MINUTES OF THE HOUSE POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS STANDING COMMITTEE

Room 450 Utah State Capitol 26 January 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. Fred R Hunsaker, Chair

Rep. R. Curt Webb, Vice Chair

Rep. Laura Black

Rep. Rebecca Chavez-Houck

Rep. Jack R. Draxler Rep. James A. Dunnigan Rep. Becky Edwards Rep. Janice M. Fisher Rep. Kerry W. Gibson Rep. Richard Greenwood

Rep. Curtis Oda

MEMBERS ABSENT: Rep. Marie H. Poulson

STAFF PRESENT: Joseph Wade, Policy Analyst

Becky Lawyer, Committee Secretary

Note: A list of visitors and a copy of handouts are filed with the committee minutes.

Representative Hunsaker called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

H.B. 216 Incorporation of a Town Amendments (Rep. G. Froerer)

Rep. Froerer introduced and explained the bill to the committee. Lincoln Shurtz, representing the Utah League of Cities and Towns also addressed the committee.

MOTION: Rep. Draxler moved to substitute the bill with HB 216 1st Sub. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Rep. Dunnigan moved to amend 1st Sub HB216 as follows:

- 1. Page 1, Line 11:
 - 11 This bill:

amends notice requirements;

- 2. Page 4, Line 88:
 - 88 (III) publishing notice of the public hearing in accordance with { Section

45-1-101. Section 63F-1-701 on the Utah Public Notice Website.

House Political Subdivisions Standing Committee January 26, 2010 Page 2

```
3. Page 7, Lines 207 through 210:
   207
               [<del>(II)</del>] (ii) (A)
                                 the results of the financial feasibility study described in Subsection
          (8)(a)(i)
   208
          show that the average annual amount of revenues described in Subsection (1)(b)(i)
            {+} does not
   209
          exceed \{+\}
                           { exceeds } the average annual amount of costs described in
          Subsection (1)(b)(ii) by more
   210
          than \{\frac{10\%}{}\}
                             25%
                                       {+} ; or {+}
               (B) the results of the financial feasibility study described in Subsection (8)(a)(i)
          show that the average annual amount of costs described in Subsection (1)(b)(ii) does
          not exceed the average annual amount of revenues described in Subsection (1)(b)(i)
          by more than 10%
4. Page 8, Lines 213 through 239:
   213
               (c) (i) If [the county legislative body commissions a financial feasibility study under
   214
          Subsection (8)(a) and the results of the financial feasibility study described in Subsection
   215
          (8)(a)(i) show that the average annual amount of revenues described in Subsection
          (1)(b)(i)
   216
            \{+\} exceeds \{+\}
                                     { does not exceed } the average annual amount of costs
          described in Subsection
   217
          (1)(b)(ii) by more than \{10\%\} 25%, the county legislative body [may] shall:
   218
               (A) deny the petition, [subject to] in accordance with Subsection
          (8)(c) \{ -(ii) \}
                                    \{+\}, if the
                            (iii)
   219
          results of the financial feasibility study show that the average annual amount of revenues
   220
          described in Subsection (1)(b)(i) exceeds the average annual amount of costs described in
   221
          Subsection (1)(b)(ii) by more than 25% { or more }
                                                                        {+}; <u>or</u>
   222
               (B) approve the petition and hold an election for town officers, as provided in
   223
          Subsection (9); or
   224
               [<del>(C)</del>] (B) (I) with the consent of the petition sponsors:
   225
               (Aa) impose conditions to [mitigate the fiscal inequities identified in the financial
   226
          feasibility study prevent the average annual amount of { costs
                revenues described in Subsection (1)(b) { (ii) }
   227
          from exceeding the average annual amount of { revenues } costs described in
          Subsection (1)(b) \{ \frac{(i)}{(i)} \}
                                      <u>(ii)</u> by
```

```
228
       more than \{-10-\}
                             25 %; or
229
            (Bb) alter the boundaries of the area proposed to be incorporated as a town to
230
       approximate the boundaries necessary to prevent the average annual amount of
         \{+\} revenues \{+\}
                                   { costs }
       described in Subsection (1)(b) \{+\} (i) \{+\} from exceeding the average
231
       annual amount of \{+\} costs \{+\}
232
         \{ \frac{\text{revenues}}{1} \} described in Subsection (1)(b) \{ \frac{1}{1} \} (ii) \{ \frac{1}{1} \}
                                                                            { (i) by more than
                  by more than 25%; and
       <del>10%</del>}
233
            (II) approve the incorporation petition and hold an election for town officers, as
234
       provided in Subsection (9).
              (ii) If the results of the financial feasibility study described in Subsection
       (8)(a)(i) show that the average annual amount of costs described in Subsection
       (1)(b)(ii) exceeds the average annual amount of revenues described in Subsection
       (1)(b)(i) by more than 10\%, the county legislative body shall:
                 (A) deny the petition in accordance with Subsection (8)(c)(iii); or
                 (B)(I) with the consent of the petition sponsors;
                      (Aa) impose conditions to prevent the average annual amount of costs
       described in Subsection (1)(b)(ii) from exceeding the average annual amount of
       revenues described in Subsection (1)(b)(i) by more than 10%; or
                      (Bb) alter the boundaries of the area proposed to be incorporated as a
       town to approximate the boundaries necessary to prevent the average annual amount
       of costs described in Subsection (1)(b)(ii) from exceeding the average annual amount
       of revenues described in Subsection (1)(b)(i) by more than 10%; and
                 (II) approve the incorporation petition and hold an election for town
       officers, as provided in Subsection (9)
235
              {<del> (ii)</del> }
                                A county legislative body intending to deny a petition under
                        (iii)
       Subsection (8)(c)(i)(A) or (8)(c)(ii)(A)
236
       shall deny the petition within 20 days after the feasibility consultant submits the written
       results
237
       of the financial feasibility study.
```

(d) Each town that incorporates pursuant to a petition approved after the county

legislative body imposes conditions under Subsection $(8)(c)(i)[\frac{(C)(I)}{(C)(I)}](B)(I)(Aa)$ or

5. Page 9, Line 249:

(8)(c)(ii)(B)(I)(Aa) shall comply

238

239

House Political Subdivisions Standing Committee January 26, 2010 Page 4

results of the financial feasibility study, for an election under Subsection $(8)(c)(i)[\frac{(C)}{(B)}](B)(II)$ or (8)(c)(ii)(B)(II).

The motion to amend passed unanimously with Rep. Poulson absent for the vote.

MOTION: Rep. Dunnigan moved to amend the amendment of 1st Sub HB216 as follows:

- 1. Line 210: Change "by more than 10%" to "by more than 25%"
- 2. Line 234: Three times change "by more than 10%" to "by more than 25%"

The motion to amend passed with Rep. Draxler, Rep. Edwards and Rep. Greenwood voting against the amendment.

MOTION: Rep. Oda moved to pass 1st Sub HB216 out favorably as amended. The motion passed unanimously with Rep. Poulson absent for the vote.

H.B. 199 Municipal Clerk and Recorder Responsibilities (Rep. B. Last)

Rep. Last introduced and explained the bill to the committee.

MOTION: Rep. Black moved to pass the bill out favorably. The motion passed unanimously with Rep. Poulson absent for the vote.

H.B. 205 Impact Fee Amendments (Rep. S. Sandstrom)

Rep. Sandstrom presented the bill and gave explanations to the committee.

MOTION: Rep. Oda moved to amend the amendment as follows:

- 1. Page 1, Lines 12 through 14:
 - requires that an impact fee enactment allow, in certain circumstances, a developer <u>including a school district or charter school</u> to
 - 13 receive a credit against or proportionate reimbursement of an impact fee { if the
 - 14 developer is a school district or charter school };
- 2. Page 1, Line 25 through Page 2, Line 28:
 - development activity for construction of a replacement school if the replacement

- school is built for a student capacity that is less than or equal to a { 10% } 20% increase
- of the student capacity of the old school; and
- 28 makes technical corrections.
- 3. Page 4, Lines 101 through 102:
 - 101 (b) allows a developer, { if the developer is } including a school district or a charter school, to receive
 - a credit against or proportionate reimbursement of an impact fee if the developer:
- 4. Page 5, Lines 121 through 131:
 - 121 (4) A local political subdivision or private entity shall include a provision in an impact
 - fee enactment that requires a credit against impact fees for any dedication of land for,
 - improvement to, or new construction of {+}, any system improvements provided by the developer or school district or charter school
 - 124 if the {+} [facilities] { a facility if } facility :
 - 125 { (a) the developer is a school district or charter school; and
 - 126 (b) the facility: }
 - 127 [(a) are] {(i)} (a) is a system [improvements; or] improvement;
 - 128 $[\frac{\text{(b) (i) are}}]$ $\frac{\text{(ii) (A)}}{\text{(b) (i)}}$ is dedicated to the public; and
 - 129 [(ii) offset] {(B)} (ii) offsets the need for an identified system improvement[-]; or
 - 130 { (iii) } (c) in the case of a school district or charter school, is not for the exclusive use of the school district or charter school, regardless of
 - whether the facility is identified as a system improvement in a capital facilities plan.
- 5. Page 6, Lines 169 through 171:
 - (B) the new school [creates no greater demand or need for public facilities than] is built
 - for a student capacity that is less than or equal to a {10%} increase of the student capacity of the
 - school being replaced; and
- 6. Page 6, Lines 176 through 180:

House Political Subdivisions Standing Committee January 26, 2010 Page 6

- 176 (A) the development resulting from the school { district } or charter school's development
- activity directly results in a need for additional system improvements for which the impact fee
- is imposed; and
- (B) the impact fee is calculated to cover only the school { district } district's or charter school's
- proportionate share of the cost of those additional system improvements <u>regardless of</u>

 whether the school district's or charter school's development activity is on property

 that is zoned for a higher density public facility use than the school district's or

 charter's school's actual public facility use;

The motion passed unanimously with Rep. Poulson absent for the vote.

H.B. 211 Improvement District Board Membership (Rep. K. Powell)

This bill was not considered.

H.B. 220 Disproportionate Rental Fee Amendments (Rep. G. Froerer)

This bill was not considered.

MOTION: Rep. Oda moved to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously with Rep. Poulson absent for the vote.

Rep. Hunsaker adjourned the meeting at 9:56 a.m.

Rep. Fred R Hunsaker, Chair