



**PUBLIC HEARING AND CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS  
Tuesday, February 4, 2014 7:00 p.m.**

Notice is hereby given that the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, will hold a **City Council Meeting on Tuesday, February 4, 2014, beginning at 7:00 p.m.** at the Community Recreation Center, 10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah. This is a public meeting and anyone is invited to attend.

**COUNCIL MEETING**

1. Call to Order, Invocation given by C. Geddes and Pledge led by C. Crawley
2. Approval of Meeting's Agenda
3. Public Comment: Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns and comments (comments limited to 3 minutes per person with a total of 30 minutes for this item)

**PUBLIC HEARING**

4. Adoption of an Impact Fee Facilities Plan, Impact Fee Written Analyses, and Fee Schedule

**CONSENT AGENDA**

5. Appointment of Members to the Water Conservation Citizens Advisory Committee

**CITY REPORTS AND BUSINESS**

6. City Manager
7. Mayor and Council

**SCHEDULED ITEMS**

8. Review/Action on Adopting an Impact Fee Facilities Plan, Impact Fee Written Analyses, and Fee Schedule
9. Review/Action on a Resolution Authorizing the Mayor to sign an Interlocal Cooperative Agreement for NPDES Phase II Storm Water Public Education and Outreach Best Management Practice Compliance
10. Review/Action on FY 2014 Budget Amendments
11. Discussion on FY 2015 Capital Projects Fund, Motor Pool Fund and Vehicle Replacement Plan

**ADJOURNMENT**

12. Adjourn

Posted this 31st day of January, 2014

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey  
Colleen A. Mulvey, City Recorder

- Supporting documentation for this agenda is posted on the city's website at [www.cedarhills.org](http://www.cedarhills.org).
- In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Cedar Hills will make reasonable accommodations to participate in the meeting. Requests for assistance can be made by contacting the City Recorder at 801-785-9668 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.
- An Executive Session may be called to order pursuant to Utah State Code 54-4-204 & 54-4-205.
- The order of agenda items may change to accommodate the needs of the City Council, the staff, and the public.
- This meeting may be held electronically via telephone to permit one or more of the council members to participate.



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor and City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	David Bunker
<b>DATE:</b>	2/4/2014

## City Council Agenda Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Appointment of members to the Water Conservation Citizens Advisory Committee
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	N/A
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	David Bunker, City Manager
<b>BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:</b> Members of the Water Conservation Citizens Advisory Committee are appointed by the Mayor with the consent of the City Council. Mayor Gygi wishes to appoint the following residents to serve on this committee:  Chairperson: Richard Noble Regular Members: Joel Wright Brady Daley Pricilla Leak Cliff Chandler Betty Jo McKinlay	
<b>PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:</b> Resolution No. 12-03-2013D	
<b>FISCAL IMPACT:</b> n/a	
<b>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:</b>	
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b> Staff recommends that the above named residents be made a members of the Water Conservation Citizens Advisory Committee.	
<b>MOTION:</b> No motion necessary, appointed by the Mayor.	



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor and City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	David Bunker, City Manager
<b>DATE:</b>	2/4/2014

## City Council Agenda Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Impact Fee Facilities Plan Update and Impact Fee Amendment
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	N/A
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	David Bunker

**BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:**

The City has authorized the preparation of a comprehensive update to the Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and associated Impact Fee Calculations for the Public Safety, Culinary Water, Sanitary Sewer, Parks and Transportation systems. Zions Bank Public Finance and Bowen Collins & Associates have reviewed and prepared the updates based on approved methodology as outlined in Title 11, Chapter 36a of the Utah Code Annotated (the Impact Fees Act).

Based on the requirements for the preparation of the IFFP and information gathered for each facility, the IFFP has been updated and recommendations for amendments to the Impact Fee schedule are presented in the attached tables.

**PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:**

Last impact fee facilities plan and impact fee analysis completed in 2007.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Please refer to Impact Fee Summary Tables.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

Impact Fee Summary Tables, Ordinance and Resolution.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the City Council review the Impact Fee Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Analysis as presented, and adopt the 2014 Impact Fee Facilities Plan and associated Impact Fee Schedule.

**MOTION:**

To approve/not approve Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_\_, An Ordinance adopting the Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) and Impact Fee Evaluation for the Public Safety, Culinary Water, Sanitary Sewer, Parks and Transportation Facilities.

To approve/not approve Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_, A Resolution adding, amending, or deleting certain fees to the official fee schedule of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah.

**ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AN IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN (IFFP) AND IMPACT FEE EVALUATION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY, CULINARY WATER, SANITARY SEWER, PARKS AND TRAILS, AND TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES.**

**WHEREAS**, the Utah State Legislature through the enactment of Title 11, Chapter 36a, Impact Fees Act, of the Utah Code Annotated (UCA) 1953, has sought to encourage the City of Cedar Hills to enact impact fees; and

**WHEREAS**, the imposition of impact fees is one of the preferred methods of ensuring that development bears a proportionate share of the cost of capital facilities necessary to accommodate such development. This must be done in order to protect the public health, safety and welfare; and

**WHEREAS**, impact fees are a reasonable and legally permissible means of generating the revenue necessary to provide funding to construct adequate public facilities that are necessary to service new development; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills has theretofore authorized the preparation of a Capital Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Evaluation; and

**WHEREAS**, a report entitled “Cedar Hills Capital Facilities Plan for Public Safety, Culinary Water, Sanitary Sewer, Parks and Trails, and Transportation and Impact Fee Evaluation” setting forth a reasonable methodology and analysis for the determination of impact fees of new development on the need for and the costs of additional public facilities improvement in the City of Cedar Hills has been prepared; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council of the City of Hills has determined that the proposed amendments are in the best interest of the City and its citizens;

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS, UTAH, AS FOLLOWS:**

**PART I  
ADOPTION**

Section 1. That certain document entitled “Impact Fee Facilities Plan for Public Safety, Culinary Water, Sanitary Sewer, Parks and Trails, and Transportation Facilities” is hereby adopted by reference and attached hereto.

Section 2. That certain document adopted pursuant to Section 1, shall constitute the impact fee analysis as contemplated under Title 11, Chapter 36a, Utah Code Annotated 1953 as amended.

**PART II**  
**CONFLICTING ORDINANCES REPEALED, PROVISIONS SEVERABLE AND**  
**EFFECTIVE DATE**

**A. CONFLICTING PROVISIONS**

Whenever the provisions of the ordinance conflict with the provisions of any other ordinance, resolution or part thereof, the more stringent shall prevail.

**B. PROVISIONS SEVERABLE**

This ordinance and the various sections, clauses and paragraphs are hereby declared to be severable. If any part, sentence, clause or phrase is adjusted to be unconstitutional or invalid it is hereby declared that the remainder of the ordinance shall not be affected thereby.

**C. EFFECTIVE DATE**

This ordinance shall take effect upon its passage and posting.

**PASSED, ADOPTED AND ORDERED PUBLISHED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS, UTAH, THIS 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2014.**

---

Gary R. Gygi, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Colleen A. Mulvey, City Recorder

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION ADDING, AMENDING, OR DELETING CERTAIN FEES TO THE OFFICIAL FEE SCHEDULE OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS, UTAH.**

**WHEREAS**, the City has enacted various ordinances and fee resolutions setting certain fees for the City; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council desires to provide an updated schedule of all City fees; and

**WHEREAS**, the purpose of this resolution is to add, amend or delete certain fees on the fee schedule.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS, UTAH**, as follows:

**Section 1  
Adoption**

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 10-3-717 UCA, 1953, as amended, the City Council hereby adopts the schedule of fees for certain municipal services provided by the City as set forth by this Resolution.

Specific fees to be added and/or amended are as follows per Attachment A contained herein and shall be effective no sooner than 90 days after the adoption of this Resolution or April 6, 2014:

**Section 2  
Update/Adjustment of Fees**

1. Any subsequent fee resolutions for any or all of the fees contained within this fee schedule shall have the effect of updating and/or adjusting the fee schedule accordingly.
2. Any adjustment that is needed for those fees not created by a separate fee resolution shall be accomplished only by amending or repealing this resolution and adoption of a new fee resolution.

**Section 3  
Severability**

If any section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this resolution is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this resolution.

All resolutions or policies in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

**PASSED AND APPROVED this 4th day of February, 2014.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary R. Gygi, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Colleen A. Mulvey, City Recorder

# Attachment A

## Public Safety Impact Fee

A	B	C	D
1	Recommended Public Safety Impact Fees Per Unit		
2	Public Safety Impact Fee Categories	Cost per Call	Calls per Unit
3	Residential		Fee per Unit
4	Residential Unit	\$9,697.95	0.051
5	Non Residential		\$495.13
6	Private Non Residential (kSF Floor space)	\$9,697.95	0.073
7	Nursing Homes (kSF Floor space)	\$9,697.95	0.528
8	Big Box Retail (kSF Floor space)	\$9,697.95	0.042
9			
10	Non Standard Development Public Safety Impact Fee Formula		
11	Public Safety Cost Per Call	Unique Project	Assessment
12	9697.950085	x	Number of Annual Fire / EMS Calls
13		=	Projected to be Created
14	A	B	C
15			D

# Culinary Water Impact Fee

	A	B	C	
1	Upper Zone per ERU			1
2	Units of Measure		Fee	2
3	Per Equivalent Residential Connection (ERC)		\$1,749.00	3
4				4
5	Upper Zone by Connection Size			5
6	Units of Measure	Equivalency	Water Impact Fee	6
7	Residential			7
8	3/4" Meter Residential	1.00	\$1,749.00	8
9	Non-Residential			9
10	1"	1.30	\$2,273.70	10
11	1.5"	1.60	\$2,798.40	11
12	2"	2.60	\$4,547.40	12
13	3"	10.00	\$17,490.00	13
14	4"	12.70	\$22,212.30	14
15	6"	19.10	\$33,405.90	15
16	8"	26.40	\$46,173.60	16
17	10"	36.40	\$63,663.60	17
18				18
19	Upper Zone Non Standard Calculation			19
20	Non-Standard Users Impact Fee Formula			20
21	Step 1: Average Day Demand divided by 193 gallons = Equivalent ERC:			21
22	Step 2: Multiply Equivalent ERCs by Impact Fee per ERC of \$1,750			22
23				23
24				24
25				25
26	Lower Zone per ERU			26
27	Units of Measure		Water Impact Fee	27
28	Per Equivalent Residential Connection (ERC)		\$1,081.00	28
29				29
30	Lower Zone by Connection Size			30
31	Units of Measure	Equivalency	Water Impact Fee	31
32	Residential			32
33	3/4" Meter Residential	1.00	\$1,081.00	33
34	Non-Residential			34
35	1"	1.30	\$1,405.30	35
36	1.5"	1.60	\$1,729.60	36
37	2"	2.60	\$2,810.60	37
38	3"	10.00	\$10,810.00	38
39	4"	12.70	\$13,728.70	39
40	6"	19.10	\$20,647.10	40
41	8"	26.40	\$28,538.40	41
42	10"	36.40	\$39,348.40	42
43				43
44	Lower Zone Non Standard Calculation			44
45	Non-Standard Users Impact Fee Formula			45
46	Step 1: Average Day Demand divided by 193 gallons = Equivalent ERC:			46
47	Step 2: Multiply Equivalent ERCs by Impact Fee per ERC of \$1,081			47

## Sewer Impact Fee

	A	B	C	
1	Per ERU			1
2	Units of Measure		Fee	2
3	Per Equivalent Residential Connection (ERC)		\$928.80	3
4				4
5	By Culinary Connection Size			5
6	Units of Measure	Equivalency	Water Impact Fee	6
7	Residential			7
8	3/4" Meter Residential	1.00	\$928.80	8
9	Non-Residential			9
10	1"	1.30	\$1,207.44	10
11	1.5"	1.60	\$1,486.08	11
12	2"	2.60	\$2,414.88	12
13	3"	10.00	\$9,287.99	13
14	4"	12.70	\$11,795.75	14
15	6"	19.10	\$17,740.06	15
16	8"	26.40	\$24,520.29	16
17	10"	36.40	\$33,808.28	17
18				18
19	Non Standard Calculation			19
20	Non-Standard Users Impact Fee Formula			20
21	Step 1: Average Day Demand divided by 193 gallons = Equivalent ERC:			21
22	Step 2: Multiply Equivalent ERCs by Impact Fee per ERC of \$928.80			22
	A	B	C	



## Transportation Impact Fee

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Fee Per Trip End				
2	Unit of Measurement				Fee
3	Trip End				\$130.87
4					
7	Residential Fee by Type of Unit				
6	Unit of Measurement	Trips per Unit	Incoming vs. Outgoing	Net Trip Ends	Transportation Impact Fee
8	Single Family Unit	9.55	50%	4.78	\$624.90
9	Multi Family Unit	6.65	50%	3.33	\$435.14
10					
11	<b>TABLE F.3: NON-RESIDENTIAL AND NON-STANDARD IMPACT FEE CALCULATION</b>				
12	<i>Non-Residential and Non-Standard Users Impact Fee Formula</i>				
13	Total Trip Ends (Average Daily Trips ÷ 2)	X	Passby Adjustment Factor	X	Fee per Trip End
	A		B		C
				=	Customized Impact Fee
				D	E



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor and City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	Jeff Maag, Public Works Director
<b>DATE:</b>	2/4/2014

## City Council Agenda Item

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Storm Water Interlocal Agreement
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	n/a
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	Jeff Maag, Public Works Director

**BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:**

As part of our participation in the Utah County Storm Water Coalition, Cedar Hills is an active partner with the County and other participating cities in multiple Minimum Control Measures and Best Management Practices (BMP) of the City's Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) as required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II Storm Water regulations.

The BMPs specifically targeted as a coalition include 1) Public Education and Outreach on storm water impacts, and 2) Public Involvement and Participation. The City is currently participating in these activities through an Interlocal agreement with the County. The current agreement was ratified in 2008.

The proposed Interlocal Cooperation Agreement would allow participation in the program for up to 50 years. However, any entity participating in the agreement could terminate its participation in and responsibilities under the Agreement at any time and for any reason by providing a 60 day written notice.

**PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:**

This resolution will update and replace the 2008 Utah County Storm Water Coalition agreement.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Annual cost for the Utah County Storm Water Coalition is approximately \$1,100.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

Interlocal Agreement

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the City Council approve the Interlocal Agreement with the Utah County Storm Water Coalition for participation in the NPDES Phase II Storm Water Public Education and Outreach Best Management Practice Compliance.

**MOTION:**

To approve/not approve Resolution # \_\_\_\_\_, an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with the Utah County Storm Water Coalition for participation in the NPDES Phase II Storm Water Public Education and Outreach Best Management Practice Compliance.

**INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR NPDES  
PHASE II STORM WATER PUBLIC EDUCATION AND  
OUTREACH BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICE COMPLIANCE**

THIS AGREEMENT, is entered into this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014, by and between PROVO, OREM, PLEASANT GROVE, AMERICAN FORK, SPRINGVILLE, SPANISH FORK, LEHI, PAYSON, UTAH COUNTY, LINDON, HIGHLAND, ALPINE, MAPLETON, SALEM, CEDAR HILLS, and EAGLE MOUNTAIN, political subdivisions of the State of Utah.

**WITNESSETH:**

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to the provisions of the Interlocal Cooperation Act, Title 11, Chapter 13, Utah Code Annotated, 1953 as amended, public agencies, including political subdivisions of the State of Utah as therein defined, are authorized to enter into written agreements with one another for joint or cooperative action; and

**WHEREAS**, the parties to this Agreement are public agencies as defined in the Interlocal Cooperation Act; and

**WHEREAS**, the parties desire to establish a joint undertaking to comply with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II Storm Water Permit Coverage;

**NOW, THEREFORE**, the parties do mutually agree, pursuant to the terms and provisions of the Interlocal Cooperation Act, as follows:

**Section 1. EFFECTIVE DATE; DURATION**

This Interlocal Cooperation Agreement shall become effective and shall enter into force, within the meaning of the Interlocal Cooperation Act, upon the submission of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement to, and the approval and execution thereof by Resolution of the governing

bodies of each of the parties to this Agreement. Unless otherwise terminated as provided for herein, this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement shall be effective for a period of up to, but not exceeding, fifty (50) years. This Interlocal Cooperation Agreement shall not become effective until it has been approved by Resolution of all parties and reviewed as to proper form and compliance with applicable law by the attorney authorized to represent each of the parties hereto. Prior to becoming effective, this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement shall be filed with the official keeper of records of each of the parties hereto.

**Section 2. ADMINISTRATION OF AGREEMENT**

The parties to this Agreement do not contemplate nor intend to establish a separate legal entity under the terms of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement. The parties hereto agree that, pursuant to Section 11-13-207, Utah Code Annotated, 1953 as amended, UTAH COUNTY shall act as the administrator responsible for the administration of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement. The parties further agree that this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement does not anticipate nor provide for any organizational changes in the parties. The administrator agrees to keep all books and records in such form and manner as the Utah County Clerk/Auditor shall specify and further agrees that said books shall be open for examination by all parties to this Agreement, at reasonable times. The parties agree that they will not acquire, hold nor dispose of real or personal property pursuant to this Interlocal Agreement during this joint undertaking.

**Section 3. PURPOSES**

This Interlocal Cooperation Agreement has been established and entered into between the parties, for the purpose of a joint undertaking to comply with NPDES Phase II Storm Water Permit Public Education and Outreach Best Management Practices.

**Section 4. MANNER OF FINANCING**

The parties agree that they shall provide the following resources and/or assistance for this joint undertaking:

- a. COUNTY shall act as the administrator of this Agreement, pursuant to the terms of Section 2 hereof, and shall :
  1. Schedule and conduct Utah County Storm Water Coalition meetings which are necessary to correlate activities, set proposed budgets, and provide training opportunities.
  2. Provide information regarding best management practices for preventing storm water pollution that can be placed in a newsletter or other form of communication as determined by each member agency to be distributed to the public as each agency deems appropriate.
  3. Maintain contract with approved Storm Water Educational Instructor and ensure proper teaching material is being presented. Maintain a master list of approved schools to be given to approved Storm Water Educational Instructor. Provide for each member agency a list of schools visited, the dates of all visits, an estimated number of attending students, and the number of classes taught.
  4. Become a central warehouse for storm water educational materials and provide on demand materials for distribution. These materials could include informational pamphlets, activity books, pencils, note pads, magnets, videos, etc.
  5. Maintain storage of display information for booths to be used for city and

county activities and other events.

6. Provide, maintain, and promote an information system to the public for the disposal of household materials and chemicals to include internet and phone services. Citizens will be able to call a local, countywide phone number or access a website where gathered information for disposal sites will be distributed.
- b. Each party to this agreement will pay to Utah County within 30 days of receipt of an annual invoice from Utah County, the sums listed in Exhibit A to this Agreement, said sums to be used solely for the NPDES Storm Water Phase II Public Education and Outreach Best Management Practices. The sums listed in Exhibit A shall be reviewed, approved, and modified by agency representatives on an annual basis, based on a combination of the percentage of the party's total population to the total population of the County as determined by the most recent Mountainland Association of Government figures and the percentage of the party's total number of schools to the total school count as submitted by the member agencies.

#### **Section 5. METHOD OF TERMINATION**

This Interlocal Cooperation Agreement will automatically terminate at the end of its term herein, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph one (1) of this Agreement. Prior to the automatic termination at the end of the term of this Agreement, any party to this Agreement may terminate its participation in and responsibilities under this Agreement at any time and for any reason by providing a sixty (60) day written notice of termination to the other parties. This Agreement may not be terminated in any event, if termination would cause a violation of the parties' NPDES Storm Water Permit.

**Section 6. INDEMNIFICATION**

The parties to this Agreement are public entities. Each party agrees to indemnify and save harmless the other for damages, claims, suits, and actions arising out of a negligent error or omission of its own officials or employees in connection with this Agreement.

**Section 7. ADDITION OF OTHER MEMBERS**

Other entities may become parties to this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement, by executing an Addendum to this Agreement. In order for an entity to be added to this Agreement by Addendum, the Addendum must be approved by resolution of the governing body of the entity to be added and the Addendum must be reviewed for proper form and compliance with applicable law by the attorney for the entity to be added. Prior to becoming effective, this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement and any Addendum shall be filed with the official keeper of records of the entity being added to this Agreement.

**Section 8. FILING OF INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT**

Executed copies of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement shall be filed with the official keeper of records of all parties to this Agreement and shall remain on file for public inspection during the term of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement.

**Section 9. ADOPTION REQUIREMENTS**

This Interlocal Cooperation Agreement shall be (a) approved by Resolution of the governing body of each of the parties, (b) executed by a duly authorized official of each of the parties (c) submitted to and approved by an Authorized Attorney of each of the parties, as required by Section 11-13-202.5(3), Utah Code Annotated, 1953 as amended, and (d) filed in the official records of each party.

**Section 10.   LAWFUL AGREEMENT**

The parties represent that each of them has lawfully entered into this Agreement, having complied with all relevant statutes, ordinances, resolutions, by-laws, and other legal requirements applicable to their operation.

**Section 11.   AMENDMENTS**

This Interlocal Cooperation Agreement may not be amended, changed, modified or altered except by an instrument in writing which shall be (a) approved by Resolution of the governing body of each of the parties, (b) executed by a duly authorized official of each of the parties, (c) submitted to and approved by an Authorized Attorney of each of the parties, as required by Section 11-13-202.5(3), Utah Code Annotated, 1953 as amended, and (d) filed in the official records of each party.

**Section 12.   SEVERABILITY**

If any term or provision of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement or the application thereof shall to any extent be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement, or the application of such term or provision to circumstances other than those with respect to which it is invalid or unenforceable, shall not be affected thereby, and shall be enforced to the extent permitted by law. To the extent permitted by applicable law, the parties hereby waive any provision of law which would render any of the terms of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement unenforceable.

**Section 13.   NO PRESUMPTION**

Should any provision of this Agreement require judicial interpretation, the Court interpreting or construing the same shall not apply a presumption that the terms hereof shall be more strictly construed against the party, by reason of the rule of construction that a document is to be construed more strictly against the person who himself or through his agents prepared the same, it being

acknowledged that all parties have participated in the preparation hereof.

**Section 14. BINDING AGREEMENT**

This Agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, administrators, and assigns of each of the parties hereto.

**Section 15. NOTICES**

All notices, demands and other communications required or permitted to be given hereunder shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been properly given if delivered by hand or by certified mail, return receipt requested, postage paid, to the parties' recorder or clerk/auditor as the case may be; or at such other addresses as may be designated by notice given hereunder.

**Section 16. ASSIGNMENT**

The parties to this Agreement shall not assign this Agreement, or any part hereof, without the prior written consent of all other parties to this Agreement. No assignment shall relieve the original parties from any liability hereunder.

**Section 17. GOVERNING LAW**

All questions with respect to the construction of this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement, and the rights and liability of the parties hereto, shall be governed by the laws of the State of Utah.

**Section 18. ENTIRE AGREEMENT**

This Agreement shall constitute the entire Agreement between the parties and any prior understanding or representation of any kind proceeding the date of this Agreement shall not be binding upon either party except to the extent incorporated in this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have signed and executed this Interlocal Cooperation Agreement, after resolutions duly and lawfully passed, on the dates listed below:

**UTAH COUNTY**

Authorized by Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_, authorized and passed on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
UTAH COUNTY, UTAH**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
GARY J. ANDERSON, Chairman

ATTEST: Bryan Thompson  
Utah County Clerk/Auditor

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:  
Jeff Buhman, Utah County Attorney

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy Utah County Attorney

**PROVO CITY STORM WATER SERVICE DISTRICT**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TITLE

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR DISTRICT

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR DISTRICT

**CITY OF OREM**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF PLEASANT GROVE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF AMERICAN FORK**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF SPRINGVILLE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF SPANISH FORK**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF LEHI**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF PAYSON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF LINDON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF HIGHLAND**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF ALPINE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF MAPLETON**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF SALEM**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF CEDAR HILLS**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**CITY OF EAGLE MOUNTAIN**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
RECORDER FOR CITY

APPROVED AS TO PROPER FORM AND  
COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAWS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY FOR CITY

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN AMENDED INTERLOCAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT FOR NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES) PHASE II STORM WATER PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICE COMPLIANCE.**

**WHEREAS**, the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, desires to enter into an Amended Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with Utah County and various Utah County Cities for the NPDES Phase II Storm Water Public Education and Outreach Best Management Practice Compliance.

**NOW THEREFORE**, the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah resolves to approve the Amended Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with various cities for NPDES Phase II Storm Water Public Education and Outreach Best Management Practice Compliance and authorizes the Mayor to sign the said agreement (attached).

**PASSED AND APPROVED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2014.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary R. Gygi, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Colleen A. Mulvey, City Recorder



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor Gygi and City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	David Bunker, City Manager
<b>DATE:</b>	2/4/2014

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Review/Action on FY 2014 Budget Amendments
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	Charl Louw, Finance Director

**BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:**

The City is required to keep expenditures within budget. As the Council is aware, accurately forecasting all the expenditures and needs of the community is difficult; therefore, budget amendments may be necessary to comply with State requirements.

**PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:**

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Golf Course Driving Range Posts and Netting Replacement  
Golf Fund

20-95-202	Driving Range Fence	\$19,700 increase
20-30-990	Use of Fund Balance	\$12,200 increase
20-30-600	Season Passes	\$7,500 increase
20-35-300	Transfer In From Other Funds	\$12,200 increase

Capital Projects Fund

40-97-100	Transfer To Golf Course Fund	\$12,200 increase
-----------	------------------------------	-------------------

Lone Peak Public Safety District Admin Fee not included

10-55-300	Fire Services	\$11,000 increase
10-40-510	Insurance	\$11,000 decrease

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

To approve the resolution.

**MOTION:**

Adopt Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_ A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE AMENDED 2013-2014 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS, UTAH.

**RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS, UTAH,  
ADOPTING THE AMENDED 2014 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF  
CEDAR HILLS, UTAH.**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CEDAR HILLS,  
UTAH:**

Pursuant to §10-6-118, Utah Code, the Amended 2013-2014 Fiscal Year Budget for the General Fund, Capital Projects Fund, Golf Special Revenue Fund, Golf Debt Service Fund and Golf Course Fund for the City of Cedar Hills, Utah, is hereby adopted. A copy of said budget amendments is attached hereto (Attachment A), and by this reference made part of this Resolution.

**PASSED APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2014**

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary R. Gygi, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Colleen A. Mulvey, City Recorder



# CITY OF CEDAR HILLS

<b>TO:</b>	Mayor Gygi & City Council
<b>FROM:</b>	David Bunker, City Manager
<b>DATE:</b>	2/4/2014

## City Council Memorandum

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	FY 2015 Budget Presentation
<b>APPLICANT PRESENTATION:</b>	
<b>STAFF PRESENTATION:</b>	Charl Louw, Finance Director
<b>BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS:</b>	Presentation of the 2015 Capital Projects Fund Budgeted Expenditures, Motor Pool Fund, Vehicle Replacement Plan
<b>PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE ACTION:</b>	
<b>FISCAL IMPACT:</b>	
<b>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:</b>	Preliminary 2015 Capital Projects Fund Budgeted Expenditures, Available Fund Balance Update, Motor Pool Fund Budget, & Vehicle Replacement plan
<b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>	To review and comment on the 2015 Capital Projects Fund Budgeted Expenditures, Motor Pool Fund Budget, & Vehicle Replacement plan
<b>MOTION:</b>	

**MOTOR POOL REVENUES**

	FY 2011 ACTUAL	FY 2012 ACTUAL	FY 2013 ACTUAL	FY 2013 BUDGET	FY 2014 BUDGET	FY 2015 BUDGET	CHANGE
60-30-100 Contribution from General Fund	\$71,255	\$132,500	\$104,000	\$104,000	\$88,105	\$82,198	(\$5,907)
60-30-200 Contribution from Water & Sewer Fund	\$63,946	\$57,100	\$43,000	\$43,000	\$37,045	\$68,376	\$31,331
60-30-300 Contribution from Community Recreation Fund	\$2,332	\$2,750	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$0
60-70-205 Gain on Sale of Assets	\$13,467	\$3,722	\$45,647	\$40,000	\$36,450	\$18,195	(\$18,255)
	<b>\$151,000</b>	<b>\$196,072</b>	<b>\$195,647</b>	<b>\$190,000</b>	<b>\$164,600</b>	<b>\$171,768</b>	<b>\$7,168</b>

**MOTOR POOL EXPENDITURES**

VEHICLE EXPENDITURES	FY 2011 ACTUAL	FY 2012 ACTUAL	FY 2013 ACTUAL	FY 2013 BUDGET	FY 2014 BUDGET	FY 2015 BUDGET	CHANGE
60-40-100 Gas & Oil - Admin	\$6,028	\$5,231	\$8,051	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$8,000	\$0
60-40-200 Vehicle Maintenance - Admin	\$888	\$626	\$2,552	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0
60-40-300 Insurance - Admin	\$1,085	\$696	\$806	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$0
60-40-400 Gas & Oil - Bldg/Zoning	\$1,071	\$543	\$656	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$0
60-40-500 Vehicle Maintenance - Bldg/Zoning	\$563	\$196	\$104	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$0
60-40-600 Insurance - Bldg/Zoning	\$873	\$878	\$269	\$750	\$900	\$900	\$0
60-40-700 Gas & Oil - PW	\$29,610	\$25,314	\$21,481	\$35,000	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$0
60-40-800 Vehicle Maintenance - PW	\$5,576	\$7,050	\$6,682	\$10,000	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$0
60-40-900 Insurance - PW	\$5,631	\$4,413	\$4,031	\$6,750	\$6,750	\$6,750	\$0
60-40-930 Gas & Oil - Golf	\$1,375	\$0	\$1,787	\$1,750	\$1,750	\$1,750	\$0
60-40-940 Vehicle Maintenance - Golf	\$431	\$1,372	\$1,835	\$500	\$750	\$750	\$0
60-40-950 Insurance - Golf	\$525	\$348	\$269	\$750	\$500	\$500	\$0
60-40-905 Contingency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<b>\$53,658</b>	<b>\$46,667</b>	<b>\$48,522</b>	<b>\$68,000</b>	<b>\$67,150</b>	<b>\$67,150</b>	<b>\$0</b>

EQUIPMENT EXPENDITURES	FY 2010 ACTUAL	FY 2012 ACTUAL	FY 2013 ACTUAL	FY 2013 BUDGET	FY 2014 BUDGET	FY 2015 BUDGET	CHANGE
60-60-100 Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,000	\$8,000
60-60-400 Rent Expense	\$16,858	\$16,250	\$17,219	\$17,000	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$0
60-70-200 Depreciation	\$88,324	\$81,092	\$79,777	\$105,000	\$75,450	\$74,618	(\$832)
	<b>\$105,182</b>	<b>\$97,342</b>	<b>\$96,997</b>	<b>\$122,000</b>	<b>\$97,450</b>	<b>\$104,618</b>	<b>\$7,168</b>

<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$158,840</b>	<b>\$144,009</b>	<b>\$145,518</b>	<b>\$190,000</b>	<b>\$164,600</b>	<b>\$171,768</b>	<b>\$7,168</b>
--------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------

**CAPITAL OUTLAY**

- 2015 Compact Truck (Zoning)
- 2015 1 Ton Flat-bed Truck (Public Works)
- 2015 1 Ton Truck (Public Works)
- 2015 1 Ton Truck (Public Works)
- 2015 ATV



Popular at KBB.com

10 Best SUVs Under \$25,000

Advertisement

Why ads?

Home > Top Picks > Best Resale Value Awards > Best Brands

# 2014 Best Resale Value Awards: Best Brands

Overview | **Best Brands** | Top Ten | Categories



Advertisement

Why ads?

Share this article

Like   Tweet  Share

## Best Brands

[Previous](#) | [Next](#)

Kelley Blue Book's Best Brand and Best Luxury Brand awards are the pinnacle of what every car company on the planet wants to be recognized as: An undisputed icon of long-term value.

### Best Brand: Toyota

For the third year in a row, Japan's biggest automaker has earned podium-topping stature as the brand to buy if you want to see more of your money come back when you sell your vehicle. There's no trick to Toyota's success in the resale value arena – it's an old-fashioned formula: Make a quality product that improves people's lives, sell it at an affordable price, and make triple-certain that the comfort, reliability and enjoyment last for years. From across a crowded field of competitors that's never been stronger, the 2014 Best Resale Value Award for Best Brand goes to Toyota.

### Crossovers & SUVs

- 2014 Toyota 4Runner
- 2014 Toyota FJ Cruiser
- 2014 Toyota Highlander
- 2014 Toyota Land Cruiser
- 2014 Toyota RAV4
- 2014 Toyota Sequoia
- 2014 Toyota Venza

### Best Luxury Brand: Lexus

Everything Lexus knows about keeping resale values strong, it learned from parent company Toyota: Insist on a level of quality and mechanical craftsmanship so high, it would have been unimaginable just a few years ago. Perfect your interiors and make people so comfortable, they never want to leave. And most importantly, build vehicles that earn the emotional trust of your customers. Over the past three years, Lexus has taken home back-to-back-to-back Best Resale Value Awards as the Best Luxury Brand in America. One win is an honor, two wins is a thrill, but three wins in a row is a dynasty.

### Crossovers & SUVs

- 2014 Lexus GX
- 2014 Lexus LX
- 2014 Lexus RX

### Sedans & Convertibles

- 2014 Lexus ES
- 2014 Lexus GS

## Free Dealer Price Quote

Get the best price and be more prepared with your free, no-obligation price quote

Select Make  Select Model

ZIP Code

[Get your quote](#)

## Most Recent

- [Editors' Guide: 2014 Midsize SUVs](#)
- [Full Review: 2014 Cadillac ELR](#)
- [Editors' Page: 2014 Mazda CX-9](#)
- [Editors' Page: 2014 Hyundai Santa Fe](#)
- [2014 Audi S8 Quick Take](#)
- [Editors' Page: 2014 Toyota Highlander](#)
- [2014 Kia Soul Review](#)
- [Editors' Page: 2014 Nissan Pathfinder](#)
- [Editors' Page: 2014 Honda Pilot](#)
- [Editors' Page: 2014 Dodge Durango](#)

[more](#)

Recently Viewed Cars | My Saved Cars



1/30/2014

2014 Best Resale Value Awards: Best Brands - Kelley Blue Book

[2014 Toyota Camry](#)  
[2014 Toyota Corolla](#)

### Hybrids & Plug-In Cars

[2014 Toyota Prius](#)  
[2014 Toyota Prius c](#)  
[2014 Toyota Prius Plug-in](#)  
[2014 Toyota Prius v](#)

### Van/Minivan

[2014 Toyota Sienna](#)

### Pickup Trucks

[2014 Toyota Tacoma](#)  
[2014 Toyota Tundra](#)

### Hatchback

[2014 Toyota Yaris](#)

### Hybrids & Plug-In Cars

[2014 Lexus LS Hybrid](#)  
[2014 Lexus RX Hybrid](#)  
[2014 Lexus CT Hybrid](#)

See the previous Winners of these Awards: [2013](#) | [2012](#) | [2011](#)

[Previous](#) | [Next](#)

Share this article

Like 517 8+1 157 Tweet 179

Share 649

Search:

#### Popular Topics

[Best Cars](#)  
[Car Classifieds](#)  
[Best Resale Value Awards](#)  
[5-Year Cost-to-Own Center](#)  
[New Cars for 2014](#)

#### Car Reviews & News

[Car Reviews](#)  
[Car Videos](#)  
[2014 Detroit Auto Show](#)  
[Car News](#)  
[Car Infographics](#)

#### Help

[FAQ](#)  
[Site Map](#)  
[Find a New Car](#)  
[What's My Car Worth](#)  
[KBB<sup>SM</sup> Mobile](#)

#### Company

[About Us](#)  
[Contact Us](#)  
[Careers](#)  
[Corporate Information](#)

#### Industry Relations

[Advertising](#)  
[Media Center](#)  
[Linking Policy](#)  
[Business Solutions](#)

Follow KBB

[Facebook](#)

[Twitter](#)

[Google+](#)

[YouTube](#)

[LinkedIn](#)

[RSS](#)

[Mobile Apps](#)

[iPhone<sup>®</sup>](#)

[Android<sup>™</sup>](#)

[Windows<sup>®</sup>](#)

© 1995-2014 Kelley Blue Book Co.®, Inc. All rights reserved. [Copyright & Trademarks](#) | [Terms of Service](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Ad Choices](#)

# Vehicle Replacement Schedule

Vehicle Description	FY 2015 Budget		FY 2016 Budget		FY 2017 Budget		FY 2018 Budget		
	Sell	Buy	Sell	Buy	Sell	Buy	Sell	Buy	
PW 2014 Ford F-150									3 years
PW 2009 GMC Sierra 3500HD FLATBED									4 years
PW 2012 GMC Sierra 3500									3 years
PW 2014 Ford F-150									3 years
PW 2012 GMC Sierra 3500									3 years
PW 2005 GMC Sierra									3 years
PW 2006 International Bobtail									At least 6 years
PW 2007 International Bobtail									At least 6 years
PW 2012 Freightliner 10 Wheeler									At least 6 years
PW 2012 Tesco Dump Body for 10 Wheeler									At least 6 years
PW 2009 Honda ATV									6 years
PW 2014 Ford F-150 Super Crew									3 years
B&Z 2012 GMC Canyon Ex Cab									3 years
CS 2013 Ford F150									3 years
AD 2013 GMC Sierra Crewcab									3 years
AD 2013 Toyota Camry									3 years

### Cash Outflow for Purchases

	<b>\$86,000</b>
	<b>\$56,500</b>
	<b>\$29,500</b>

	<b>\$92,500</b>
	<b>\$56,500</b>
	<b>\$36,000</b>

	<b>\$83,500</b>
	<b>\$57,500</b>
	<b>\$26,000</b>

	<b>\$81,000</b>
	<b>\$55,000</b>
	<b>\$26,000</b>

### 2013 Disposals

	Original Price	Sell Price
2009 GMC Sierra Crew	\$ 38,443.00	\$ 25,600.00
2009 GMC Sierra 2500	\$ 24,908.00	\$ 18,025.00
2009 GMC Sierra 2500	\$ 24,908.00	\$ 17,250.00
2009 GMC Canyon	\$ 19,079.85	\$ 16,250.00

### Months Used Average Monthly Cost

	Months Used	Average Monthly Cost
	43	\$ 298.67
	40	\$ 172.08
	40	\$ 191.45
	41	\$ 69.02

**CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND EXPENDITURES**

<b>STREET PROJECTS</b>		<b>FY 2012 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2014 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2015 BUDGET</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>	
40-76-731	Sidewalk Projects	\$0	\$20,364	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	Unrestricted fund balance
40-76-732	Harvey Roundabout Project	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000	Harvey Blvd-Street Impact fees
40-76-779	Street Lights	\$4,755	\$1,400	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
40-76-781	Harvey Blvd Widening	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0	Street impact fees & Financing
40-76-783	GIS - Streets	\$13,461	\$4,490	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
		<b>\$18,214</b>	<b>\$24,254</b>	<b>\$525,000</b>	<b>\$520,000</b>	<b>\$820,000</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>	
<b>PARK PROJECTS</b>		<b>FY 2012 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2014 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2015 BUDGET</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>	
40-80-802	Deerfield Park - Land Purchase	\$0	\$0	\$972,000	\$972,000	\$972,000	\$0	Land Impact fees & Financing
40-80-803	Deerfield Park - Development	\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$0	Financing
40-80-814	Mesquite Soccer Park Restroom/Storage	\$0	\$2,500	\$25,000	\$38,000	\$0	(\$38,000)	Park grant (\$5k), CARE tax funds (\$30k)
40-80-817	Bayhill Trailhead Park Phase I	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	CARE TAX and Park Development Impact fees
40-80-820	Heritage Park - Basketball Court	\$36,245	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
40-80-821	Splash Pad	\$15,117	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
		<b>\$51,342</b>	<b>\$2,500</b>	<b>\$2,497,000</b>	<b>\$2,510,000</b>	<b>\$2,522,000</b>	<b>\$12,000</b>	
<b>MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS</b>		<b>FY 2012 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2014 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2015 BUDGET</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>	
40-90-761	Canyon Road Sewer	\$175,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400,000	\$400,000	Water & Sewer fund balance
40-95-102	Settlement, Wileoffs	\$175,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
40-95-115	Avanyu Projects	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
40-95-125	Trench Box	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,000	\$0	(\$12,000)	
40-95-135	Golf Miami Equipment Facility & Site	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$100K Gen Fund, \$100K Capital Proj, \$100K Water
40-95-150	Impact Fee Analysis	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,000	\$0	(\$36,000)	
40-95-200	Community Recreation Center - Phase II	\$0	\$218,706	\$350,000	\$350,000	\$0	(\$350,000)	
40-95-201	Community Recreation Center - Phase III	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
40-95-230	Hillside Remediation Project	\$74,949	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
40-77-720	Public Works Building Basement	\$47,201	\$2,158	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
40-95-220	Civic Center	\$7,950	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
		<b>\$305,120</b>	<b>\$220,864</b>	<b>\$850,000</b>	<b>\$398,000</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>	<b>(\$98,000)</b>	
<b>DEBT SERVICE</b>		<b>FY 2012 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2014 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2015 BUDGET</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>	
40-98-100	1999 Lease Revenue Bond - PSB	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
40-98-105	Interest Expense	\$105,476	\$86,663	\$86,700	\$83,963	\$81,063	(\$2,700)	50/50 Split between General fund and Water & Sewer fund
40-98-200	2006 Excise Revenue Bond - PWB	\$65,000	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$70,000	\$75,000	\$5,000	50/50 Split between General fund and Water & Sewer fund
40-98-795	Trustee Fees	\$4,091	\$1,580	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,450	(\$150)	PWB \$1,650 U.S. Bank
		<b>\$574,547</b>	<b>\$153,243</b>	<b>\$153,200</b>	<b>\$155,443</b>	<b>\$157,713</b>	<b>\$2,250</b>	
<b>OTHER USES</b>		<b>FY 2012 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 ACTUAL</b>	<b>FY 2013 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2014 BUDGET</b>	<b>FY 2015 BUDGET</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>	
40-96-11	Transfer to the Community Recreation Fund	\$2,366,656	\$2,049,358	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Transfer of Cash to cover deficit as of 6-30-12
		<b>\$2,366,656</b>	<b>\$2,049,358</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>		<b>\$3,315,921</b>	<b>\$2,472,218</b>	<b>\$4,025,200</b>	<b>\$3,583,443</b>	<b>\$3,779,713</b>	<b>\$ 214,250</b>	

