

FEBRUARY 13, 1968

The Mayor welcomed less than thirty citizens in the Council Chambers and announced that this was the time and the place for reconvening a public hearing, originally called January 18th, 1968, for the purpose of considering all written and verbal protests, testimony and other comments, relative to the creation and establishment of Local Improvement District #37. There were present at said meeting: Mayor S. Eddie Pedersen; Councilmen Jim Freeman, Mel Erickson, Jack Wood, Gordon Nelson, Dale Parish. Absent: Councilwoman Lyn Smith. Also present: Roy C. Barnes, City Clerk; Arthur Smith, City Attorney; Don Lloyd, Public Works Director; Joe Baird, City Engineer.

The Mayor asked for additional written protests. There were none submitted. Since January 18th, the Mayor noted that a Committee of interested and affected citizens had been working closely with the Engineering Department and the Council, through informal meetings, toward the objective of arriving at lower construction costs for the proposed district. The Mayor expressed appreciation to the Chairman of said Committee, Mr. Steve Barton, for the spirit of unity and community cooperation as demonstrated by the Committee. The Mayor called upon Public Works Director Lloyd to describe the interim progress since January 18th. Lloyd reported that, as a result of several meetings, constructive suggestions were offered, all of which were studied and analyzed by the Engineering Department. Lloyd said the Committee's primary objective was that of cutting costs and that, to some degree, this mission has been accomplished. He asked City Engineer Laird to report on revised costs, with an explanatory word of caution that the figures, as submitted by the City Engineer, were no more than estimates. He said actual costs would only be determined by construction bonds. Lloyd concluded his remarks by saying that the Engineer's estimate serves as a maximum and, after bids are opened, construction costs can be lowered but never revised higher than said estimate.

City Engineer Laird then submitted a revised proposal reflecting certain downward adjustments. He said, throughout the study, the cost of underground pipe was compared to cross drains and that in some instances one was more costly than the other and, in other instances, visa versa. It had been decided that cross drains would suffice, generally, north and south of Riverside School. Laird drew attention to low spots south and southwest of Hillcrest which must be served by pipes. He described the proposed pipe route from the Hillcrest sink well as follows: To canal, then to K Street; along K Street to the Mound Avenue storm tunnel. Laird explained that the specifications would call for alternate bids. It would then be possible to determine the most economical installation, intersection by intersection. Subsequent to Laird's presentation was an informal discussion. Following are some of the more salient points:

Question: Who paid for the Hillcrest storm sewer?

Answer: This was included in a Local Improvement District for street construction. However, the project was never satisfactorily completed, as evidenced by the fact that the destination for storm water was a sink well.

Question: In Hillcrest, is storm and sanitary sewerage intermingled?

Answer: No.

Question: What is objectionable with the sink well as a means of disposing of storm drainage?

FEBRUARY 13, 1968

Answer: State law prohibits any attempt to rehabilitate sink wells, once they become non-functionable. It is anticipated that the sink well in question will fall into this category within the predictable future.

Question: If Hillcrest were excluded from the district, where would the northeastern boundary point begin?

Answer: At the second low point, previously described, at approximately North Boulevard and West Elva.

Question: What would be the difference in cost if Hillcrest were excluded?

Answer: (By Barton) Costs would be cut approximately in half. The Citizens Committee, from the standpoint of cost, would very much like to see this happen. But it would not completely correct the storm drainage problem.

Question: Who will be assessed in this L.I.D.?

Answer: All who contribute to the drainage problem.

Question: Is it not true that all new construction must pay a sewer connection fee and, if so, where is this money spent?

Answer: Yes, there has been a \$100.00 sewer connection fee since 1958. This money is used to construct sanitary trunk sewers.

Question: Where is the sanitary sewerage north of the Riverside district routed?

Answer: To the Mound Avenue line, by means of a lift station.

Laird, by use of slide, then submitted a chart of revised costs as follows:

Storm Drainage and Cross Drains	\$ 86,550
Storm Tunnel Renovation	11,200
Contingencies, Legal, etc.	9,775
Engineering, Drafting, etc.	9,775
TOTAL:	\$117,300

Laird explained that revenue would be provided approximately as follows:

City Participation	\$ 22,700
School District #91	2,430
L.D.S. Temple & Hospital	4,483

TOTAL: \$117,300
FEBRUARY 13, 1968

Laird said the square foot assessment has been reduced to .027¢.

Mr. Steve Barton, Citizens Committee Chairman, appeared before the Council to say that the Committee is yet far from being convinced that costs cannot be further reduced. He said his committee has a minimum goal of \$70,000 to \$80,000. He agreed that the Engineer's estimate must be lowered; otherwise, contractors will bid accordingly. He said that the foregoing figures suggested triple taxation in part. By way of explanation, he noted certain anticipated revenues from School District #91, the L.D.S. Temple and Hospital. He said all those included in the district are taxpayers and most were members of the L.D.S. Church; therefore, contributions from these three agencies were, in effect, forthcoming from the same people being assessed. Barton cited other possible savings or expenditures which should not be included in total costs, in the opinion of the Committee, as follows: 12 inch underground pipe could be substituted for 24 inch, as proposed; on many intersections, one cross drain could adequately suffice, instead of two as proposed, in view of the infrequent occurrence of flash floods; no justifiable reason for a contingency allowance in the amount of \$9,775; engineering, drafting, etc., should be excluded entirely, inasmuch as the work would be done by the City Engineering staff who are otherwise on the payroll. Barton, noting that the engineers has indicated every effort would be made to effect additional savings and having presented the foregoing challenges to the cost program, as proposed, placed the burden of proof directly on the Mayor's shoulders for continued protection of all affected property owners as the district progresses and as the assessment role is being computed. The Mayor agreed, either by a public statement or by any other means satisfactory to the Committee, to continue to pledge himself, the City Council and the Engineering Department to keep costs to an absolute minimum.

With reference to Barton's suggestion to substitute one cross drain for two and to substitute 12 inch pipe for 24 inch, Councilman Parish warned that there is a limit to substitutes to effect economy which might otherwise deter from a well engineered project to the point that its future effectiveness might be jeopardized. He said that the administration would be more subject to criticism for an ineffectively constructed project than for unrealistic economies in the planning stage.

There followed a non-relevant general discussion pertaining to sub-standard streets in the Hillcrest Addition.

The Mayor declared the hearing adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

ATTEST: s/ Roy C. Barnes
CITY CLERK

s/ S. Eddie Pedersen
MAYOR
