

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Tuesday, March 3, 2020 6:00 p.m.
Community Recreation Center
10640 N Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Jenney Rees, Mayor, Presiding
 Councilmembers: Denise Andersen, Ben Ellsworth, Kelly Smith
 Mike Geddes (6:12 p.m.)
 Absent/Excused: Brian Miller
 Chandler Goodwin, City Manager
 Greg Gordon, Recreation Director
 Jeff Maag, Public Works Director
 Charl Louw, Finance Director
 Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder
 Others: Lt. Josh Christensen

This work session meeting of the City Council of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Mayor Rees.

Mayor Rees stated the only things on the agenda was a discussion of the items on the regular agenda.

1. Discussion on Smart Irrigation Controllers

Chandler Goodwin stated that the City had restrictions on watering based on an odd/even system depending on home address. He stated that the Council wanted to develop a policy that would incentivize people to go out and buy smart irrigation controllers which regulate how much water is put onto lawns based on temperature. He stated that the EPA had a website called WaterSense where they judge these controllers based on certain criteria. He stated that there is a WaterSense logo on the boxes of the controllers and these would qualify for rebate through the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. He quoted from the EPA website that “residential outdoor water use in the United States accounts for 9 billion gallons of water each day” and he stated that that was mainly for landscape irrigation. He continued from the website, “Experts estimate that as much as 50% of this water is wasted due to over water watering caused by inefficiencies in irrigation methods and systems.” He stated these controllers were to address the inefficiencies and bridge the gap between efficient and inefficient and the irrigation controllers act as a thermostat for sprinkling systems. They used local weather and landscape to tailor watering schedules instead of using a preset schedule.

Mr. Goodwin stated that one of the problems he had with his personal system was that the weather in Cedar Hills was so localized that the weather could be different than what was happening at the nearest weather station. C. Andersen asked if the City office could become a weather station so that their controllers could be programmed to that station. Mr. Goodwin replied that they could program a computer to act as a weather station; however, it wouldn’t be recognized as an official weather station and the information would not be as good.

Jeff Maag commented that the City had smart controllers and one of the weather stations they used was at Pleasant Grove Junior High. There was an underground weather station in Highland. He stated that if the City created a weather station it would also have to create a website or some sort of contact where people could sign up to utilize the station as part of their smart controller. Mayor Rees commented that she had one on her property that used the Pleasant Grove station and that it seemed to work well.

Mr. Goodwin stated that currently there were odd/even watering days based on address and no watering on Sundays at all. He stated if a smart controller policy like this were adopted then that would need to change. Mayor Rees agreed and stated people might manually override the system, but the controller would regulate based on weather. Mr. Goodwin stated that across the City the enforcement measures included hanging notices on doors where violations were occurring, and the addresses are put into a spreadsheet where the offenses were kept track of. He stated that the first offense was a warning and fines started with the second offense.

He stated there were some large open areas that were excluded from the watering restrictions. For example, HOA common areas because they were unable to water their whole zone in 24 hours, but they had a schedule approved with the City. He said that many of the City's water systems were on smart controllers. Many were still on timers, but that it didn't make financial sense to replace these because they would need power and cell service. He stated that these controllers were about \$300 each.

Mr. Maag stated that right now they were doing around \$4500 annually for the cell service to operate for six months. Mr. Goodwin said he knew they were going to get complaints but that they were just going to have to accept those phone calls.

C. Andersen asked about annual fees. Mr. Goodwin stated that there wouldn't be an annual fee at an individual home because it would run off the homes' power and Wi-Fi. The City's controllers weren't connected to a power source because they are in the middle of a park or road, so they would have to pay extra for battery and cell service.

Mayor Rees stated that if a smart controller from the approved list was bought it could be turned in for a rebate of 50% of the purchase price. She stated that they were hiring teenagers to monitor this as a seasonal job and that it would be smart for them to have a list of who had smart controllers and who didn't. She suggested changing the wording on the notice to state that if residents had registered their smart controller with the City to disregard the notice. If they wanted more information on the smart controller program, citizens should visit the website.

Mr. Goodwin added that in 2015 the water restrictions were introduced, and they hadn't seen a significant reduction in water use savings. Most of the water savings they saw was based on the weather. He commented that he didn't think that this would move the dial all that much but that it encouraged good behavior. Mayor Rees disagreed and stated that BYU did a study on smart controller implementation and they implemented a program where they gave smart controllers to residents for free. She stated that the study found a pretty significant reduction in usage when they added smart controllers. Mr. Goodwin stated that there was probably an accelerated pricing

schedule that accompanied that. Mayor Rees replied that was possible and stated that Spanish Fork wasn't seeing the results they wanted with meters alone and that with the smart controller it takes a lot of the guesswork out.

C. Smith asked if meters would substantially change things. Mr. Goodwin answered affirmatively, and voiced agreement with Mayor Rees. Mayor Rees stated that she wants to add meters with a pricing structure. Mr. Goodwin stated he didn't know how they would do meters long term without a down payment on pricing. C. Andersen mentioned turning on PI later in the season. Mr. Goodwin commented that that was something that the staff would look at.

C. Smith asked what the cons of the meters were to which Mr. Goodwin replied cost. Mayor Rees added that it was also considered a push back and they didn't want to go that route. C. Ellsworth asked about new construction. Mayor Rees commented it was required by law. Mr. Goodwin stated that if users use more than what's allotted there's no consequence in place.

Mayor Rees said that the interesting thing about meters with smart controllers is that meters have been implemented in some of the drier states. Studies have shown that in higher socioeconomic areas meters don't really move the needle all that much. In lower socio-economic status areas, they aren't using as much water because they can't afford as much.

Mr. Maag stated that from their experience with the smart controllers, there is a plastic cuplike device that attaches to the controller on the side of the building to regulate the system. This has shown the biggest advantage to conserving water versus the online services or weather stations, because it monitors the exact location. He stated that rain will delay the system and then after three days it will start back up again. C. Ellsworth asked if that could be hooked up to existing systems cheaper than the smart controller, to which Mr. Maag replied yes. C. Smith asked if they received a rebate for those devices. Mr. Maag said he did not know.

Mayor Rees stated that the big cost for them was that they would have to purchase the device and then have them all installed. They would then have to collect data every month and somehow provide it to the residents. Part of the policy is not only installing the PI meters, but also providing the residents with regular information about how much water is being used to help them reduce usage. Mr. Goodwin stated there is a lot of cost involved; if they took their time and dragged it out and did 5% each year and finished by 2039, they would have completed installation throughout the City.

C. Ellsworth said that if everyone could see how much water they were using, then there would be some drop and they would see savings. Mayor Rees agreed. Mr. Goodwin added there would be savings on pumping costs, but there would also be long term maintenance because water was being run through the system so fast it was putting a lot of wear and tear on the system. He commented that the pumps in the PI system are almost constantly going.

Mayor Rees stated she liked the policy because it encouraged good behavior; even if it didn't make things better it wouldn't make things worse. Mr. Goodwin stated that he didn't think this alone was going to do it, but it was a move in the right direction. C. Smith commented that she liked the idea from the standpoint of education. C. Andersen asked if there was a program to buy these

controllers in bulk for the City so they could sell them cheaper to residents. Mr. Goodwin replied that many of the controllers were inexpensive, especially when considering the rebate. Mayor Rees commented that the one she had was \$100 and she got a \$50 rebate. Mr. Goodwin stated that most lots could be serviced by one controller.

Mr. Goodwin stated the changes he was making to the proposed policy included language right from the EPA website, allow watering on Sundays, and mentioning common areas. Mayor Rees added that they should include a link for the rebate.

2. Discussion on Golf Course Logo/Rebranding

Mr. Goodwin stated that one of the reasons for rebranding was to give the course a fresh look. He stated that some people associated the golf course with the contention in the City over the years. They also associated it with the trailer that the pro shop operated out of for years. He said perceptions of the course were old. He commented that it was also to come up with a logo that was less ubiquitous, and they wanted to give Cedar Hills golf course a logo that was their own. They had gone to other golf courses for inspiration and liked a more abstract idea for the golf course.

Mr. Goodwin stated that the guidelines given to the staff were that even though they wanted to get away from the trees on the logo, the logo still needed to say Cedar Hills. Chase Media Group did some mockups of the golf logo and put them on hats and shirts so the Council could see what they looked like in the real world. Mr. Goodwin then reviewed pictures of the logos Chase had come up with.

Mayor Rees asked Mr. Gordon what he thought. He stated he liked the first one. C. Smith liked the mountain one because they were one of the few courses in the state located on the hillside. There was subsequent discussion on the logo and rebranding process.

Mr. Gordon stated that they were waiting to put logos on the new golf carts until the Council decided. Staff wasn't in a huge rush but that they wanted some direction. Mr. Goodwin reiterated that they weren't changing the logo of the City just the golf course.

ADJOURNMENT

This meeting was adjourned 6:48 pm on a motion by C. Andersen, seconded by C. Smith, and unanimously approved.

Approved by Council:
April 14, 2020

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC
City Recorder