

# **WATER CONSERVATION PLAN**

**Coalville City**

**October 2022**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Description of System.....	3
Water Source and Rights .....	4
Billing .....	8
Water Usage.....	9
Water Conservation Efforts .....	10
Water Reduction Goal and Implementation Plan .....	10
Water Conservation Plan Updating .....	10

## **Description of System**

### **Introduction**

Coalville City is a community of approximately 1,500 residents located on the south end of Echo Reservoir just east of U.S. Interstate 80 in Summit County, UT. As the name implies, Coalville City was once known for the coal mined from the surrounding area. Second to coal, the area has also been known for farming and ranching. Local histories indicate the town was established by pioneer settlers and miners in the 1850s. Coalville is the County Seat for Summit County. Figure 1 shows the service area of Coalville City.

### **Culinary System**

Coalville City's existing drinking water supply includes:

- A spring source west of town known as "Icy Springs;"
- Four drilled wells in various states of use including: Brown Well, Lewis Well, Boyden Well, and Hoytsville Well;
- Four tanks in three locations namely: Icy Springs (two tanks), 0.35 Mgal Booster Tank, and 1 Mgal tank (another tank, known as the Allen Hollow tank was constructed by a developer but never commissioned and is not in service);
- A duplex booster pump station;
- Various distribution lines ranging from 4-inch to 14-inch in diameter;
- Three pressure zones.

### **Secondary System**

Coalville City has a secondary water system that provides irrigation water to much of the community. The water source is primarily surface water supplies in Chalk Creek. Historically 'ditch companies' funded efforts such as diversions, water right acquisitions, and canals/ditches to irrigate parcels along the Chalk Creek drainage. The irrigation was primarily flood irrigation or localized pumping. As agricultural lands become converted to residential lands, flood irrigation can become more problematic as ditches are cut off for roads or residential neighborhoods no longer have open ditches. In 2002 the City installed a pressurized secondary irrigation system that serves much of the community

### **Growth Projections**

Census data since 1950 shows that overall the City has experienced slow to modest growth during this time. Similar to other rural areas, the City has also had periods of little or no growth during periods of economic downturn. The City's population according to the census data of 2010 is 1,363 people. Despite a recent slowdown, the historic trend of slow to modest growth is expected to continue into the future. Future population projections are presented below in Table 1-1. An annual average growth rate of 2.2% was assumed over the period from 2014 to 2035. This rate is higher than the historic rate of

change from 1950 to 2010. However, it is not excessive and will allow for some conservatism in future planning. A value of 2.2% is in line with the Mountainland Association of Governments (AOG) estimates from 2000 to 2040 for Coalville and other communities in the Mountainland region. It is noted that Table 1 includes the Coalville residential population typically canvassed during census counts. Coalville has a number of non-residential entities that can also place a demand on the water supply. These non-residential demands include: motels/hotel, the North Summit School District (which brings elementary, middle, and high school students from outside of Coalville), a number of commercial businesses, and seasonal RV parks.

**Table 1. Coalville City Design Population Estimates (Planning Period is to 2035)**

Year	Published Population Data or Published Estimates <sup>1</sup>	Published and Proposed Population	AARC Between Reporting Periods For Published and Proposed Population <sup>2, 3, 4</sup>
1950	850	850	-
1960	907	907	0.65%
1970	864	864	-0.48%
1980	1,031	1,031	1.78%
1990	1,065	1,065	0.32%
2000	1,382	1,382	2.65%
2010	1,363	1,363	-0.14%
2014	-	1,418	1.00%
2020	1510	1,510	1.50%
2025	-	1,671	2.00%
2030	1,859	1,896	2.50%
2035	-	2,205	3.00%
2040	2,729	2,626	3.50%

1. US Census data and Mountainland Association of Governments (AOG) accessed on 2/24/2014 at [www.mountainland.org](http://www.mountainland.org).
2. Per Mountainland AOG and historical census data: Annual Average Rate of Change (AARC) from 1950-2010 is 0.79%, AARC from 2000 to 2040 is 1.7%.
3. Most recent Mountainland AOG projections are January 2013 at the time of this analysis.
4. Annual growth percentages in Table 1-1 from 2015 to 2040 were adjusted to closely match the AOG future projections. The net AARC assumed from 2014 to 2035 is 2.2%.

## Water Source and Rights

### Culinary Water Source

Potable water sources for Coalville City includes a spring source which includes the Lewis, Allgood and Icy Springs (aka "Icy Springs"), and four water wells, named Lewis, Boyden, Brown and Hoytsville. The springs provide the vast majority of the city water supply. The Lewis well and Hoytsville well are the only wells that have been operated in

recent years. Table 2 summarizes Coalville’s potable water source capacity and condition.

**Table 2. Summary of Source Water Supply**

Source	Capacity	Location	Condition <sup>1</sup>
“Icy Springs” (Lewis, Allgood, Icy) Springs	225 gpm	West side of river	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spring collection lines are in good shape up to the main collection manhole</li> <li>• Meter between spring collection manhole and tank is installed improperly (pipe is not full) and meter is unreliable</li> </ul>
Lewis Well (submersible pump)	135 gpm 10” casing to 360’, 8” screen 360’-460’, 8” casing to 465’.	East side of river	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well produces high quality water and has been used in recent past</li> <li>• The well house is in poor condition, the house is a dilapidated wood structure in need of significant repair. Some of the piping is lower grade PVC. The valve vault just outside the well house is PVC that is reported to be of concern by City staff during start up and shut down events.</li> </ul>
Boyden Well	25 gpm, City reports 6” well; depth is unknown	West side of river	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boyden is a shallow well that many years ago failed coliform tests. It has been disconnected from the system for a number of years.</li> <li>• City has reported they would like to convert this to a secondary source or even an industrial source for things such as truck water, dust control, etc. (possibly in some kind of filling station scenario).</li> </ul>
Brown Well	400 gpm 12” casing to 512’, 8” casing to 600’ with 8” screen from 510’-550’ and 556’-586’	East side of river	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hydro report lists pumping up to 750, but 350-450 a more reasonable expected sustained rate.</li> <li>• City staff report the Brown well has quality issues related to high mineral content including offensive taste and odor problems.</li> <li>• Use of this well results in customer complaints.</li> <li>• The well has not been used for many years but could be placed into the system in an emergency.</li> <li>• The well house is a wooden structure in moderate condition.</li> </ul>
Hoytsville	25 gpm 8” casing to 402’ with 8”	East side of river	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2005 report summarizing redevelopment effort by driller states a 55 gpm pump was installed with a 15 hp submersible motor.</li> <li>• The water quality meets standards but the City</li> </ul>

	screen from 159'-179' and 245'-270'.		<p>does get citizen complaints at times when using the well because the water looks “cloudy” which is essentially many small diameter air bubbles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City has used the Hoytsville well recently but the use is infrequent.</li> <li>• The well house is a dilapidated wooden structure in need of significant attention.</li> <li>• Nearby house allowed by County appears to be in source protection zone (possible septic concerns).</li> </ul>
--	--------------------------------------	--	--

<sup>1</sup>Condition review is based on discussions with City staff and site visits.

### Culinary Water Rights

Coalville City has five water rights for drinking water. These water rights are summarized in Table 3. All five of the water rights have a nature of use listed as municipal, and in April of 2010, a certificate of beneficial use was issued by the Division of Water Rights for each. These rights all share the same points of diversion which are the city’s water sources listed in Table 2. Noticeable in Table 3 is the fact that two of the water rights are constrained by an annual volume, while the other three are not. The water rights allow for a total diversion flow rate of 1.589 cfs, or 713 gpm. However, the annual volume allowed is not as clear. One interpretation would be to convert the flow rates for the three water rights not constrained by an annual volume to an annual volume equivalent to the continuous given flow rate and add the defined volume from the two other rights. Table 4 summarizes this approach.

**Table 3. Coalville City Drinking Water Rights**

Water Right #	Flow (cfs)	Volume (ac-ft)	Priority	Nature of Use	Status	Points of Diversion
35-447	0.186	N/A	1947	Municipal	Certificate	Springs and four wells
35-2769	0.078	N/A	1921	Municipal	Certificate	Springs and four wells
35-5443	0.038	20.0	1985	Municipal	Certificate	Springs and four wells
35-8657	0.56	100.2	1879	Municipal	Certificate	Springs and four wells
35-8727	0.727	N/A	1913	Municipal	Certificate	Springs and four wells
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.589 (713 gpm)</b>					

**Table 4. Coalville City Drinking Water Rights – Assumed Annual Volumes**

Water Right #	Flow (cfs)	Volume (ac-ft)	Annual Volume Basis
35-447	0.186	134.7	Annual equivalent volume
35-2769	0.078	56.5	Annual equivalent volume
35-5443	0.038	20.0	Volume defined in water
35-8657	0.56	100.2	Volume defined in water
35-8727	0.727	526.3	Annual equivalent volume
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.589</b>	<b>837.7</b>	

This approach results in an annual available volume of 837.7 ac-ft. The total allowed diversion rate, or summation of the flows from each water right, is 1.589 cfs or 713 gpm. The city also has a Reservation Agreement for Replacement Water with Weber Basin Water for 300 ac-ft of water.

### Secondary Water Portfolio

Table 4 shows the secondary water portfolio held by the City.

**Table 4. Coalville City Secondary Water Portfolio<sup>1</sup>**

Ditch Company	Shares	Shares per acre	Duty - AF/acre	Acres Irrigated	Estimated Annual AF
Coalville City Ditch <sup>2</sup>	296.5	10	3	30	89
Robinson Bros/Primary	8.5	1	3	9	26
Robinson Bros/Secondary	4	4	3	1	3
Upper Chalk Creek	36.5	1	3	37	110
Middle Chalk Creek	51	4	3	13	38
South Chalk Creek/Deed <sup>2</sup>	?	title	3	12	37
North Narrows	0	1	3	0	0
Ext./Middle Chalk Creek	0	1	3	0	0
			<b>Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>302</b>

<sup>1</sup>Data in table such as # of shares and shares per acre was reported by the city. <sup>2</sup>City reports these as estimates.

The 'Duty' of 3 AF/acre in the table above is only an estimate based on the State of Utah Division of Water Rights typical duty values for the area around Coalville. From the water rights documentation in City possession, the City is reporting it is not clear what the duty is for a given set of shares. Pumping records from 2014 indicate the City used approximately 242 acre-feet of water. The City also reports they are allowed a maximum withdrawal of 2.4 cubic feet per second (cfs), which is 4.76 AF/day. The

actual amount used varies year to year and is a function of snow pack, other priority withdrawals, City coordination with the ditch company and local farmers, and the climate during the summer. The analysis of the shares, the maximum withdrawal, and the 2014 flow records suggest the City currently has access to 250 to 350 AF of water in a typical year in the secondary system. The secondary water provides for the majority of the residents in Coalville (secondary water is only on the east side of I-80). Table 5 shows how an assumed volume of 302 AF annually, applied at 3 AF/acre would serve Coalville.

**Table 5. Secondary Water Supply and Connections Served**

Criteria/Assumption	Value	Units
Secondary Supply	302	AF annually
Duty	3	AF/acre
Total Irrigable Acreage	101	Acres
Typical Irrigable Land/Connection	0.18	Acres (typical of 1/4 to 1/3 acre residential lots)
Connections served	559	Connections

## Billing

The City charges residential and commercial users a fee for water use. The current fees for drinking and secondary water are shown in Tables 6 and 7 respectively.

**Table 6. Drinking Water User Rates**

User Type	Base Rate	Usage Charge (1,000 – 10,000 gallons)	Usage Charge (10,001– 30,000 gallons)	Usage Charge (>30,000 gallons)
User within City Limits	\$22/connection <sup>1</sup>	\$1.00/1,000	\$2.00/1,000	\$3.00/1,000
User outside City Limits	\$40/connection	\$1.50/1,000	\$3.00/1,000	\$4.50/1,000

<sup>1</sup>The City issues a single “water bill” that is currently \$40 for the “base rate charge” if you live in City limits. The use of these funds is distributed \$18 to secondary water expenses and \$22 to drinking water expenses.

**Table 7. Secondary Water User Rates**

Category of Fee	Connection Fee
1” connection (typical of a residence)	\$500
2” connection	\$1,000



4" connection	\$2,000
Water Right Fee (paid at connection)	\$0 if landowner can show certificated water right \$500 per 1/10 acre of irrigated water on the parcel
Monthly Rate <sup>1</sup>	\$18/month regardless of use (there are no meters on secondary)

<sup>1</sup>The City issues a single "water bill" that is currently \$40 for the "base rate charge." The use of these funds is distributed \$18 to secondary water expenses and \$22 to drinking water expenses.

So a typical user within the City limits using 8,000 gallons of drinking water a month would pay \$30 for the monthly use for the drinking water portion. If they were to use 12,000 gallons of water the cost would be \$36 for the monthly use (for drinking portion).

## Water Usage

Table 8 shows the type of use and total use of culinary water. The quantities are in ac-ft.

**Table 8. Culinary Water Use**

Year	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Institutional	Total
2021	142.47	19.68	1.3	8.43	171.88
2020	143.52	12.24	1.15	12.79	169.7
2019	139.83	11.9	1.05	11.68	164.46
2018	177.43	21.42	0.4	13	212.25
2017	143.61	36.97	0.39	13	193.97
2016	176.1	26	0	13	215.1
2015	171.51	15	0	13	199.51
2014	0	15	0	13	28
2013	0	16	0.5	13	31.5
2012	0	16	0.5	13	31.5
2011	8	16	0.5	13	39.5

Table 9 shows the type of use and total use of culinary water. The quantities are in ac-ft. Data is only available for the last two years.

**Table 9. Secondary Water Use**

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual
2021	0	0	0	0	72.7	77.6	74.3	46.85	8.83	0	0	0	280.28
2020	0	0	0	0	40.3	95.1	110.8	88.5	39.8	0	0	0	374.5

## **Water Conservation Efforts**

Coalville has utilized various measures to encourage conservation and increase awareness amongst its customers. Coalville City recognize the importance of water conservation and will continue to implement water conservation measures and programs below:

- Early detection of distribution system leaks and/or making timely repairs will reduce water losses. Making upgrades to the system or replacing aging infrastructure not only safeguards water quality, but it also conserves water and can save money in the long run.
- Continue the use flat and increasing block rate structures to encourage more efficient use of water. The City works with industry professionals, consultants and elected officials to help ensure that rates are adequate for the durability of the system and its delivery.
- All pressurized irrigation turnouts will be metered by the 2025 irrigation season. Metering usage will make water users more accountable for the water they use, encourage conservation.
- Educate the residents about the importance of water conservation and the proper use of this valuable natural resource. This is done by disseminating information through the media and through information in newsletters, handouts and brochures distributed to residents.
- Restricts residential outdoor watering between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. due to high evapo-transpiration.
- Plans are currently being developed to address water shortages during emergencies such as drought.

## **Water Reduction Goal and Implementation Plan**

Through a dedicated effort of Mayor, City Council and staff plan to implement the water conservation efforts above. These efforts will be put into action over the next five years and will ensure getting the City closer to its goal of reducing the usage 5% about 50 GPCD.

## **Water Conservation Plan Updating**

This Water Management and Conservation Plan should be reviewed and updated periodically by the Hooper Irrigation Company to reflect new data and trends and gauge performance and progress.

This water conservation plan was placed on the XXXX XX, 2022, Coalville City Council agenda and adopted by the city council on that date. The city council is comprised of the following:

### **Mayor**

Mark R. Marsh

### **City Council**

Philip Geary

Steven B. Richins

Tyler Rowser

Louise Willoughby

Don Winters



## Certification of Adoption

We hereby certify that the attached Water Conservation Plan has been established and adopted by our Coalville City Council on October 11, 2022.

Handwritten signature of Mark R. Marsh in black ink, written over a horizontal line.

Mayor Mark R Marsh

Handwritten signature of Tyler Rowser in blue ink, written over a horizontal line.

Council Member Tyler Rowser

Handwritten signature of Steven B. Richins in black ink, written over a horizontal line.

Council Member Steven B Richins

Handwritten signature of Don Winters in black ink, written over a horizontal line.

Council Member Don Winters

Handwritten signature of Philip B. Geary in black ink, written over a horizontal line.

Council Member Philip Geary

Handwritten signature of Louise Willoughby in blue ink, written over a horizontal line.

Council Member Louise Willoughby

Handwritten signature of Nachele D. Sargent in blue ink, written over a horizontal line.

City Recorder Nachele D Sargent

**PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE  
COALVILLE CITY COUNCIL**

**PROPOSED WATER CONSERVATION PLAN**

Public notice is hereby given that the Coalville City Council will conduct a Public Hearing to review, discuss, receive comment, and possibly take action on the proposed Water Conservation Plan on **Tuesday, October 11, 2022** beginning at **6:00 P.M.** at the Coalville City Hall located at 10 North Main, Coalville, Utah.

The proposed Water Conservation Plan requires approval from the City Council. All interested persons are invited to attend and make public comment or file written comment to read into the public minutes. Questions, comments, or correspondence should be addressed to Coalville City.

For further information, please contact Nachele Sargent, City Recorder, at Coalville City Hall, 10 North Main, PO Box 188, Coalville, UT 84017, 435-336-5981, [cityhall@coalvillecity.org](mailto:cityhall@coalvillecity.org).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during these hearings should notify the City Hall at least three days prior to the hearing to be attended.

Posted: September 30, 2022 - Coalville City Hall, Coalville City Website, Utah Public Notice Website  
Published: September 30, 2022 - Summit County News

Coalville City Council  
Regular Meeting  
HELD ON  
October 11, 2022  
IN THE  
Coalville City Council Chambers And Virtual

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

Mayor Mark Marsh opened the meeting at 6:00 P.M.

**MAYOR And COUNCIL PRESENT:** Mayor Mark Marsh  
Council: Tyler Rowser, Don Winters,  
Phil Geary, Louise Willoughby,  
Steven Richins

**CITY STAFF PRESENT:** Don Sargent, Community Development Director  
Zane DeWeese, Public Works Director  
Nachele Sargent, City Recorder

**PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE:** Nathan Rackliffe, Mary Rackliffe, Tim Rees,  
Becky Rees, Courtney Richins, Doug Wilde,  
Robin Wilde, Margarita Richins  
Virtual Attendance: Jack Walkenhorst, Nathan  
Rackliffe

**Item 1 – Roll Call:**  
A quorum was present.

**Item 2 – Pledge Of Allegiance:**  
Council Member Phil Geary led the Council, Staff, and Public in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Item A – Public Comment – The Public May Address The Mayor And Council With Any Matter Of City Business Not Listed On The Agenda:**  
There was no public comment.

**Item B – A Resolution Authorizing Water Revenue Bonds In The Amount Not To Exceed \$500,000, Calling A Public Hearing, Authorizing A Notice Of Public Hearing And Bonds To Be Issued, Approving A Maximum Interest Rate, Maximum Maturity, And Maximum Discount On The Bonds, And Related Matters Resolution No. 2022-8:**

Mayor Mark Marsh explained Resolution No. 2022-8 (Exhibit A) the bond parameters the secondary water meter funding. Council Member Don Winters questioned if they had figured in any inflation for the estimated costs. Mayor Marsh stated the amount was from the information the City had provided. He stated the costs had gone up some already. Council Member Phil Geary questioned if this was enough to cover all of the secondary connections. Mayor Marsh stated it would be enough to cover the existing connections. Any new connections would be required to pay for their own

1 meter which was covered by an ordinance that was already in place. He stated the Grant would  
2 cover 70% of the project. Niki Sargent pointed out the resolution for the final bond which was  
3 included with their packet. She stated this resolution No. 2022-8, was the parameters for the Bond  
4 which would come back for a public hearing and approval for the final bond in November. She  
5 reminded the Council they would also be looking at raising the water rates which had been  
6 approved with the budget and would now need to include paying back the loan portion of the  
7 secondary water meter funding. Council Member Louise Willoughby questioned what they would  
8 be looking at for a rate increase. Mayor Mark Marsh stated they would need to look at the costs to  
9 provide the current service and include the cost of paying back the loan portion of the funding.

10  
11 **Council Member Tyler Rowser made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2022-8 A Resolution**  
12 **Authorizing Water Revenue Bonds In The Amount Not To Exceed \$500,000, Calling A Public**  
13 **Hearing, Authorizing A Notice Of Public Hearing And Bonds To Be Issued, Approving A Maximum**  
14 **Interest Rate, Maximum Maturity, And Maximum Discount On The Bonds, And Related Matters**  
15 **And Additionally Calling For A Budget Amendment For The Bond. Council Member Louise**  
16 **Willoughby seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

17  
18 **Roll Call:**

19  
20 **Council Member Rowser – Aye**  
21 **Council Member Richins – Aye**  
22 **Council Member Winters – Aye**  
23 **Council Member Geary – Aye**  
24 **Council Member Willoughby - Aye**

25  
26 **Item D – Review, Discussion, And Possible Approval: Whispering Trees Minor Subdivision Final**  
27 **Plat, 678 South Main (CT-356-A):**

28  
29 Don Sargent referred to the Staff report (Exhibit B) and stated this was for the Whispering Trees  
30 Minor Subdivision project. He stated this was part of the Tim and Becky Rees property and the  
31 application for this project was one of the most complete he had reviewed. He stated a single lot  
32 subdivision had been created before from this parcel and the new application included that on the  
33 plat to show there were three lots there. Don stated the Planning Commission recommended  
34 approval for this project with the condition they connect to the City sewer system. He stated the  
35 Ordinance for the sewer system required anyone within 300 feet to connect to the system. He  
36 stated the sewer system daylighted right before this property and didn't provide the gravity flow  
37 needed for this location. The Planning Commission and the applicant had suggested addressing  
38 this issue by using an ejector system pump. He stated the property located to the South of this lot  
39 owned by Melvin and Margarita Richins was also interested in using this system to connect to the  
40 City system. Don reviewed the ejector pump system with the Mayor and Council. He stated the  
41 sewer laterals were owned by the property owner and the City was recommending for them to run  
42 a private line to the nearest manhole located to the North of the property. The property owner  
43 would be responsible for maintaining the lateral. Zane DeWeese stated he and Chris Thomsen, City  
44 Engineer, reviewed the proposal and agreed with the suggested changes shown. He read the  
45 provisions of the Sewer Ordinance that referred to private lateral lines. Don Sargent stated there

1 wasn't a sidewalk on the Master Plan for this area. He stated it did show a bike lane on the East  
2 side of the roadway. He stated the County planned to create a bike lane to the point of the Red  
3 Hills Ranch Subdivision but would not be coming any further North. He stated the Planning  
4 Commission didn't require the easement for the sidewalk because any sidewalk would be in the  
5 City right-of-way. Don reviewed the seven conditions of approval with the Mayor and Council. He  
6 stated if the Richins' wanted to join in with the Rackliffe's for the sewer line then it would be an  
7 agreement between the two property owners for the mutual use of the service line. Council  
8 Member Phil Geary questioned if it was an option for the property owners further South. He  
9 mentioned the Hull family had wanted to connect to the City sewer system for a long time. Don  
10 Sargent stated not at this time, but there may be some options available when the Red Hills Ranch  
11 Subdivision ran the sewer line for their project. Zane DeWeese read the note that was included on  
12 the OK Subdivision plat that referred to the options for those property owners. He stated this  
13 would also be applicable to the Richins' lot. Council Member Louise Willoughby questioned if they  
14 would be setting a precedent if they allowed them to connect to the City system. Don Sargent  
15 stated no, because anyone beyond 300 feet wouldn't be required to connect to the City system. He  
16 stated if the Richins' decided to join, it would be voluntary. He stated the system's design would  
17 have to be engineered and then accepted by the City Engineer. Don stated the plat would have to  
18 be reviewed and accepted by the NS Fire District. He stated Chief Nelson had been reviewing and  
19 approving new projects. Council Member Louise Willoughby and Council Member Don Winters  
20 questioned why they wouldn't be required to provide an easement for the sidewalk. Don Sargent  
21 stated because of the way the roadway ran along this property, any sidewalk in this area would be  
22 in the City right-of-way and not on private property. Nathan Rackliffe stated he and his wife Mary  
23 were the applicants for this project. He stated he had researched the ejector system for the  
24 proposed sewer connection and reviewed the information with the Mayor and Council. He verified  
25 they would need to negotiate with the property owner to the North which was his sister-in-law to  
26 install their sewer lateral. Don Sargent stated that was correct. He stated all subdivisions were  
27 required to have a 10-foot public utility easement and so they should be able to work within that  
28 area, but they would need to negotiate with them to install the line along their property. Don  
29 Sargent stated a public hearing wasn't required for this project. There was only one required at the  
30 Planning level. The Mayor and Council discussed the options for the sewer connection. Don stated  
31 the Richins' would need to amend the OK Subdivision for the sewer connection and also negotiate  
32 with both property owners to the North to connect to the sewer system. He stated it made sense  
33 to see if they could avoid a septic tank, but that was what their lot and project was approved for.  
34 Margarita Richins stated they were almost finished with their house, and when the Rackliffes had  
35 proposed connecting to the sewer line they thought it may be a good option for them too. She  
36 stated with having to complete a subdivision amendment and then negotiating with the other  
37 property owners, they would just go ahead and install the septic system they had planned on  
38 originally. She stated they wouldn't want to hold up finishing their house.

39

40 **Council Member Louise Willoughby made a motion to approve the Whispering Trees Minor**  
41 **Subdivision Plat with the seven conditions of approval and a note placed on the plat for the**  
42 **private sewer line connection. Council Member Phil Geary seconded the motion. All Ayes.**  
43 **Motion Carried.**

44

45 **Roll Call:**



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

- Council Member Rowser – Aye**
- Council Member Richins – Aye**
- Council Member Winters – Aye**
- Council Member Geary – Aye**
- Council Member Willoughby – Aye**

**Item C – Review, Discussion, Public Hearing, And Possible Approval: Wilde Estates 6-Plex Conditional Use Permit, 310 South Main (CT-363-1):**

Don Sar4gent referred to the Staff report (Exhibit C) and stated this project was for the Wilde Estates 6-Plex which was a Conditional Use Permit and an MPD project. He stated the project was located at 310 South Main and the Applicant was Courtney Richins. Council Member Tyler Rowser disclosed he was related to the Applicant, Courtney Richins. Don Sargent stated this project was subject to the MPD regulations because it was over five units. He stated it was a conditional use because it was a multi-family project. He stated the Applicant was proposing to use only a portion of the property involved at this time. If he wanted to do something else at a later date, a subdivision would be required to remove this project from the rest of the property. Don stated the Planning Commission had reviewed the project and the Applicant had responded to any questions or conditions. He stated the Applicant had provided a different site plan to address some of the Planning questions. He stated the Council would need to determine if it still met the Code requirements. He reviewed the plan with the Mayor and Council. Don stated the project exceeded the height requirement, but there was an MPD provision the Council could consider. He reviewed the MPD language with the Mayor and Council. Courtney Richins stated he had changed the site plan to address the concerns from the Planning Commission regarding snow removal. Council Member Don Winters questioned if the new site plan met the requirements. Don Sargent stated technically it met the requirements, but not the spirit of the intent of the requirements. Courtney Richins stated he was fine to go back to the original site plan. Council Member Louise Willoughby stated she would prefer the using the original site plan that gave a very clear double egress. Don Sargent recommended using the original site plan because it met the spirit as well as the requirements of the provision. He stated there were some exceptions the Council could consider for the height restrictions. Courtney Richins stated he would like consideration for being over the building height by three feet since this project was considered workforce housing. He stated he could change the pitch of the roof and go deeper into the ground if the Council wasn't on board.

Mayor Mark Marsh opened the public hearing at 7:32 P.M.

Fred Owens - 294 South Main

Fred Owen stated we're at two properties North of the proposal on this. My question is if these are intended to be for rental properties or for own ownership properties? Courtney Richins stated they are intended for rental properties right now. They would have to stay at one 6-plex, but could possibly conform to something else when he subdivided, but that wasn't the intent of the project. Don Sargent stated it would be prohibited to do something else until a subdivision was approved.

1 Fred Owens stated what is the square footage of the units? Courtney Richins stated the two units  
2 at the back were 1,000 square feet and the four units at the front were 1,400 square feet.

3

4 Mayor Mark Marsh closed the public hearing at 7:35 P.M.

5

6 Council Member Louise Willoughby questioned if they wanted to do something else with the rest of  
7 the property what the next step would be. Don Sargent stated it would still be an MPD project and  
8 was eligible for around 70 units. Courtney Richins stated there were two parcels involved and he  
9 would have to go through a subdivision process. He stated he had several options for this property,  
10 but wasn't sure which direction he was going at this time. Don Sargent stated the 6-plex would be  
11 counted toward the unit count. Council Member Louise Willoughby questioned if there would be  
12 any rezoning in the future. Courtney Richins stated no, he wouldn't be asking for a rezone. Council  
13 Member Louise Willoughby questioned what was happening with the water. Don Sargent stated  
14 the Applicant was proposing the "fee in lieu" for each unit. Council Member Tyler Rowser  
15 questioned if the moratorium needed to be rescinded. Don Sargent stated he wasn't sure and they  
16 could review that at a later date. Council Member Phil Geary questioned if they would have the  
17 new numbers for what was left in the system. Zane DeWeese stated they were just waiting for the  
18 pump for the Water Treatment Plant to be able to bring it online. Council Member Louise  
19 Willoughby questioned if Courtney Richins had water rights he could give the City in place of the  
20 "fee in lieu". Courtney Richins stated he planned on bringing in the water rights with the bigger  
21 portion of the project. He stated he wanted to be able to do the same thing as everyone else.  
22 Council Member Louise Willoughby stated she would like to require for the water rights to come to  
23 the City if the property owners had water shares. She stated she would like to leave the water "fee  
24 in lieu" for others that didn't have water rights. Courtney Richins questioned how they picked  
25 between the people that had water rights and the others that didn't. He stated he wanted to keep  
26 his shares for the remaining property as they would still be irrigating it. He stated he shouldn't be  
27 penalized or treated differently from other developers. He stated he was willing to do whatever  
28 was required as long as everyone else would be required to provide water shares. He stated they  
29 shouldn't be able to pick and choose between the other developers. Don Sargent read the  
30 provisions from the Code for the water requirements. Courtney Richins stated he would bring his  
31 water rights for his project if the City wasn't going to sell or allow the "fee in lieu" for other  
32 developers. He stated he understood if they had to stop the "fee in lieu" because they didn't have  
33 it, but then they would need to require all projects to bring water rights. Council Member Louise  
34 Willoughby stated she would like more input from the City Attorney. She stated she thought the  
35 Council had the right to require the water on a case-by-case basis. She questioned how many  
36 shares would be required for six units. Don Sargent stated it depended on where the water rights  
37 came from. Council Member Louise Willoughby questioned if an apartment required the same as a  
38 single family or something else. Don Sargent stated yes, it was based on the units or lots. Zane  
39 DeWeese stated it was based on an average of the ERC's. Don Sargent stated the "fee in lieu" was  
40 based on units or lots and was the same amount for each one. Council Member Phil Geary directed  
41 Don Sargent to work with Sheldon Smith to come up with the figures of the number of connections  
42 for water and sewer. Council Member Louise Willoughby stated she would also like Sheldon Smith  
43 to address the fairness issue. Don Sargent stated it was discretionary and they could negotiate with  
44 the developers to bring water rights and the new "fee in lieu" would also help to bring that in line.  
45 Council Member Tyler Rowser stated he really wanted to see the numbers for the water

1 connections. The Mayor, Council, and Staff continued to discuss the water options. Don Sargent  
2 stated he had three possible conditions of approval for consideration; number one was the site  
3 plan be revised back to the original site plan that was reviewed by the Planning Commission,  
4 number two that the height would be 35 feet, and number three would be for the landscape plan  
5 to be same as what was reviewed by the Planning Commission.

6  
7 **Council Member Tyler Rowser made a motion to approve the Wilde Land Estates 6-plex**  
8 **Conditional Use and MPD project with the three conditions as stated by Don Sargent with the**  
9 **addition of the water right “fee in lieu” for four conditions. Council Member Louise Willoughby**  
10 **seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

11  
12 **Roll Call:**

13  
14 **Council Member Rowser – Aye**  
15 **Council Member Richins – Aye**  
16 **Council Member Winters – Aye**  
17 **Council Member Geary – Aye**  
18 **Council Member Willoughby - Aye**

19  
20 Don Sargent stated Courtney Richins would need to provide a final site plan with the changes  
21 approved tonight and would then he would be able to proceed with a building permit for his  
22 project.

23  
24 **Item E – Review, Discussion, And Possible Approval Of The 2022 Water Conservation Plan:**  
25

26 Don Sargent reviewed the 2022 Water Conservation Plan (Exhibit D) and stated the Utah Water  
27 Resources had asked for a more detailed water reduction goal and plan implementation to be  
28 included with the Master Plan. Council Member Phil Geary questioned why the Boyden Well was  
29 listed as a resource. Zane DeWeese stated there were still water rights associated with that site.  
30 Council Member Phil Geary questioned what water rights were available with the Allen Hollow  
31 property and if the City had access to them. Zane DeWeese Allen Hollow never did develop a water  
32 source there. He stated all they developed was a storage mechanism to serve that subdivision.  
33 Council Member Steven Richins stated that was the tank that didn’t hold any water. Zane DeWeese  
34 stated he didn’t know about that, but it wasn’t considered operational and the City hadn’t ever  
35 received any operating permits for it. He stated it had been physically disconnected from the City  
36 system. He stated they had built a new storage tank by the NS Bus Garage with the water  
37 improvements plan. Council Member Louise Willoughby stated she noticed the studies referenced  
38 were from 2014 and questioned how those were commissioned. Zane DeWeese stated the  
39 information would have probably been pulled from last Water Master Plan. Mayor Mark Marsh  
40 stated they had directed Cindy Gooch, JUB Engineers Inc., to work on getting funding to update the  
41 water and sewer Master Plan. He stated this was the only information the City had at this time.  
42 Council Member Louise Willoughby questioned what the 300-acre feet reservation agreement was.  
43 Mayor Marsh stated it was the Weber Basin water. Council Member Don Winters stated it was  
44 being leased right now.

45

1 Mayor Mark Marsh opened the public hearing at 8:24 P.M.

2

3 There was no public comment.

4

5 Mayor Mark Marsh closed the public hearing at 8:25 P.M.

6

7 **Council Member Steven Richins made a motion to pass and adopt the 2022 Water Conservation**  
8 **Plan with the updated amendment regarding the water reduction goal and plan implementation.**  
9 **Council Member Don Winters seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

10

11 **Roll Call:**

12

13 **Council Member Rowser – Aye**

14 **Council Member Richins – Aye**

15 **Council Member Winters – Aye**

16 **Council Member Geary – Aye**

17 **Council Member Willoughby – Aye**

18

19 **Item F – Review, Discussion, And Possible Approval Of The 2023 Capital Improvement Plan:**

20

21 Zane DeWeese referred to the 2023 Capital Improvement Plan (Exhibit E) and stated the Capital  
22 Improvement Plan was basically a ranking of the projects and information on funds to pay for the  
23 projects. He reviewed the Plan with the Council. He stated how important the Water and Sewer  
24 Master Plans were for the City. He stated they looked at the short term as a one-year solution and  
25 then moved to the medium term and moved forward that way. Zane stated this was something  
26 that was required to be updated and approved each year to receive grants and other funding for  
27 the projects listed and the project had to be on the list to be considered. Council Member Tyler  
28 Rowser stated he thought they could remove the community park softball complex because the  
29 Recreation District would be doing that. He stated they had added a pedestrian bridge over I-80  
30 last year and he would like to have that added back into the plan in the 5–10-year phase. Council  
31 Member Phil Geary questioned what the Beacon Hills new Street alignment was. Council Member  
32 Tyler Rowser stated it was a roadway that would tie Beacon Hill Drive over to the Walker View  
33 Subdivision. Council Member Louise Willoughby questioned what was happening with the  
34 Secondary Water Pond. She stated she remembered discussing it and some other options had  
35 been thrown in for consideration. Zane DeWeese stated he didn't know what the other options  
36 were. He stated Sheldon Smith had brought those options up. Mayor Mark Marsh stated Sheldon  
37 had some other options for consideration, but he wasn't available to present them at the last work  
38 session. He stated he planned on presenting them at the next meeting. Council Member Louise  
39 Willoughby stated she thought that was something they needed to solidify because if not, they  
40 could end up in a lawsuit. Zane DeWeese agreed and stated he had just received another call from  
41 the landowner questioning what the City was going to do to resolve the issue. Mayor Marsh stated  
42 hopefully Sheldon would provide his information at the next work session so they could make a  
43 decision about it. He stated myself, as Mayor, I'm here to solve the problem and not band aid the  
44 problem. He stated he knew the lining looked like a big step in the line of money, but he had found  
45 out about two or three funding options that might fit the project while he was at the Utah League

1 Convention. He stated he had two or three people that had said what if you put in the liner and the  
2 pond still leaked. He stated they would have at least eliminated that. Mayor Marsh stated from the  
3 research he had done; he would say there was a 90% chance it's in that pond. Zane DeWeese  
4 stated the landowner had invited any of them to go up there and look at the problem and if that  
5 was something they were interested in doing he would be happy to go with them. The Mayor,  
6 Council, and Staff continued to discuss the secondary water pond issues.

7  
8 **Council Member Steven Richins made a motion to approve the 2023 Capital Improvements Plan**  
9 **list with the amendments made by Council Member Rowser. Council Member Tyler Rowser**  
10 **seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

11  
12 **Roll Call:**

13  
14 **Council Member Rowser – Aye**  
15 **Council Member Richins – Aye**  
16 **Council Member Winters – Aye**  
17 **Council Member Geary – Aye**  
18 **Council Member Willoughby – Aye**

19  
20 **Item H – Public Works Updates:**

21  
22 Zane DeWeese stated he had completed one of the big water projects and they now had a  
23 functional meter at Icy Springs. He stated they would know what the flow was for the Spring and  
24 going forward would be able to track the data. He stated he had entered into a corrective action  
25 plan with the Division of Water where they had 120 days to fix that as a significant deficiency. He  
26 stated he had gone through the paperwork and the motions to get approval from the Division,  
27 which involved writing letters etc. to keep the City in compliance. He stated he had received the  
28 official letter from the Division of Drinking Water to release them from any deficiency to continue  
29 on being approved and in good standing list.

30  
31 Zane DeWeese stated all of the source sampling had been completed for this year. He stated  
32 everything came back good and they weren't even close to the radar on exceeding any levels. He  
33 stated he just finished the lead and copper sampling, which they had been lucky enough to be  
34 under that radar to only have to sample every three years. He stated he submitted the paperwork  
35 to the State and mailed the customers their results. He stated one of the things they were going to  
36 have to watch was by the year 2025, they would have to do what they called a lead copper  
37 inventory. He stated it wasn't just what was on City side, but it was also what was on the other side  
38 of the meter as well. They would have to create an inventory on both sides of the meter. He stated  
39 he wanted them to be aware of the new regulations coming.

40  
41 **Item G – Community Development Updates:**

42  
43 Don Sargent stated there was one business license for approval for Powis Principles LLC for a home  
44 business for professional, scientific, and technical services consulting, Shawn Powis. He stated this  
45 was an organization that created content for leadership development, E-learning courses, and

1 instructional design across multiple industries. Modules were distributed electronically through a  
2 learning management system.

3  
4 **Council Member Phil Geary made a motion to approve the business license for Powis Principles**  
5 **LLC, Shawn Powis. Council Member Louise Willoughby seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion**  
6 **Carried.**

7  
8 Don Sargent reviewed the items coming up for the Planning Commission agenda for the meeting on  
9 October 17<sup>th</sup>.

10  
11 **Item I – Engineer Updates:**

12  
13 There were no Engineering updates tonight.

14  
15 **Item J – Legal Updates:**

16  
17 There were no Legal Updates tonight.

18  
19 **Item K – Mayor Updates:**

20  
21 Mayor Mark Marsh stated he had changed the business hours to Monday through Thursday with  
22 the office staying open during the lunch hour starting on October 17th. He stated most of the cities  
23 on the Wasatch back had already been on that type of schedule for years.

24  
25 Mayor Marsh stated the sidewalk was almost complete going up 100 North. He stated the County  
26 would also be asphaltting all of the driveway entrances for every home.

27  
28 Mayor Marsh stated he had received the final draft of the RFP for Engineering and Planning and it  
29 should be sent out by Friday of this week to comply with the five-year time limit they were  
30 supposed to be following.

31  
32 Mayor Marsh stated they had started planning the Light Parade which would be held on  
33 Thanksgiving weekend, November 26<sup>th</sup>. He gave the Council the assignment to provide two entries  
34 each for the parade. He stated they would be continuing the shop local program along with Santa,  
35 Hot Chocolate, and donuts.

36  
37 Mayor Marsh stated they had great success with the Mobile Mammogram screening service. He  
38 stated he would be scheduling for them to come back again within the parameters of their  
39 schedule for sometime in February or March and then again toward the end of the Summer.

40  
41 Mayor Mark Marsh stated Niki Sargent had accepted a position at Summit County and would be  
42 leaving the City. He stated he wanted to thank her for the many years of service to Coalville City.  
43 Mayor Marsh presented Niki with some flowers, lotion, and a gift card. Niki Sargent thanked the  
44 Mayor and Council and stated she had enjoyed her time at Coalville City and it would be hard to

1 leave. She stated the City had been a big part of her life and she had been very loyal to the City for  
2 many years and had enjoyed working there.

3

4 **Item L – Council Updates:**

5

6 Council Member Louise Willoughby stated the NS Fire District had finished reviewing their policies  
7 and procedures with the new fire plan and it should be ready to adopt at the next meeting.

8

9 **Item 4 - Review And Possible Approval Of Accounts Payable:**

10

11 The Mayor and Council reviewed the accounts payable for October 2022.

12

13 **Council Member Tyler Rowser made a motion to approve the accounts payable for October 2022.**

14 **Council Member Steven Richins seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

15

16 **Item 5 – Review And Possible Approval Of Minutes:**

17

18 The Mayor and Council reviewed the minutes for September 13, 2022.

19

20 **Council Member Louise Willoughby made a motion to approve the minutes of September 13,**

21 **2022 as written. Council Member Steven Richins seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

22

23 **Item 6 – Adjournment:**

24

25 **Council Member Tyler Rowser made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Council Member Steven**

26 **Richins seconded the motion. All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

27

28 The meeting adjourned at 9:17 P.M.

29

30

31

32

33

---

Mayor Mark Marsh

34

35 Attest:

36

37

---

Nachele D. Sargent, City Recorder

38

39