anticipated City growth through residential development is expected to diminish current service levels if no action is taken. If no improved park land is purchased, the level of service would decline from 5.73 to 4.14 improved park acres per 1,000 residents by 2034.

The cost of new system improvements required to maintain the service levels related to new development activity is based on the costs of system-wide park facilities, impact fee fund balances, and the consultant fees for the preparation of the IFFP and IFA. The total fee is \$2,023.56 per capita, which amounts to \$5,949.27 per household, given an average household size of 2.94 persons per household.

TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Summary of Gross Fee	
Park Land and Improvements per Capita	\$2,189.87
Consultant Costs per Capita	\$3.63
Fund Balance Credit	(\$169.94)
<b>Total per Capita</b>	<b>\$2,023.56</b>
Household Size	2.94
<b>Total per Household</b>	<b>\$5,949.27</b>

*Source: Harrisville City, US Census Bureau 2023 ACS 5-Year Estimates, ZPFI*

## Manner of Financing

---

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(2)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)(h)*

An impact fee is a one-time fee that is implemented by a local government on new development to help fund and pay for all or a portion of the costs of public facilities that are needed to serve new development. Additionally, impact fees allow new growth to share in the cost of existing facilities that have excess capacity.

### **Impact Fee Credits**

The Impact Fees Act requires credits to be paid back to development for future fees that may be paid to fund system improvements found in the IFFP so that new development is not charged twice.

### **Extraordinary Costs and Time Price Differential**

It is not anticipated that there will be any extraordinary costs in servicing newly developed park properties. To account for the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times, actual costs have been used to compute buy-in costs to public facilities with excess capacity and current costs have been used to compute impacts on system improvements required by anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility.

## Utah Code Legal Requirements

---

**Preparation of Impact Fee Analysis.** Utah Code requires that “each local political subdivision... intending to impose an impact fee shall prepare a written analysis (Impact Fee Analysis or IFA) of each impact fee” (Utah Code 11-36a-303). This IFA follows all legal requirements as outlined below. The City of Saratoga Springs has retained Zions Public Finance, Inc. (ZPFI) to prepare this Impact Fee Analysis in accordance with legal requirements.

Section 11-36a-304 of the Utah Code outlines the requirements of an impact fee analysis which is required to identify the following:

- anticipated impact on or consumption of any existing capacity of a public facility by the anticipated development activity;

- anticipated impact on system improvements required by the anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility;

- how anticipated impacts are reasonably related to the anticipated development activity

- the proportionate share of:

  - costs for existing capacity that will be recouped; and

  - costs of impacts on system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development activity; and

  - how the impact fee was calculated

Further, in analyzing whether or not the proportionate share of the costs of public facilities are reasonably related to the new development activity, the local political subdivision or private entity, as the case may be, shall identify, if applicable:

- the cost of each existing public facility that has excess capacity to serve the anticipated development resulting from the new development activity;

- the cost of system improvements for each public facility;

- other than impact fees, the manner of financing for each public facility such as user charges, special assessments, bonded indebtedness, general taxes, or federal grants;

- the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to financing the excess capacity of and system improvements for each existing public facility, by means such as user charges, special assessments, or payment from the proceeds of general taxes;

- the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to the cost of existing public facilities and system improvements in the future;



the extent to which the development activity is entitled to a credit against impact fees because the development activity will dedicate system improvements or public facilities that will offset the demand for system improvements, inside or outside the proposed development;

extraordinary costs, if any, in servicing the newly developed properties; and

the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times.

**Calculating Impact Fees.** Utah Code 11-36a-305 states that for purposes of calculating an impact fee, a local political subdivision or private entity may include the following:

construction contract price;

cost of acquiring land, improvements, materials, and fixtures;

cost for planning, surveying, and engineering fees for services provided for and directly related to the construction of the system improvements; and

for a political subdivision, debt service charges if the political subdivision might use impact fees as a revenue stream to pay the principal and interest on bonds, notes or other obligations issued to finance the costs of the system improvements and

one or more expenses for overhead

Additionally, the Code states that each political subdivision or private entity shall base impact fee amounts on realistic estimates and the assumptions underlying those estimates shall be disclosed in the impact fee analysis.

**Certification of Impact Fee Analysis.** Utah Code 11-36a-306 states that an impact fee analysis shall include a written certification from the person or entity that prepares the impact fee analysis. This certification is included at the conclusion of this analysis.

**Impact Fee Enactment.** Utah Code 11-36a-401 states that a local political subdivision or private entity wishing to impose impact fees shall pass an impact fee enactment in accordance with Section 11-36a-402. Additionally, Utah Code 11-36a-401 states that an impact fee imposed by an impact fee enactment may not exceed the highest fee justified by the impact fee analysts. An impact fee enactment may not take effect until 90 days after the day on which the impact fee enactment is approved.

**Notice of Intent to Prepare Impact Fee Analysis.** A local political subdivision must provide written notice of its intent to prepare an IFA before preparing the Analysis (Utah Code 11-36a-503(1)). This notice must be posted on the Utah Public Notice website for at least 10 days. The City has complied with this noticing requirement for the IFA by posting notice.

## Impact Fee Analysis

Harrisville City (“City”) updated its General Plan in 2019. The General Plan’s component on Parks, Recreation, and Trails, along with updated input from the City, forms the basis for this Impact Fee Analysis (IFA). Only residential development is considered to create demand for parks, trails, and recreation facilities, and therefore, only residential growth has been considered in the determination of impact fees.

Utah Code allows cities to include only system parks for the purpose of calculating impact fees. Project parks cannot be used to establish levels of service eligible to be maintained through impact fees. Based on input from the Harrisville City and the consultants, a system park is defined as a park that serves more than one local development area. System parks in Harrisville include community and regional parks.

This IFA is organized based on the legal requirements of Utah Code 11-36a-304.

### Impact on Consumption of Existing Capacity

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(a)*

The City’s current system parks include Millennium Park, Harrisville Park, Independence Park, and the Martin Harris Bicentennial Park & Cabin. These parks contain a wide variety of improvements and comprise 41.08 total improved park acres.

TABLE 4: SYSTEM PARKS

Park Description	Park Acres
Millennium Park	8.14
Harrisville Park	16.40
Independence Park	13.00
Martin Harris Bicentennial Park & Cabin	3.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>41.08</b>

Based on the most recent decennial census, Harrisville City had a 2020 population of 7,036 and has an estimated 2024 population of 7,166. The City is anticipated to experience high growth within the study period. This growth is due to a large number of developments, in various stages of approval, that are anticipated to be completed in the next ten years. For example, the new development resulting in the closure of the Ben Lomond golf course is expected to create over 600 new housing units alone.<sup>1</sup>

All system-wide parks have no excess capacity. With incoming population growth and a current level of service of 5.73 improved acres per 1,000 persons, the service level will decline if no action is taken.

<sup>1</sup>In contrast, it is anticipated that future commercial growth will not place any additional demand on park or trail facilities. Therefore, this demand analysis considers only future population growth.

TABLE 5: PARK LAND AND IMPROVEMENT SERVICE LEVEL IMPACTS FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY, 2024-2034

Year	Population	Population Growth	Land Acres per 1,000 Persons if No New Facilities <sup>2</sup>
2024	7,166		5.73
2025	7,284	118	5.64
2026	7,402	118	5.55
2027	7,961	559	5.16
2028	8,520	559	4.82
2029	9,079	559	4.52
2030	9,599	520	4.28
2031	9,679	80	4.24
2032	9,760	81	4.21
2033	9,841	81	4.17
2034	9,923	82	4.14
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,757</b>	

**Identify the Means by Which the Political Subdivision or Private Entity Will Meet Growth Demands**

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(b)*

The proposed level of park service is 5.73 improved park acres per 1,000 persons. As stated previously, if no new park land and improvements are purchased, the level of service would decline from 5.73 to 4.14 improved park acres per 1,000 residents in 2034.

TABLE 6: IMPACTS TO SERVICE LEVELS DUE TO NEW DEVELOPMENT IF NO IMPROVEMENTS ARE MADE

	Existing Level of Service 2024	Projected Level of Service 2034
Park Land and Improvements (acres per 1,000 persons)	5.73	4.14

Because the City intends on maintaining its level of service, it will need to acquire additional park lands and improvements. Impact fees will be used to maintain the existing service levels for parks and improvements.

The figures in the following table were calculated by multiplying the existing service levels by the cost for each line item by the projected growth in demand over the next ten years.

TABLE 7: COST OF NEW CONSTRUCTION DUE TO NEW GROWTH, 2024-2034

	Proposed Service Level	Facilities Needed in 10 Years	Total Improvement Cost Needed Over 10 Years
Improved Park Acres - per 1,000 population	5.73	15.80 <sup>3</sup>	\$6,037,471.59 <sup>4</sup>
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$6,037,471.59</b>

<sup>2</sup> Calculated by taking the number of system-wide acres (41.08) and dividing it by the population for a given year divided by 1,000.

<sup>3</sup> Calculated by taking the existing LOS (5.73 acres per 1,000 persons) and multiplying it by the anticipated population growth divided by 1,000 (2,757 ÷ 1,000).

<sup>4</sup> A summary of how this figure was derived can be found in Table 9.

To maintain the proposed LOS of 5.73 improved acres per 1,000 residents, the City will need to spend \$6,037,471.59 for park land and improvements.

**Relationship of Anticipated Impacts to Anticipated Development Activity**

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(c)*

The demand placed on existing public park facilities by new development activity is attributable to population growth. Harrisville City has a 2024 population of 7,166 persons, and as a result of anticipated development activity, will grow to a projected 9,923 persons by 2034 – an increase of 2,757 persons. As growth occurs as a result of increased development activity, more parks system improvements are needed to maintain existing service levels and to reach proposed service levels.

**Proportionate Share Analysis**

*Utah Code 11-36a-304(1)(d)*

The cost of new system improvements required to maintain the service levels related to new development activity are based on the costs of system-wide park and trail facilities, and the consultant fees for the preparation of the Impact Fee Facilities Plan and the Impact Fee Analysis.

The City will need to acquire an additional 15.80 acres in order to maintain its existing service level of 5.73 acres per 1,000 persons.

In addition, all 15.80 acres will need improvements or an expansion of capacity through various means. Total land and improvement costs necessary over the next ten years are calculated at \$6,037,471.59. Divided by the projected population growth of 2,757 persons, the cost per capita for park land and improvements is calculated to be \$2,189.87.

TABLE 8: PER CAPITA COST TO MAINTAIN LOS FOR PARK LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS

Per Capita Cost to Maintain Park Land and Improvements	
Total Cost of Current Park Land and Improvements	\$15,692,606.75
2024 Population	7,166
Existing Cost per Capita	\$2,189.87
Population Growth, 2024-2034	2,757
Cost of Acres and Improvements Needed	\$6,037,471.59
<b>Cost of Acres and Improvements Needed per Capita</b>	<b>\$2,189.87</b>

*Source: Harrisville City, US Census Bureau 2023 ACS 5-Year Estimates, ZPFI*

The Impact Fee Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Analysis consultant cost is \$3.63 per capita. This is calculated by taking the total consultant costs and dividing it by population growth in the study period.

TABLE 9: PER CAPITA CONSULTANT COSTS

Per Capita Consultant Costs	
Consultant Cost	\$10,000.00
Population Growth, 2024-2034	2,757
<b>Cost per Capita</b>	<b>\$3.63</b>

The impact fee calculation also considers the current impact fee balance for parks, recreation, and trails. This balance is the net amount of impact fees collected after approved expenses and disbursements. The current impact fee balance is \$468,515.66<sup>5</sup> and would result in a credit of \$169.94 per person.

TABLE 10: PER CAPITA IMPACT FEE FUND BALANCE CREDIT

Per Capita Impact Fee Fund Balance Credit	
Impact Fee Fund Balance	\$468,515.66
Population Growth, 2024-2034	2,757
<b>Credit per Capita</b>	<b>(\$169.94)</b>

Taking the relevant costs calculated above and an average household size of 2.94 persons<sup>6</sup>, the maximum allowable impact fee is \$5,949.27.

TABLE 11: MAXIMUM IMPACT FEE CALCULATION

Summary of Gross Fee	
Park Land and Improvements per Capita	\$2,189.87
Consultant Costs per Capita	\$3.63
Fund Balance Credit	(\$169.94)
Total per Capita	\$2,023.56
Household Size	2.94
<b>Total per Household</b>	<b>\$5,949.27</b>

Source: Harrisville City, US Census Bureau 2023 ACS 5-Year Estimates, ZPFI

The City currently has no outstanding bonds or debts for its park system.

### Manner of Financing

Utah Code 11-36a-304(2)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)(h)

An impact fee is a one-time fee that is implemented by a local government on new development to help fund and pay for all or a portion of the costs of public facilities that are needed to serve new development. These fees are usually implemented to help reduce the economic burden on local jurisdictions that are trying to deal with population growth within the area. As a matter of policy and legislative discretion, a City may choose to have new development pay the full cost of its share of new public facilities if the facilities would not be needed except to service new development. However, local governments may use other sources of revenue to pay for the new facilities required to service new development and use impact fees to recover the cost difference between the total cost and the other sources of revenue. Additionally, impact fees allow new growth to share in the cost of existing facilities that have excess capacity.

While impact fees will be used to maintain the established level of purchased park services, impact fees will not fully fund the level of park services currently enjoyed by Harrisville City residents due to

<sup>5</sup> Source: Harrisville City

<sup>6</sup> Source: US Census Bureau 2023 ACS 5-Year Estimates

donated park land and donated and improved recreation facilities. Therefore, additional system park land and recreation facility improvements beyond those funded through impact fees that are desired to maintain this “higher” level of service will be paid for by the community through other revenue sources such as user charges, special assessments, GO bonds, general taxes, etc.

At the current time, no other sources of funding other than impact fees have been identified, but to the extent that any are identified and received in the future, then impact fees will be adjusted accordingly.

### **Impact Fee Credits**

The Impact Fees Act requires credits to be paid back to development for future fees that may be paid to fund system improvements found in the IFFP so that new development is not charged twice. Credits may also be paid back to developers who have constructed or directly funded items that are included in the IFFP or donated to the City in lieu of impact fees, including the dedication of land for system improvements. This situation does not apply to developer exactions or improvements required to offset density or as a condition for development. Any item for which a developer receives credit must be included in the IFFP and must be agreed upon with the City before construction begins.

In the situation that a developer chooses to construct facilities found in the IFFP in lieu of impact fees, the arrangement must be made through the developer and the City.

The standard impact fee can also be decreased to respond to unusual circumstances in specific cases in order to ensure that impact fees are imposed fairly. In certain cases, a developer may submit studies and data that clearly show a need for adjustment.

At the discretion of the City, impact fees may be modified for low-income housing, although alternate sources of funding for the recreation facilities must be identified.

### **Extraordinary Costs and Time Price Differential**

It is not anticipated that there will be any extraordinary costs in servicing newly developed park properties. To account for the time-price differential inherent in fair comparisons of amounts paid at different times, actual costs have been used to compute buy-in costs to public facilities with excess capacity and current costs have been used to compute impacts on system improvements required by anticipated development activity to maintain the established level of service for each public facility.

## Certification

---

Zions Public Finance, Inc. certifies 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; or
  - 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;
  
3. offsets costs with grants or other alternate sources of payment; and
  
4. complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.