

SANTA CLARA CITY, UTAH WASTEWATER SYSTEM IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN & IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS

Sunrise Engineering, Inc. March 2022 Update

SANTA CLARA CITY, UTAH

Wastewater System Impact Fee Facilities Plan & Impact Fee Analysis

March 2022 Update

MAYOR	Rick Rosenberg
COUNCIL MEMBER	Jarett Waite
COUNCIL MEMBER	Christa Hinton
COUNCIL MEMBER	Ben Shakespeare
COUNCIL MEMBER	Leina Mathis
COUNCIL MEMBER	Denny Drake
CITY MANAGER	Brock Jacobsen
PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR	Dustin Mouritsen
RECORDER	Chris Shelley

PREPARED BY:

SUNRISE ENGINEERING, INC. 11 North 300 West Washington, UT 84780 TEL: 435-652-8450 FAX: 435-652-8416



Joseph K. Philips, P.E. Project Engineer State of Utah No. 4777017

© Copyright 2022 Sunrise Engineering, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECT	ION		
I.	INTRO A. B.	ODUCTION Preface Introduction	1 1 1
II.	USER	ANALYSIS	3
	A. B. C.	Projected Growth Rate Length of Planning Period Equivalent Residential Units	3 5 5
III.	WAST	TEWATER SYSTEM IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN	7
	A. B. C. D. E.	Impact Fee Facilities Plan Future Demand Calculations Existing Demand Calculations Recommended Improvements Timing of Improvements	7 8 9 9 11
IV.	WAST	TEWATER SYSTEM IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS	14
	А. В.	Existing Impact Fee Proposed Impact Fee	14 14
APPE	NDIX A	A – POPULATION & BUILD-OUT PROJECTIONS	

APPENL	DIX A – POPULA	ATION & BUI	LD-OUT PROJECT	TIONS
APPEND	DIX B – SANTA	CLARA CITY	ZONING MAP	
APPEND	DIX C – WASTW	ATER BASIN	FLOW CALCULA	TIONS
APPEND	DIX D – OPINIO	NS OF PROB A	ABLE COST	
APPEND	DIX E – PUBLIC	NOTICE FOR	R IMPACT FEE AN	JALYSIS
APPEND	DIX F – IMPACI	T FEE CERTIF	FICATION	

TABLES AND EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT I.B-1	Area Map	2
TABLE II.A-1	Historic Growth	3
TABLE II.A-2	Zoning Types and Densities	4
EXHIBIT III.B-1	Santa Clara Sewer Basins & Pipelines	12
EXBIBIT III.D-1	Santa Clara Sewer Basins & Pipelines Improvements	13
TABLE IV.B-1	Recommendations and Impact Fee Eligible Costs	14
TABLE IV.B-2	Proposed Impact Fee	15

SECTION I INTRODUCTION

A. PREFACE

In 2013 Sunrise Engineering, Inc. completed a Wastewater Impact Fee Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Analysis for Santa Clara City's wastewater system. This plan identified improvements to be undertaken by the city to prepare for future demands on the system due to growth and development. Since that time, additional demands on the system due to growth have been identified and previous recommendations have been implemented. Sunrise Engineering, Inc. has again been contracted to update the plan based on current market conditions and other related occurrences since 2013.

B. INTRODUCTION

This Wastewater Impact Fee Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Analysis has been prepared for Santa Clara City, located west of St. George, Utah in Washington County along Old Highway 91. An area and location map showing the location of Santa Clara City, has been provided as Exhibit I.B.1.

Santa Clara City has experienced significant growth over the past 30 years. At times, this growth has been somewhat rapid and has required improvements and upgrades to much of the city's public infrastructure to meet the increased demands. This growth did slow as the economy went into a recession several years ago, however, the Southern Utah housing market has started to gain momentum again. It is projected that growth rates will increase over the next several years.

In addition, it was previously believed that a large portion of future growth in the city would occur in the area south of the Santa Clara River, known as the "South Hills". This area is owned by the Federal Government and is under the control of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The area had previously been identified in a land bill as an area of potential disposal. However, due to change in politics and the discovery of threatened and/or endangered plants in the South Hills area, it is no longer anticipated that the BLM will be disposing of this land any time soon. Consequently, the city has requested that this area be excluded from the plan.

To help ensure that the city is prepared to meet the needs of anticipated growth and to ensure up-to-date information is considered in planning efforts, the City of Santa Clara has contracted with Sunrise Engineering, Inc. to update their existing Impact Fee Facilities Plan and to perform an updated Impact Fee Analysis.



SECTION II USER ANALYSIS

A. PROJECTED GROWTH RATE

An important element in any community plan is the projection of the city's population growth rate. This projection gives the planner an idea of the future demands the city should plan for throughout the planning period.

Projecting the future population can be a subjective process. The table below shows the city's historic growth rates based on official Census data from 1970 to 2010, and the latest population data the city had on record for 2020.

Y ear	Source	Population	Growt	ERUs					
1970	Census	271	-	-	-				
1980	Census	1,091	1970-1980	14.9%	-				
1990	Census	2,311	1980-1990	7.8%	-				
2000	Census	4,630	1990-2000	7.2%	-				
2010	Census	6,003	2000-2010	2.6%	-				
2020	City	8,685	2010-2020	3.8%	2713				
2021	Estimate	9,206	2019-2021	6.0%	2826				

 Table II.A-1: Historic Growth

The City of Santa Clara has grown significantly since 1970. During the 1970's it grew at almost 15% per year. During the 1980's and 1990's the city grew at over 7% per year. Despite this rapid population growth, there has been very little commercial development in Santa Clara. The city is primarily a residential community supporting the St. George area. Because it is bounded by lava flows, flood plains, environmentally sensitive areas, and other municipalities, it is not expected to grow as fast as it historically has.

As shown in Table II.A-1 above, a 2020 population was provided by Santa Clara City. This indicated a growth rate of 3.8% since 2010. Sunrise Engineering, Inc. projected the current 2021 population as 9,206 assuming a 6.0% average annual growth rate since 2020 based on the high growth rate recently experienced in the community.

Recent housing market trends in Southern Utah indicate that Santa Clara is only expected to grow rapidly for a short period. After which, growth will continue at a steady rate. The recent 2020 Santa Clara Public Safety IFFP used a growth rate of 4.0% and to remain consistent, the city chose to use the same growth rate projection for this report, with a slight adjustment to 2021-2022 being at 6.0%. A growth rate of 4.0% is projected through the end of the planning period after 2022.

A large development in the northern region of the city limits known as Black Desert is planned to occur in the near future. The Impact Fee Analysis included in this report will be beneficial for the city to reference when determining the impact fees for this planned development. As mentioned previously, the city is no longer expecting to see development occur in the BLM portion of the South Hills area anytime soon. Prior to the discovery of threatened and/or endangered plant life in the area, it was anticipated that the BLM would be disposing of 1,000 to 1,500 acres of land in this area. Based on current communication with the BLM, the city believes that considering this area to remain as open space throughout the planning period may be the most accurate representation. If things with the BLM change and this area is "disposed of" a new IFFP would be recommended.

Because the City of Santa Clara will eventually develop all its available land, build-out projections have been considered in this study. As indicated, this build-out projection is based on all property within the existing city limits, excluding the BLM portion of the South Hills area.

To determine build-out projections, several samples of existing densities were taken from established areas of the city. These samples were then utilized to estimate densities for other zoning types which are not as prevalent in the community, or which have not yet been utilized. Table II.A-2 below indicates the densities assumed for each zoning type. The zones marked by an asterisk (*) represent the zoning types for which a sample was taken.

Zone	Description	Density (DU/Acre)
R1-10	*Single Family Residential	2.85
PDR	*Planned Development (Residential)	3.99
R-A	*Residential Agricultural	1.41
MR	*Multi-Family Residential	8.49
COM	Commercial	0
MU	Mixed Use	1.4
OS	Open Space	0
PD-MU	Planned Development (Mixed Use)	3.99
PDC	Planned Development (Commercial)	0
HD	Historic District (overlay)	0
PDR-STR	Short Term Rentals (overlay)	0

 Table II.A-2:
 Zoning Types and Densities

These densities were utilized in conjunction with a current zoning map provided by Santa Clara City (see Appendix B). Total areas of each zoning type were calculated and multiplied by the densities to calculate a projected number of dwelling units (DUs) at build-out. This process resulted in 6,789 total projected DUs. Multiplying this number by 3.36 people per unit according to the 2015-2019 Census figure, provides a total build-out population projection of 22,812 residents.

It is important to understand that projected growth rates are not the corner stone of this plan. If the projected population is reached earlier or later than anticipated, then future improvements to support growth may either come earlier or later. Impact Fees should not be significantly affected if the actual rate of growth varies from the rate used in the plan.

B. LENGTH OF PLANNING PERIOD

It is typical for a Master Plan to use a 20-year planning period and this method was used for this IFFP. For example, beginning in year 2021, and running through year 2041. Based on the forecasted growth rate the number of people the city will need to plan for in 20 years can be calculated based on the compound interest formula as follows:

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{P}(1+\mathbf{i})^N$$

 $F = Future Population \qquad P = Present Population \\ i = Projected Growth Rate \qquad N = Years$

20-Year Projected Population

2020 Population: 8,685 2021 Population: 8,685 (1+0.06)¹ = 9,206 2022 Population: 9,206 (1+0.06)¹ = 9,758 2041 Population: 9,758 (1+0.04)¹⁹ = **20,560**

As shown above, the total number of people projected for the end of a 20-year planning period is 20,560. The projected build-out population of 22,812 is slightly higher than the 20-year projection, suggesting build-out will occur shortly after the planning period ends if growth rates are not significantly affected. According to the projected growth rates, the build-out population will be reached between years 2043 and 2044.

It is understood that the likelihood of growth staying consistent to the end of the planning period is minimal. It is possible factors influencing Santa Clara's growth could change before the end of the planning period that influence the build-out date. As such, the build-out projection of 22,812 people will be utilized in further analysis.

C. EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNITS

Based on the sewer connection data provided by Santa Clara, 2,826 sewer connections are assumed to be in the system. For this report, we will assume this number to be the amount of existing Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs). By definition, a residential unit is a home or other single-family dwelling.

Based on the build-out projections explained above, it is estimated that there will be approximately 3,963 additional DUs at build-out. By assuming that the current number of ERUs will grow at the same rates as the population, we can approximate the future number of ERUs over the next 20 years. Following this assumption results in a total of 7,099 ERUs in 2044, the anticipated year of build-out. The difference between the 7,099 ERUs in 2044 and the existing number of 2,826 ERUs is 4,273. This number is slightly higher than the 3,963 additional DUs projected above but will account for commercial and other ERUs not accounted for in the DU projections. A table showing the population and build-out projections has been included in Appendix A.

By dividing the current population by the build-out population estimate, or by dividing the current number of ERUs by the build-out ERU estimate, it can be found that 39.8% of the projected build-out population is existing.

SECTION III WASTEWATER SYSTEM IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN

A. IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN

This Wastewater System Impact Fee Facilities Plan identifies the demands which will be placed on existing Santa Clara City wastewater infrastructure due to growth development and outlines how the city will meet those demands. The plan focuses on five main interceptor lines including the "Valley Line", the "Lava Flow Wash Line", the "Tuacahn Wash Line", the "Lava Cove Line", and the "Canyon View Dr. Line". Each of these lines ultimately connect into St. George City sewer mains, which deliver the raw sewage to the regional treatment plant owned and operated by St. George City. The plan assumes that smaller collector lines serving specific areas of the city are all installed per standard slopes and diameter (minimum of 8-inch) and as such are adequately sized to meet the demands of the areas for which they were designed. A description of each of the four main interceptor lines has been included below:

Valley Line

The Valley Line, which runs along the Santa Clara River, collects wastewater for much of the existing developed area in the city including the Historic Valley District, and a portion of the Heights area.

Lava Flow Wash Line

The Lava Flow Wash Line is a shared line with Ivins City and extends southeast through Santa Clara from 800 South in Ivins to the intersection of Pioneer Parkway and N. Red Mountain Drive. From there the line generally follows Tuacahn Wash until it leaves the Santa Clara City boundary near Snow Canyon High School.

Tuacahn Wash Line

The Tuacahn Wash Line is also shared by Ivins City and Santa Clara. The line extends into Santa Clara near the south end of Cordero Drive in Ivins. From there, the line generally follows Tuacahn Wash until it meets up with the Lava Flow Wash Line at the intersection of Pioneer Parkway and N. Red Mountain Drive.

Lava Cove Line

The Lava Cove Line is found on the east side of Santa Clara and flows south to tie into the existing Lava Flow Wash Line near Snow Canyon High School. It follows Lava Cove Drive and provides service to the new development in that area. This line also allows a development from St. George City to tie into the Santa Clara System.

Canyon View Dr. Line

This line travels along Canyon View Drive and ultimately connects into the Valley Line in Vineyard. This line has been considered a smaller collector line feeding into the Valley

line in the past. However, the city requested further analysis based on the age of the line and the potential for high-capacity flow. After further analysis, it was determined to be sufficient until build-out and in need of no further improvements. Calculations can be seen in Appendix C.

B. FUTURE DEMAND CALCULATIONS

To determine the future demands placed on each of the main interceptor lines, Sunrise obtained shapefile data from the city for the existing Santa Clara wastewater system. Using this data, the city was broken down into wastewater basins defined by identifying areas believed to discharge sewage to a common pipe (see Exhibit III.B-1). In previous plans this data was supplemented by a field investigation of some locations and manholes to provide a more accurate representation and has been used again in this plan.

By utilizing the existing zoning map along with the density samples mentioned previously, a projected number of build-out ERUs was obtained for each basin. The number of ERUs in each basin was multiplied by 3.36 to represent the number of projected people within the basin and then by an average daily flow estimate of 80 gallons per capita per day based on the metered flow data collected and finally by a peaking factor of 2.5 according to the Utah Division of Water Quality guidelines. The wastewater basin flow calculations have been included in Appendix C.

Most of the Black Desert development currently planned will be Multi-Family Residential (MR) units in an area of Santa Clara currently zoned as Planned Development Residential (PDR). To account for the difference in population density, approximately 1,518 additional ERU's have been incorporated in the analysis. Should more developers show interest in MR units it may be beneficial to reevaluate the assigned zoning type in this area to better account for the increased density.

Because the Lava Flow Wash and Tuacahn Wash lines are shared with Ivins City, an estimate of the number of ERUs from Ivins City that influence the capacity of each line were also calculated. 2015-2019 Census estimates and the Master Plan for the Black Desert development were used to estimate 3,450 ERUs from Ivins currently contribute to the flow in these lines and approximately 6,194 ERUs will contribute at build-out. Combining these estimates, and assuming Ivins has the same flow as Santa Clara of 80 gallons per capita per day resulted in a current flow of 1,332 gpm and build-out flow of 2,392 gpm. These calculations have been included in Appendix A.

As-built drawings showing the slopes, sizes and approximate locations of the Valley Line, upper Lava Flow Wash Line, and Tuacahn Wash Line were used to estimate flow capacities using Manning's equation for full flowing pipes. The slopes and locations of the section of the Lava Flow line from the intersection of the Tuacahn Wash Line to Snow Canyon High School were determined using recent survey data.

Calculated flows from each of the sewer basins, the flow in the system from Ivins City, and Black Desert Master Plan flow projections have been combined at stations along each

of the interceptor lines to determine the required build-out capacity of those lines. Exhibit III.B-1 shows the lines and stations used in these calculations. The wastewater basin flow calculations and required build-out capacity calculations have been included in Appendix C.

C. EXISTING DEMAND CALCULATIONS

To determine the existing demands placed on existing wastewater facilities and to establish an existing level of service, each wastewater basin was evaluated and assigned a percentage representing the portion of that basin that has already been developed. This percentage was then multiplied by the total projected build-out flow for each basin to determine the existing wastewater flow. The existing calculated flows from each basin were then combined at stations along the interceptors as was done in the build-out calculations to determine the total existing flow for each interceptor. The calculations showing the percent developed and existing wastewater flow demands have been included in Appendix C.

The existing level of service for each ERU has been determined based on the 2015-2019 Census estimate of 3.36 people per household and 80 gallons per person per day and multiplied by a peaking factor of 2.5 for interceptor lines as required by the Utah Division of Water Quality guidelines. This calculation results in an existing level of service of 672 gallons per ERU per day, which has been used in this plan.

D. RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Valley Line Extension

As shown in the build-out capacity calculations included in Appendix C, the Valley Line has adequate existing capacity to support build-out conditions. However, the city has requested additional improvements at both ends of the line to increase service. It is recommended that the northern end of the line be extended to reach an existing service yard that is currently using a septic system. This improvement would add approximately 1,000 additional feet of 8-inch line. While this facility is already existing, adding this line will create more opportunity for new development in the area to join the system. Excluding the existing service yard and agricultural land nearby suggests there is approximately 33.3 acres of the existing 50.8 acres that remain undeveloped, making this project 65.5% impact fee eligible.

Valley Line Replacement

On the southern end of the line, it has been requested that approximately 1,000 feet of the existing 15-inch line be replaced with 21-inch line. This will make all the line after the tie-in with the Canyon View Drive line 21-inch. After this tie-in the Valley Line is servicing 15 of the 27 wastewater basins, or approximately 56% of the total city area. Because of this, this replacement will increase the system capacity for future growth for much of the community. It is also 100% impact fee eligible because it would not be necessary without new growth.

It should be noted that if the South Hills area does end up being developed, these calculations will need to be re-visited as it is likely that the Valley Line would also carry wastewater generated in the South Hills.

Lava Flow Wash Line Improvement

The Lava Flow Line does not have adequate capacity to support Ivins and Santa Clara until build-out. In some areas of the system the flow is already nearing capacity, which was assumed to be 80% full for this analysis. It is recommended that a parallel line ranging from 15-inch to 18-inch be constructed to accommodate future flow of both cities. Exhibit III.D-1 shows the recommended pipe sizes and stationing for the system.

It is recognized that numerous options exist to address the deficiency in the line and that the flow in the pipeline is greatly influenced by Ivins City. However, for the purposes of this plan, the proposed improvements mentioned above will be used to determine a reasonable cost for the additional required capacity. Because additional capacity would not be required if no future growth were to occur, costs associated with the additional capacity will be borne solely by future growth. The build-out capacity calculations, included in Appendix C, show that at build-out conditions Santa Clara will require 58.0% of the line capacity on average if no improvements are made. Because of this, cost has also been calculated under the assumption that Santa Clara will pay for 58.0% of the improvements because that is the capacity they require. If Ivins is to pay the remaining 42.0% an agreement between the two cities will need to be discussed. An Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost for these improvements has been included in Appendix D.

Tuacahn Wash Line Improvement

This line will be insufficient for Santa Clara and Ivins at build-out without any improvements. As new developments are constructed, the existing 10-inch line is expected to be replaced with a 12-inch line by the developer. This improvement has already been discussed with current developers and portions of the line are already being improved.

With the anticipated multi-family development in the northern area of Santa Clara, 12inch line will not be adequate with such a high population density feeding into the line. It is recommended that a parallel line ranging from 12-inch to 15-inch be constructed alongside part of the Tuacahn Wash line and a 12-inch connector line be installed between the Lava Flow Wash Line and Tuacahn line. Exhibit III.D-1 shows the recommended pipe sizes and stationing for these imporvements. Calculations are shown in Appendix C.

To estimate Santa Clara City's share of the Tuacahn Wash Line cost, an Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost was prepared to estimate the total cost to replace the line. The share was calculated by multiplying the average percent of the pipeline's capacity required by Santa Clara at build-out (31.6%) by the total estimated cost of the line. The entire cost is impact fee eligible since this line would not be needed if development and growth did not occur. The Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost has been included in Appendix D.

E. TIMING OF IMPROVEMENTS

Current provisions of the Impact Fee Act found in Section 11-36a-602 of the Utah Code, require that a municipality shall expend or encumber impact fees for a permissible use within six years of their receipt. The provisions also allow a municipality to hold the fees longer than six years if it identifies in writing, an extraordinary and compelling reason why the fees should be held longer than six years, and an absolute date by which the fees will be expended. It is imperative that the city plan to expend or encumber collected impact fees within six years of the date they are collected.

Based on the list of recommended improvements previously mentioned, the city should be able to meet this requirement without too much difficulty. The Valley Line Extension is an improvement that will meet a present need. The only recommended improvement that is projected to be needed near the end of the planning period is the Lava Flow Wash Line Additional Capacity.

It is projected that impact fees collected during the first half of the planning period will be expended on projects already completed or currently needed. Unless affected by future growth patterns or other unanticipated changes, it is projected that only impact fees collected in the final third of the planning period will be utilized for the additional capacity needed in the Lava Flow Wash Line.









11 NORTH 300 WEST WASHINGTON, UT 84780 TEL 435.652.8450 • FAX 435.652.8416 www.sunrise-eng.com

SECTION IV WASTEWATER SYSTEM IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS

A. EXISTING IMPACT FEE

Existing Wastewater System Impact Fees for Santa Clara City are set at \$358.61 per ERU. This value was set by the city based on the projections used in the 2013 Wastewater Impact Fee Analysis. In addition to the amount charged by Santa Clara City, there is also an impact fee charged by St. George City to cover impacts to the regional collection and treatment facilities.

B. PROPOSED IMPACT FEE

The Wastewater System Impact Fee Facilities Plan, included as Section III, outlined demands to be placed on the Santa Clara wastewater system by growth and development. The plan also provides recommended improvements or means whereby the city will be able to meet those demands and maintain the existing level of service relating to wastewater facilities.

Table IV.B-1 summarizes the recommendations outlined in the Impact Fee Facilities Plan along with total costs for each recommendation, percentages of the costs considered to be Impact Fee Eligible, and the Impact Fee Eligible Costs. The detailed breakdown of costs for each project is included in Appendix D – Opinions of Probable Cost.

Project	Total Cost	% Eligible	Eligible Cost
Valley Line Extension	\$ 333,080	65.5%	\$ 218,167
Valley Line Replacement	\$ 413,480	100.0%	\$ 413,480
Lava Flow Wash Line Improvement	\$ 1,504,507	100.0%	\$ 1,504,507
Tuacahn Wash Line Improvement	\$ 558,238	100.0%	\$ 558,238
Total	\$ 2,809,305	95.9%	\$ 2,694,392

 Table IV.B-1: Recommendations and Impact Fee Eligible Costs

The total remaining amount that is impact fee eligible is found by subtracting the amount of wastewater impact fees presently held by the city from the total impact fee eligible costs shown in Table IV.B-1. The proposed impact fee per ERU is found by dividing this number by the total number of future ERUs. This method is demonstrated in Table IV.B-2.

Table IV.B-2: Proposed Impact Fee

TABLE IV.B-2 CITY OF SANTA CLARA IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS

WASTEWATER SYSTEM FACILITY PLAN

Mar 22	
IVIAI-22	

IMPACT FEE CALCULATIONS					
Total Estimated Project Cost		\$	2,809,305		
% of New Project Cost Due to New Growth	95.9%			\$	2,694,392
Previously Collected Impact Fees				\$	-
Impact Fee Eligible Cost				\$	2,694,392
No. of ERUs (2021)					2,826
Buildout ERU's					6,789
No. of New ERU's Due to Growth					3,963
Maximum Impact Fee = Total Eligible Cost / New I	ERU's			\$	679.89 /ERU
Proposed Impact Fee for Santa Clara City (FY2021	() =			<u>\$</u>	679 /ERU
P:\Santa Clara City\08073 Wastewater IFFP and IFA\Design\[Santa Clara W	W Impact Fee Facilitie	s Plan- E	3 D.xlsx Tuachan In	ıproven	nents

The number above represents the maximum amount that can be charged per ERU. This value of \$679.89 is \$321.28 more than the current Impact Fee. It is up to the city council to determine the actual rate that will be charged.

APPENDIX A

POPULATION & BUILD-OUT PROJECTIONS

Santa Clara City, Utah Wastewater Impact Fee Facilities Plan

Year	Source	Population	Growt	ERUs	
1970	Census	271	-	-	-
1980	Census	1,091	1970-1980	14.9%	-
1990	Census	2,311	1980-1990	7.8%	-
2000	Census	4,630	1990-2000	7.2%	-
2010	Census	6,003	2000-2010	2.6%	-
2020	City	8,685	2010-2020	3.8%	2713
2021	Estimate	9,206	2019-2021	6.0%	2826
2022	Estimate	9,758		6.0%	2996
2023	Estimate	10,149		4.0%	3115
2024	Estimate	10,555		4.0%	3240
2025	Estimate	10,977		4.0%	3370
2026	Estimate	11,416		4.0%	3504
2027	Estimate	11,873		4.0%	3645
2028	Estimate	12,348		4.0%	3790
2029	Estimate	12,841		4.0%	3942
2030	Estimate	13,355		4.0%	4100
2031	Estimate	13,889		4.0%	4264
2032	Estimate	14,445		4.0%	4434
2033	Estimate	15,023		4.0%	4612
2034	Estimate	15,624		4.0%	4796
2035	Estimate	16,249		4.0%	4988
2036	Estimate	16,899		4.0%	5187
2037	Estimate	17,574		4.0%	5395
2038	Estimate	18,277		4.0%	5611
2039	Estimate	19,009		4.0%	5835
2040	Estimate	19,769		4.0%	6068
2041	Estimate	20,560		4.0%	6311
2042	Estimate	21,382		4.0%	6564
2043	Estimate	22,237		4.0%	6826
~2044~	Estimate	23,127		4.0%	7099
2045	Estimate	24,052		4.0%	7383

Santa Clara Population & Growth Projections

Santa Clara Build-Out Projections

Zone	R1-10	PDR	R-A	MR	СОМ	MU	OS	PD-MU	PDC	HD	PDR-STR	
Dus/Acre	2.8	4.0	1.4	8.5	0.0	1.4	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Acres	1046.5	714.2	386.0	2.4	8.7	11.7	1519.2	95.5	29.6	115.2	61.4	
Dus	2980.0	2848.0	544.0	20.0	0.0	16.4	0.0	380.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	6,789
						Build-Out Pop	ulation	22,812				

Year	Source	Population	Growt	h Rate	ERUs
1970	Census	137	-	-	-
1980	Census	600	1970-1980	15.9%	-
1990	Census	1,630	1980-1990	10.5%	-
2000	Census	4,450	1990-2000	10.6%	-
2010	Census	6,753	2000-2010	4.3%	-
2016	Estimate	6,921	2010-2016	2.5%	3079
2021	Estimate	8,831	2016-2021	2.3%	3450
2022	Estimate	9,034		2.3%	3529
2023	Estimate	9,242		2.3%	3610
2024	Estimate	9,454		2.3%	3693
2025	Estimate	9,672		2.3%	3778
2026	Estimate	9,894		2.3%	3865
2027	Estimate	10,122		2.3%	3954
2028	Estimate	10,355		2.3%	4045
2029	Estimate	10,593		2.3%	4138
2030	Estimate	10,837		2.3%	4233
2031	Estimate	11,086		2.3%	4331
2032	Estimate	11,341		2.3%	4430
2033	Estimate	11,602		2.3%	4532
2034	Estimate	11,868		2.3%	4636
2035	Estimate	12,141		2.3%	4743
2036	Estimate	12,421		2.3%	4852
2037	Estimate	12,706		2.3%	4964
2038	Estimate	12,999		2.3%	5078
2039	Estimate	13,298		2.3%	5195
2040	Estimate	13,603		2.3%	5314
2041	Estimate	13,916		2.3%	5436
2042	Estimate	14,236		2.3%	5561
2043	Estimate	14,564		2.3%	5689
2044	Estimate	14,899		2.3%	5820

Ivins Population & Growth Projections

APPENDIX B

SANTA CLARA CITY ZONING MAP

Santa Clara City, Utah Wastewater Impact Fee Facilities Plan



APPENDIX C

WASTEWATER BASIN FLOW CALCULATIONS

Santa Clara City, Utah Wastewater Impact Fee Facilities Plan

	ERUs/Acre	1.4	1.4	8.5	1.4	0	4.00	1.4	4	1.4	2.8		Weighted	Basin	Build-Out	Build-Out
Basin	Basin Area	СОМ	HD	MR	MU	OS	PD-MU	PDC	PDR	R-A	R1-10	∑ A*ERU/Acre	Rasin FRII	Area	FRIIc	WW Flow
	(sf)					Area	(Square Feet)						Dasin Lito	(Acre)	LINUS	(gpm)
1	1991521								1294489		697031	7129643	3.58	45.7	163.7	76.4
2	4875559						1218890		3656669			19502236	4.00	111.9	447.7	208.9
3	3179950								2066968		1112983	11384224	3.58	73.0	261.3	122.0
4	1565653										1565653	4383828	2.80	35.9	100.6	47.0
5	1171787								1171787			4687148	4.00	26.9	107.6	50.2
6	1716677	72959						51500			1592218	4632453	2.70	39.4	106.3	49.6
7	1756802							140544	1317602		298656	6303406	3.59	40.3	144.7	67.5
8	2197653								1758122		439531	8263175	3.76	50.5	189.7	88.5
9	1888818							151105	604422		1133291	5802450	3.07	43.4	133.2	62.2
10	1854967										1854967	5193908	2.80	42.6	119.2	55.6
11	3574165					178708				2680624	893541	6254788	1.75	82.1	143.6	67.0
12	2372603										2372603	6643288	2.80	54.5	152.5	71.2
13	5701607										5701607	15964500	2.80	130.9	366.5	171.0
14	1312325									196849	1115476	3398921	2.59	30.1	78.0	36.4
15	4220224			10551	126607					917899	3165168	10414462	2.47	96.9	239.1	111.6
16	4055777										4055777	11356176	2.80	93.1	260.7	121.7
17	2410442	60261						60261			2289920	6580507	2.73	55.3	151.1	70.5
18	22651275					4686831		499471	12771560		4693413	64927056	2.87	520.0	1490.5	695.6
19	3165990								2312213		853777	11639428	3.68	72.7	267.2	124.7
20	860627					860627						0	0.00	19.8	0.0	0.0
21	2199813			21998	87993					1099907	989916	4621808	2.10	50.5	106.1	49.5
22	11522684	172840			288067			518521		5242821	5300435	23552367	2.04	264.5	540.7	252.3
23	3538202	35411		35411				177053	920676	885265	1487245	9684801	2.74	81.2	222.3	103.8
24	7163303						2936954			3151853	1074495	19168996	2.68	164.4	440.1	205.4
25	5117491								2558746	1228198	1330548	15679996	3.06	117.5	360.0	168.0
26	487465									487465		682451	1.40	11.2	15.7	7.3
27	3688451	36856		36856				184280	958254	921398	1547949	10080099	2.73	84.7	231.4	108.0

Santa Clara Sewer Basin Build-Out & Flow Calculations

Per	cent	Current
Developed	Undeveloped	WW Flow (gpm)
17.7%	82.3%	13.5
3.3%	96.7%	6.9
51.1%	48.9%	62.3
94.6%	5.4%	44.4
3.7%	96.3%	1.8
65.9%	34.1%	32.7
28.4%	71.6%	19.2
95.3%	4.7%	84.4
90.4%	9.6%	56.2
95.6%	4.4%	53.2
45.4%	54.6%	30.4
95.0%	5.0%	67.6
98.6%	1.4%	168.7
36.9%	63.1%	13.4
72.9%	27.1%	81.4
95.4%	4.6%	116.1
90.3%	9.7%	63.7
0.0%	100.0%	0.0
68.7%	31.3%	85.6
17.7%	82.3%	0.0
53.8%	46.2%	26.6
57.4%	42.6%	144.8
89.1%	10.9%	92.4
13.8%	86.2%	28.3
10.7%	89.3%	18.0
0.0%	100.0%	0.0
89.1%	10.9%	96.2

Blue indicates Shared Line Basins Red indicates Valley Line Basins

Existing Sewer C	apacity - Valley Out	fall Line							Contributing Desine	SC Buildout	% of Consister	Dine Cire	SC Current
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins	Peak Flow	% of Capacity	Pipe Size	Flow (gpm
387+53	12	0.60%	0.013	0.250	3.51	0.79	2.8	1239	14	36	3%	ОК	13
383+36	12	0.90%	0.013	0.250	4.30	0.79	3.4	1517		146	10%	ОК	
381+54	12	0.80%	0.013	0.250	4.06	0.79	3.2	1430		193	14%	ОК	
378+28	12	0.66%	0.013	0.250	3.69	0.79	2.9	1299		279	21%	ОК	
376+98	12	0.66%	0.013	0.250	3.69	0.79	2.9	1299		313	24%	ОК	
374+24	15	0.25%	0.013	0.313	2.63	1.23	3.2	1450		385	27%	ОК	
369+69	15	0.26%	0.013	0.313	2.68	1.23	3.3	1478	8,9,14,15,24	504	34%	ОК	264
365+85	15	0.68%	0.013	0.313	4.34	1.23	5.3	2391		528	22%	ОК	
361+78	15	0.75%	0.013	0.313	4.56	1.23	5.6	2511	8,9,14,15,24,21	554	22%	ОК	290
356+90	15	0.82%	0.013	0.313	4.77	1.23	5.8	2625		643	24%	ОК	
351+45	15	0.68%	0.013	0.313	4.34	1.23	5.3	2391		743	31%	ОК	
349+82	15	1.21%	0.013	0.313	5.79	1.23	7.1	3189		773	24%	ОК	
346+03	15	0.84%	0.013	0.313	4.82	1.23	5.9	2657		842	32%	ОК	
343+48	15	0.48%	0.013	0.313	3.65	1.23	4.5	2009		889	44%	ОК	
339+38	15	1.45%	0.013	0.313	6.34	1.23	7.8	3491	8,9,14,15,24,21,12,13,25	964	28%	ОК	545
335+53	15	1.45%	0.013	0.313	6.34	1.23	7.8	3491		1007	29%	ОК	
320+57	15	1.45%	0.013	0.313	6.34	1.23	7.8	3491		1174	34%	ОК	
314+19	15	1.16%	0.013	0.313	5.67	1.23	7.0	3122		1245	40%	ОК	
310+64	15	1.16%	0.013	0.313	5.67	1.23	7.0	3122		1284	41%	ОК	
308+27	15	1.16%	0.013	0.313	5.67	1.23	7.0	3122		1311	42%	ОК	
306+06	15	0.50%	0.013	0.313	3.72	1.23	4.6	2050		1335	65%	ОК	
303+29	15	0.50%	0.013	0.313	3.72	1.23	4.6	2050		1366	67%	ОК	
302+51	15	0.50%	0.013	0.313	3.72	1.23	4.6	2050	8,9,14,15,24,21,12,13,25,16,17,23,26,27	1375	67%	ОК	817
296+22	15	1.00%	0.013	0.313	5.26	1.23	6.5	2899		1375	47%	ОК	
293+64	21	0.25%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1375	39%	ОК	
290+91	21	0.25%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1375	39%	ОК	
287+38	21	0.25%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1375	39%	ОК	
283+83	21	0.25%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1375	39%	ОК	
277+13	21	0.37%	0.013	0.438	4.01	2.41	9.6	4326		1375	32%	ОК	
276+00	21	0.37%	0.013	0.438	4.01	2.41	9.6	4326		1375	32%	ОК	
266+18	21	0.435%	0.013	0.438	4.34	2.41	10.5	4690		1375	29%	ОК	
263+65	21	0.250%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1375	39%	ОК	
259+00	21	0.250%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1375	39%	ОК	
256+00	21	0.250%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1375	39%	ОК	
253+00	21	0.250%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1375	39%	ОК	

SC Current	
Flow (gpm)	70 or capacity
13	1.1%
264	17.8%
290	11.6%
545	15.6%
017	20.9%
01/	33.0%

Existing Sewer Ca	pacity - Lava Flow	Wash Sewer Outfa	all Line						
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins
216+14	12	1.25%	0.009	0.25	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	1,3, 75% of Ivins Flow
213+23	12	1.25%	0.009	0.25	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	
201+36	12	1.31%	0.009	0.25	7.52	0.79	5.9	2651	
189+48	12	1.21%	0.009	0.25	7.23	0.79	5.7	2547	1,3,75% of Ivins Flow,4
185+41	12	1.81%	0.009	0.25	8.84	0.79	6.9	3116	
181+37	12	2.11%	0.009	0.25	9.53	0.79	7.5	3360	1,3,75% of Ivins Flow,4,6,7
177+66	12	1.23%	0.009	0.25	7.29	0.79	5.7	2568	
173+60	12	1.20%	0.009	0.25	7.20	0.79	5.7	2537	
170+27	12	1.32%	0.009	0.25	7.55	0.79	5.9	2661	
167+78	12	1.80%	0.009	0.25	8.81	0.79	6.9	3107	
167+19	12	1.20%	0.009	0.25	7.20	0.79	5.7	2537	
166+61	12	1.38%	0.009	0.25	7.72	0.79	6.1	2721	1,3,100% of Ivins Flow,4,6,7,2,5,18, 77 Black Desert Conn.
163+20	12	2.16%	0.009	0.25	9.66	0.79	7.6	3404	1,3,100% of lvins Flow,4,6,7,2,5,18, 10, 987 Black Desert Conn.
160+88	12	2.06%	0.009	0.25	9.43	0.79	7.4	3324	1,3,100% of Ivins Flow,4,6,7,2,5,18, 10, 1,518 Black Desert Conn.
158+71	12	2.16%	0.009	0.25	9.66	0.79	7.6	3404	
157+19	12	1.66%	0.009	0.25	8.46	0.79	6.6	2984	
153+93	12	1.71%	0.009	0.25	8.59	0.79	6.7	3028	
149+91	12	1.50%	0.009	0.25	8.05	0.79	6.3	2836	
145+92	12	1.31%	0.009	0.25	7.52	0.79	5.9	2651	
141+92	12	1.18%	0.009	0.25	7.14	0.79	5.6	2516	
137+92	12	1.24%	0.009	0.25	7.32	0.79	5.7	2579	
136+13	12	1.26%	0.009	0.25	7.37	0.79	5.8	2600	
133+94	12	1.31%	0.009	0.25	7.52	0.79	5.9	2651	
129+94	12	1.38%	0.009	0.25	7.72	0.79	6.1	2721	
126+28	15	1.50%	0.009	0.3125	9.34	1.23	11.5	5143	
122+50	15	0.58%	0.009	0.3125	5.81	1.23	7.1	3198	
121+36	15	1.50%	0.009	0.3125	9.34	1.23	11.5	5143	
118+83	15	1.17%	0.009	0.3125	8.25	1.23	10.1	4542	
115+96	15	0.56%	0.009	0.3125	5.71	1.23	7.0	3142	
112+30	15	0.46%	0.009	0.3125	5.17	1.23	6.3	2848	
110+41	15	0.75%	0.009	0.3125	6.60	1.23	8.1	3636	
107+16	15	0.94%	0.009	0.3125	7.39	1.23	9.1	4071	
104+26	15	1.01%	0.009	0.3125	7.66	1.23	9.4	4220	
102+55	15	1.15%	0.009	0.3125	8.18	1.23	10.0	4503	
101+11	15	1.11%	0.009	0.3125	8.03	1.23	9.9	4424	
99+54	15	0.61%	0.009	0.3125	5.95	1.23	7.3	3279	
95+76	15	0.56%	0.009	0.3125	5.71	1.23	7.0	3142	1,3 100% OF lvins Flow, 4,6,7,2,5,18,10,19,20, Conn. From St. George & Black Desert
93+36	15	0.80%	0.009	0.3125	6.82	1.23	8.4	3756	
91+03	15	0.54%	0.009	0.3125	5.602	1.23	6.9	3086	
85+97	15	0.46%	0.009	0.3125	5.171	1.23	6.3	2848	
81+35	15	0.50%	0.009	0.3125	5.391	1.23	6.6	2969	
80+00	15	0.75%	0.009	0.3125	6.602	1.23	8.1	3636	

SC Buildout	% of	
Peak Flow	Capacity	Pipe Size
1992	77%	ОК
1997	77%	ОК
2018	76%	ОК
2039	80%	Too Small
2098	67%	ОК
2156	64%	ОК
2556	100%	Too Small
2994	118%	Too Small
3354	126%	Too Small
3622	117%	Too Small
3686	145%	Too Small
3748	138%	Too Small
4266	125%	Too Small
4532	136%	Too Small
4544	134%	Too Small
4552	153%	Too Small
4570	151%	Too Small
4592	162%	Too Small
4614	174%	Too Small
4636	184%	Too Small
4658	181%	Too Small
4668	180%	Too Small
4680	177%	Too Small
4702	173%	Too Small
4722	92%	Too Small
4743	148%	Too Small
4749	92%	Too Small
4763	105%	Too Small
4779	152%	Too Small
4799	169%	Too Small
4809	132%	Too Small
4827	119%	Too Small
4843	115%	Too Small
4852	108%	Too Small
4860	110%	Too Small
4869	148%	Too Small
4890	156%	Too Small
4890	130%	Too Small
4890	158%	Too Small
4890	172%	Too Small
4890	165%	Too Small
4890	134%	Too Small

SC Current	% of
Flow (gpm)	Capacity
1075	41.5%
1119	43.9%
1171	34.9%
1513	55.6%
1566	46.0%
1566	47.1%
1884	60.0%

Existing Sewer Capacity - Lava Flow Wash Sewer Outfa		all Line Without Iv	ins Flow					Contributing Desine	SC Buildout	% of		
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins	Peak Flow	Capacity	Pipe Size
216+14	12	1.25%	0.009	0.25	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	1,3	198	8%	ОК
213+23	12	1.25%	0.009	0.25	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		203	8%	ОК
201+36	12	1.31%	0.009	0.25	7.52	0.79	5.9	2651		224	8%	ОК
189+48	12	1.21%	0.009	0.25	7.23	0.79	5.7	2547	1,3,4	245	10%	ОК
185+41	12	1.81%	0.009	0.25	8.84	0.79	6.9	3116		304	10%	ОК
181+37	12	2.11%	0.009	0.25	9.53	0.79	7.5	3360	1,3,4,6,7	362	11%	ОК
177+66	12	1.23%	0.009	0.25	7.29	0.79	5.7	2568		612	24%	ОК
173+60	12	1.20%	0.009	0.25	7.20	0.79	5.7	2537		886	35%	ОК
170+27	12	1.32%	0.009	0.25	7.55	0.79	5.9	2661		1110	42%	ОК
167+78	12	1.80%	0.009	0.25	8.81	0.79	6.9	3107		1278	41%	ОК
167+19	12	1.20%	0.009	0.25	7.20	0.79	5.7	2537		1318	52%	ОК
166+61	12	1.38%	0.009	0.25	7.72	0.79	6.1	2721	1,3, 4,6,7,2,5,18, 77 Black Desert Conn.	1357	50%	ОК
163+20	12	2.16%	0.009	0.25	9.66	0.79	7.6	3404	1,3,4,6,7,2,5,18, 10, 987 Black Desert Conn.	1874	55%	ОК
160+88	12	2.06%	0.009	0.25	9.43	0.79	7.4	3324	1,3, 4,6,7,2,5,18, 10, 1,518 Black Desert Conn.	2140	64%	ОК
158+71	12	2.16%	0.009	0.25	9.66	0.79	7.6	3404		2152	63%	ОК
157+19	12	1.66%	0.009	0.25	8.46	0.79	6.6	2984		2161	72%	ОК
153+93	12	1.71%	0.009	0.25	8.59	0.79	6.7	3028		2179	72%	ОК
149+91	12	1.50%	0.009	0.25	8.05	0.79	6.3	2836		2201	78%	ОК
145+92	12	1.31%	0.009	0.25	7.52	0.79	5.9	2651		2223	84%	Too Small
141+92	12	1.18%	0.009	0.25	7.14	0.79	5.6	2516		2245	89%	Too Small
137+92	12	1.24%	0.009	0.25	7.32	0.79	5.7	2579		2267	88%	Too Small
136+13	12	1.26%	0.009	0.25	7.37	0.79	5.8	2600		2276	88%	Too Small
133+94	12	1.31%	0.009	0.25	7.52	0.79	5.9	2651		2288	86%	Too Small
129+94	12	1.38%	0.009	0.25	7.72	0.79	6.1	2721		2310	85%	Too Small
126+28	15	1.50%	0.009	0.3125	9.34	1.23	11.5	5143		2330	45%	ОК
122+50	15	0.58%	0.009	0.3125	5.81	1.23	7.1	3198		2351	74%	ОК
121+36	15	1.50%	0.009	0.3125	9.34	1.23	11.5	5143		2357	46%	ОК
118+83	15	1.17%	0.009	0.3125	8.25	1.23	10.1	4542		2371	52%	ОК
115+96	15	0.56%	0.009	0.3125	5.71	1.23	7.0	3142		2387	76%	ОК
112+30	15	0.46%	0.009	0.3125	5.17	1.23	6.3	2848		2407	85%	Too Small
110+41	15	0.75%	0.009	0.3125	6.60	1.23	8.1	3636		2418	66%	ОК
107+16	15	0.94%	0.009	0.3125	7.39	1.23	9.1	4071		2435	60%	ОК
104+26	15	1.01%	0.009	0.3125	7.66	1.23	9.4	4220		2451	58%	ОК
102+55	15	1.15%	0.009	0.3125	8.18	1.23	10.0	4503		2461	55%	ОК
101+11	15	1.11%	0.009	0.3125	8.03	1.23	9.9	4424		2469	56%	ОК
99+54	15	0.61%	0.009	0.3125	5.95	1.23	7.3	3279		2477	76%	ОК
95+76	15	0.56%	0.009	0.3125	5.71	1.23	7.0	3142	1,3, 4,6,7,2,5,18,10,19,20, Conn. From St. George & Black Desert	2498	79%	ОК
93+36	15	0.80%	0.009	0.3125	6.82	1.23	8.4	3756		2498	67%	ОК
91+03	15	0.54%	0.009	0.3125	5.602	1.23	6.9	3086		2498	81%	Too Small
85+97	15	0.46%	0.009	0.3125	5.171	1.23	6.3	2848		2498	88%	Too Small
81+35	15	0.50%	0.009	0.3125	5.391	1.23	6.6	2969		2498	84%	Too Small
80+00	15	0.75%	0.009	0.3125	6.602	1.23	8.1	3636		2498	69%	ОК

SC Current	
Flow (gpm)	% of Capacity
76	2.9%
,,,	2.570
120	4.7%
	-117,0
172	5.1%
	0.1.70
181	6.6%
234	6.9%
234	7.0%
320	10.2%

58.0% Average

Existing Sewer Ca	pacity - Tuacahn W	ash Outfall Line							Contributing Desine	SC Buildout	% of	
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins	Peak Flow	Capacity	Pipe Size
49+67	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592	2, 25% of Ivins Flow	807	51%	ОК
44+84	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		883	55%	ОК
41+87	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		930	58%	ОК
36+15	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		1020	64%	ОК
31+97	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		1086	68%	ОК
30+14	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		1114	70%	ОК
27+11	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		1162	73%	ОК
23+57	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		1218	76%	ОК
19+45	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		1283	81%	Too Small
18+88	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		1292	50%	ОК
13+35	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	2,5, 25% of Ivins Flow,75% of 18	1379	53%	ОК
9+58	12	0.70%	0.009	0.250	5.50	0.79	4.3	1938	2,5, 25% of Ivins Flow,75% of 18, 77 Black Desert Conn.	1418	73%	ОК
7+34	12	0.70%	0.009	0.250	5.50	0.79	4.3	1938		1418	73%	ОК
0+00	12	0.70%	0.009	0.250	5.50	0.79	4.3	1938		1418	73%	ОК

SC Current	% of
Flow (gpm)	Capacity
340	21.3%
342	13.2%
342	17.6%

Existing Sewer Ca	apacity - Tuacahn W	/ash Outfall Line V	Vithout Ivins Flow		Contributing Basins	SC Buildout	% of					
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins	Peak Flow	Capacity	Pipe Size
49+67	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592	2	209	13%	ОК
44+84	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		285	18%	ОК
41+87	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		332	21%	ОК
36+15	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		422	26%	ОК
31+97	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		488	31%	ОК
30+14	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		516	32%	ОК
27+11	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		564	35%	ОК
23+57	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		620	39%	ОК
19+45	10	1.25%	0.009	0.208	6.50	0.55	3.5	1592		685	43%	ОК
18+88	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		694	27%	ОК
13+35	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	2,5,75% of 18	781	30%	ОК
9+58	12	0.70%	0.009	0.250	5.50	0.79	4.3	1938	2,5,75% of 18, 77 Black Desert Conn.	820	42%	ОК
7+34	12	0.70%	0.009	0.250	5.50	0.79	4.3	1938		820	42%	ОК
0+00	12	0.70%	0.009	0.250	5.50	0.79	4.3	1938		820	42%	ОК

SC Current	% of
Flow (gpm)	Capacity
7	0.4%
9	0.3%
9	0.5%

31.6% Average

Existing Sewer Ca	pacity - Lava Cove		Contributing Posing	SC Buildout	% of	Dino Sizo						
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins	Peak Flow	Capacity	Pipe Size
535+41	8	0.92%	0.013	0.167	3.33	0.35	1.2	522	19, 399 Conn. From St. George	357	69%	ОК
532+33	8	0.92%	0.013	0.167	3.33	0.35	1.2	522		357	69%	ОК
529+35	8	0.92%	0.013	0.167	3.33	0.35	1.2	522		357	69%	ОК
526+46	8	0.92%	0.013	0.167	3.33	0.35	1.2	522		357	69%	ОК
518+62	8	0.92%	0.013	0.167	3.33	0.35	1.2	522		357	69%	ОК
515+60	8	0.92%	0.013	0.167	3.33	0.35	1.2	522		357	69%	ОК
507+43	8	0.92%	0.013	0.167	3.33	0.35	1.2	522		357	69%	ОК
504+31	8	0.92%	0.013	0.167	3.33	0.35	1.2	522	19, 20, Conn. From St. George	357	69%	ОК
500+00	8	0.92%	0.013	0.167	3.33	0.35	1.2	522		357	69%	ОК

		SC Current	% of
		Flow (gpm)	Capacity
		318	61.0%

Existing Sewer Ca	Existing Sewer Capacity - Canyon View Dr. Line							Contributing Desire	SC Buildout	% of Consolity	Ding Size	SC Curre	
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins	Peak Flow	% of Capacity	Pipe Size	Flow (gpr
724+55	8	0.36%	0.013	0.167	2.08	0.35	0.7	325	10	56	17%	ОК	53
720+89	8	0.36%	0.013	0.167	2.08	0.35	0.7	325		113	35%	ОК	
717+22	8	0.36%	0.013	0.167	2.08	0.35	0.7	325		170	52%	ОК	
713+56	8	0.36%	0.013	0.167	2.08	0.35	0.7	325	10,13	227	70%	ОК	222
709+90	8	0.82%	0.013	0.167	3.13	0.35	1.1	491		238	49%	ОК	
706+23	8	0.82%	0.013	0.167	3.13	0.35	1.1	491		250	51%	ОК	
702+57	8	0.82%	0.013	0.167	3.13	0.35	1.1	491		262	53%	ОК	
698+91	8	0.82%	0.013	0.167	3.13	0.35	1.1	491		274	56%	ОК	
695+24	8	0.82%	0.013	0.167	3.13	0.35	1.1	491		285	58%	ОК	
691+58	8	0.82%	0.013	0.167	3.13	0.35	1.1	491	10,13,17	297	61%	ОК	286
687+92	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		312	23%	ОК	
684+25	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		327	24%	ОК	
680+59	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		342	25%	ОК	
676+93	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		357	27%	ОК	
673+27	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		371	28%	ОК	
669+60	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		386	29%	ОК	
665+94	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		401	30%	ОК	
662+28	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		416	31%	ОК	
658+61	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		431	32%	ОК	
654+95	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		446	33%	ОК	
651+29	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		460	34%	ОК	
647+62	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		475	35%	ОК	
643+96	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		490	37%	ОК	
640+30	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		505	38%	ОК	
636+63	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		520	39%	ОК	
632+97	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341		535	40%	ОК	
629+31	10	1.86%	0.013	0.208	5.48	0.55	3.0	1341	10,13,17,22	549	41%	ОК	430
625+64	10	0.95%	0.013	0.208	3.92	0.55	2.1	958		646	67%	ОК	
621+98	10	0.95%	0.013	0.208	3.92	0.55	2.1	958	10,13,17,22,12,16	742	77%	ОК	614
618+32	12	1.68%	0.013	0.250	5.88	0.79	4.6	2073		742	36%	ОК	
614+65	10	1.68%	0.013	0.208	5.21	0.55	2.8	1275		742	58%	ОК	
610+99	10	1.68%	0.013	0.208	5.21	0.55	2.8	1275		742	58%	ОК	
607+33	10	1.68%	0.013	0.208	5.21	0.55	2.8	1275		742	58%	ОК	
603+66	10	1.68%	0.013	0.208	5.21	0.55	2.8	1275		742	58%	ОК	
600+00	10	1.68%	0.013	0.208	5.21	0.55	2.8	1275		742	58%	ОК	

SC Current	% of Capacity
Flow (gpm)	
53	16.3%
222	68.2%
286	58.1%
430	32.1%
614	64 1%
014	04.1/0

Improved Sewer Capacity - Valley Outfall Line									Contributing Pasing	SC Buildout	% of Conseitu	
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins	Peak Flow	% of Capacity	Pipe Size
417+64	8	0.60%	0.013	0.167	2.68	0.35	0.9	420	11	67	16%	ОК
407+70	8	0.60%	0.013	0.167	2.68	0.35	0.9	420		79	19%	ОК
387+53	12	0.60%	0.013	0.250	3.51	0.79	2.8	1239	11,14	103	8%	ОК
383+36	12	0.90%	0.013	0.250	4.30	0.79	3.4	1517		213	14%	ОК
381+54	12	0.80%	0.013	0.250	4.06	0.79	3.2	1430		260	18%	ОК
378+28	12	0.66%	0.013	0.250	3.69	0.79	2.9	1299		346	27%	ОК
376+98	12	0.66%	0.013	0.250	3.69	0.79	2.9	1299		380	29%	ОК
374+24	15	0.25%	0.013	0.313	2.63	1.23	3.2	1450		452	31%	ОК
369+69	15	0.26%	0.013	0.313	2.68	1.23	3.3	1478	8,9,11,14,15,24	571	39%	ОК
365+85	15	0.68%	0.013	0.313	4.34	1.23	5.3	2391		595	25%	ОК
361+78	15	0.75%	0.013	0.313	4.56	1.23	5.6	2511	8,9,11,14,15,24,21	621	25%	ОК
356+90	15	0.82%	0.013	0.313	4.77	1.23	5.8	2625		710	27%	ОК
351+45	15	0.68%	0.013	0.313	4.34	1.23	5.3	2391		810	34%	ОК
349+82	15	1.21%	0.013	0.313	5.79	1.23	7.1	3189		840	26%	ОК
346+03	15	0.84%	0.013	0.313	4.82	1.23	5.9	2657		909	34%	ОК
343+48	15	0.48%	0.013	0.313	3.65	1.23	4.5	2009		956	48%	ОК
339+38	15	1.45%	0.013	0.313	6.34	1.23	7.8	3491	8,9,11,14,15,24,21,12,13,25	1031	30%	ОК
335+53	15	1.45%	0.013	0.313	6.34	1.23	7.8	3491		1074	31%	ОК
320+57	15	1.45%	0.013	0.313	6.34	1.23	7.8	3491		1241	36%	ОК
314+19	15	1.16%	0.013	0.313	5.67	1.23	7.0	3122		1312	42%	ОК
310+64	15	1.16%	0.013	0.313	5.67	1.23	7.0	3122		1351	43%	ОК
308+27	15	1.16%	0.013	0.313	5.67	1.23	7.0	3122		1378	44%	ОК
306+06	15	0.50%	0.013	0.313	3.72	1.23	4.6	2050		1402	68%	ОК
303+29	21	0.50%	0.013	0.438	4.66	2.41	11.2	5028		1433	29%	ОК
302+51	21	0.50%	0.013	0.438	4.66	2.41	11.2	5028	8,9,11,14,15,24,21,12,13,25,16,17,23,26,27	1442	29%	ОК
296+22	21	1.00%	0.013	0.438	6.59	2.41	15.8	7111		1442	20%	ОК
293+64	21	0.25%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1442	41%	ОК
290+91	21	0.25%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1442	41%	ОК
287+38	21	0.25%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1442	41%	ОК
283+83	21	0.25%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1442	41%	ОК
277+13	21	0.37%	0.013	0.438	4.01	2.41	9.6	4326		1442	33%	ОК
276+00	21	0.37%	0.013	0.438	4.01	2.41	9.6	4326		1442	33%	ОК
266+18	21	0.435%	0.013	0.438	4.34	2.41	10.5	4690		1442	31%	ОК
263+65	21	0.250%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1442	41%	ОК
259+00	21	0.250%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1442	41%	ОК
256+00	21	0.250%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1442	41%	ОК
253+00	21	0.250%	0.013	0.438	3.29	2.41	7.9	3556		1442	41%	ОК

SC Current	% of Capacity			
10w (ghill)				
30	7.2%			
44	3.5%			
294	19.9%			
224	42.00/			
321	12.8%			
	46 50/			
5/5	16.5%			
847	16.8%			
<u> </u>				

Improved Sewer	Capacity - Lava Flov	w Wash Parallel Li	ne						Cantaibuting Design		% of	
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins	Peak Flow	Capacity	Pipe Size
166+61	15	1.38%	0.009	0.3125	8.96	1.23	11.0	4933	1,3,100% of Ivins Flow,4,6,7,2,5,18, 77 Black Desert Conn., Silverton	2258	46%	ОК
163+20	15	2.16%	0.009	0.3125	11.20	1.23	13.8	6171	1,3,100% of Ivins Flow,4,6,7,2,5,18, 10, 987 Black Desert Conn., Silverton	2722	44%	ОК
160+88	15	2.06%	0.009	0.3125	10.94	1.23	13.4	6027	1,3,100% of Ivins Flow,4,6,7,2,5,18, 10, 1,518 Black Desert Conn., Silverton	2988	50%	ок
158+71	15	2.16%	0.009	0.3125	11.20	1.23	13.8	6171		2990	48%	ОК
157+19	15	1.66%	0.009	0.3125	9.82	1.23	12.1	5410		2991	55%	ОК
153+93	15	1.71%	0.009	0.3125	9.97	1.23	12.2	5491		2993	55%	ОК
149+91	15	1.50%	0.009	0.3125	9.34	1.23	11.5	5143		2995	58%	ОК
145+92	15	1.31%	0.009	0.3125	8.73	1.23	10.7	4806		2997	62%	ОК
141+92	15	1.18%	0.009	0.3125	8.28	1.23	10.2	4561		3000	66%	ОК
137+92	15	1.24%	0.009	0.3125	8.49	1.23	10.4	4676		3002	64%	ОК
136+13	15	1.26%	0.009	0.3125	8.56	1.23	10.5	4713		3003	64%	ОК
133+94	15	1.31%	0.009	0.3125	8.73	1.23	10.7	4806		3005	63%	ОК
129+94	15	1.38%	0.009	0.3125	8.96	1.23	11.0	4933		3007	61%	ОК
126+28	15	1.50%	0.009	0.3125	9.34	1.23	11.5	5143		3009	59%	ОК
122+50	18	0.58%	0.009	0.375	6.56	1.77	11.6	5200		3011	58%	ОК
121+36	18	1.50%	0.009	0.375	10.54	1.77	18.6	8362		3012	36%	ОК
118+83	18	1.17%	0.009	0.375	9.31	1.77	16.5	7386		3014	41%	ОК
115+96	18	0.56%	0.009	0.375	6.44	1.77	11.4	5110		3015	59%	ОК
112+30	18	0.46%	0.009	0.375	5.84	1.77	10.3	4631		3018	65%	ОК
110+41	18	0.75%	0.009	0.375	7.46	1.77	13.2	5913		3019	51%	ОК
107+16	18	0.94%	0.009	0.375	8.35	1.77	14.8	6620		3021	46%	ОК
104+26	18	1.01%	0.009	0.375	8.65	1.77	15.3	6862		3022	44%	ОК
102+55	18	1.15%	0.009	0.375	9.23	1.77	16.3	7322		3023	41%	ОК
101+11	18	1.11%	0.009	0.375	9.07	1.77	16.0	7194		3024	42%	ОК
99+54	18	0.61%	0.009	0.375	6.72	1.77	11.9	5333		3025	57%	ОК
95+76	18	0.56%	0.009	0.375	6.44	1.77	11.4	5110	1,3 100% OF Ivins Flow, 4,6,7,2,5,18,10,19,20, Conn. From St. George, Black Desert, & Silverton	3028	59%	ОК
93+36	18	0.80%	0.009	0.375	7.70	1.77	13.6	6107		3028	50%	ОК
91+03	18	0.54%	0.009	0.375	6.326	1.77	11.2	5017		3028	60%	ок
85+97	18	0.46%	0.009	0.375	5.839	1.77	10.3	4631		3028	65%	ОК
81+35	18	0.50%	0.009	0.375	6.088	1.77	10.8	4828		3028	63%	ОК
80+00	18	0.75%	0.009	0.375	7.456	1.77	13.2	5913		3028	51%	ОК

SC Current Flow	% of
(in Lava Wash)	Capacity
1513	30.7%
1566	25.4%
1566	26.0%
1884	36.9%

						A		0	Contributing Basins	Pea
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (st)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)		_
216+14	12	1.25%	0.009	0.25	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	1,3, 75% of Ivins Flow	1
213+23	12	1.25%	0.009	0.25	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		1
201+36	12	1.31%	0.009	0.25	7.52	0.79	5.9	2651		1
189+48	12	1.21%	0.009	0.25	7.23	0.79	5.7	2547	1,3,75% of lvins Flow,4	1
185+41	12	1.81%	0.009	0.25	8.84	0.79	6.9	3116		1
181+37	12	2.11%	0.009	0.25	9.53	0.79	7.5	3360	1,3,75% of Ivins Flow,4,6,7	1
177+66	12	1.23%	0.009	0.25	7.29	0.79	5.7	2568		1
173+60	12	1.20%	0.009	0.25	7.20	0.79	5.7	2537		1
170+27	12	1.32%	0.009	0.25	7.55	0.79	5.9	2661		1
167+78	12	1.80%	0.009	0.25	8.81	0.79	6.9	3107		1
167+19	12	1.20%	0.009	0.25	7.20	0.79	5.7	2537		1
166+61	12	1.38%	0.009	0.25	7.72	0.79	6.1	2721	1,3,100% of Ivins Flow,4,6,7,2,5,18	1
163+20	12	2.16%	0.009	0.25	9.66	0.79	7.6	3404	1,3,100% of lvins Flow,4,6,7,2,5,18, 10	1
160+88	12	2.06%	0.009	0.25	9.43	0.79	7.4	3324		1
158+71	12	2.16%	0.009	0.25	9.66	0.79	7.6	3404		1
157+19	12	1.66%	0.009	0.25	8.46	0.79	6.6	2984		1
153+93	12	1.71%	0.009	0.25	8.59	0.79	6.7	3028		1
149+91	12	1.50%	0.009	0.25	8.05	0.79	6.3	2836		1
145+92	12	1.31%	0.009	0.25	7.52	0.79	5.9	2651		1
141+92	12	1.18%	0.009	0.25	7.14	0.79	5.6	2516		1
137+92	12	1.24%	0.009	0.25	7.32	0.79	5.7	2579		1
136+13	12	1.26%	0.009	0.25	7.37	0.79	5.8	2600		1
133+94	12	1.31%	0.009	0.25	7.52	0.79	5.9	2651		1
129+94	12	1.38%	0.009	0.25	7.72	0.79	6.1	2721		1
126+28	15	1.50%	0.009	0.3125	9.34	1.23	11.5	5143		1
122+50	15	0.58%	0.009	0.3125	5.81	1.23	7.1	3198		1
121+36	15	1.50%	0.009	0.3125	9.34	1.23	11.5	5143		1
118+83	15	1.17%	0.009	0.3125	8.25	1.23	10.1	4542		1
115+96	15	0.56%	0.009	0.3125	5.71	1.23	7.0	3142		1
112+30	15	0.46%	0.009	0.3125	5.17	1.23	6.3	2848		1
110+41	15	0.75%	0.009	0.3125	6.60	1.23	8.1	3636		1
107+16	15	0.94%	0.009	0.3125	7.39	1.23	9.1	4071		1
104+26	15	1.01%	0.009	0.3125	7.66	1.23	9.4	4220		1
102+55	15	1.15%	0.009	0.3125	8.18	1.23	10.0	4503		1
101+11	15	1.11%	0.009	0.3125	8.03	1.23	9.9	4424		1
99+54	15	0.61%	0.009	0.3125	5.95	1.23	7.3	3279		1
95+76	15	0.56%	0.009	0.3125	5.71	1.23	7.0	3142	1,3 100% oF Ivins Flow, 4,6,7,2,5,18,10,19,20, Conn. From St. George	1
93+36	15	0.80%	0.009	0.3125	6.82	1.23	8.4	3756		1
91+03	15	0.54%	0.009	0.3125	5.602	1.23	6.9	3086		1
85+97	15	0.46%	0.009	0.3125	5.171	1.23	6.3	2848		1
81+35	15	0.50%	0.009	0.3125	5.391	1.23	6.6	2969		1
80+00	15	0.75%	0.009	0.3125	6.602	1.23	8.1	3636		1

SC Current Peak Flow	% of Capacity	Pipe Size		
1075	47%	ОК		
1080	42%	ок		
1099	41%	ок		
1119	44%	ок		
1145	37%	ок		
1171	35%	ОК		
1257	49%	ок		
1351	53%	ок		
1428	54%	ок		
1486	48%	ок		
1499	59%	ок		
1513	56%	ок		
1566	46%	ок		
1832	55%	ОК		
1587	47%	ОК		
1594	53%	ОК		
1610	53%	ОК		
1629	57%	ОК		
1648	62%	ОК		
1666	66%	ОК		
1685	65%	ОК		
1694	65%	ОК		
1704	64%	ОК		
1723	63%	ОК		
1740	34%	ОК		
1758	55%	ОК		
1764	34%	ОК		
1776	39%	ОК		
1789	57%	ОК		
1806	63%	ОК		
1815	50%	ОК		
1831	45%	ОК		
1844	44%	ОК		
1852	41%	ОК		
1859	42%	ОК		
1867	57%	ОК		
1884	60%	ОК		
1884	50%	ОК		
1884	61%	ОК		
1884	66%	ОК		
1884	63%	ОК		
1884	52%	ок 🛛		

SC Additional Flow	Equivalent
Before Reaching	Number of
Capacity (80%)	Connections
997	2135
919	1969
1517	3251
664	1422
1157	2479
630	1240
029	1349

Improved Sewer Capacity - Tuacahn Parallel Line									Contributing Pasing	New Growth	% of	Dino Sizo
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)	Contributing Basins	Peak Flow	Capacity	Pipe Size
18+88	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	2, 25% of Ivins Flow	467	18%	ОК
13+35	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	2,5, 25% of Ivins Flow,75% of 18	1037	40%	ОК
9+58	15	0.70%	0.009	0.313	6.38	1.23	7.8	3513	2,5, 100% of Ivins Flow,75% of 18, 77 Black Desert Conn., 1,3,4,6,7, Silverton	2084	59%	ОК
7+34	15	0.70%	0.009	0.313	6.38	1.23	7.8	3513		2084	59%	ОК
0+00	15	0.70%	0.009	0.313	6.38	1.23	7.8	3513		2084	59%	ОК

SC Current	% of
Flow (gpm)	Capacity
340	18.0%
342	40.1%
1513	59.3%

Improved Sewer Capacity - Tuacahn Wash Outfall Line									Contributing Posing	SC Current	% of	Dino Ciro
Station	Pipe Size (in)	Slope (%)	Mannings "n"	Hyd Radius (ft)	Velocity (ft/s)	Area (sf)	Capacity (cfs)	Capacity (gpm)			Capacity	Pipe Size
49+67	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	2, 25% of Ivins Flow	340	13%	ОК
44+84	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		340	13%	ОК
41+87	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		340	13%	ОК
36+15	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		341	13%	ОК
31+97	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		341	13%	ОК
30+14	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		341	13%	ОК
27+11	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		341	13%	ОК
23+57	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		341	13%	ОК
19+45	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		341	13%	ОК
18+88	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589		341	13%	ОК
13+35	12	1.25%	0.009	0.250	7.35	0.79	5.8	2589	2,5, 25% of Ivins Flow,75% of 18	342	13%	ОК
9+58	12	0.70%	0.009	0.250	5.50	0.79	4.3	1938	2,5, 100% of Ivins Flow,75% of 18, 1,3,4,6,7	1513	78%	ОК
7+34	12	0.70%	0.009	0.250	5.50	0.79	4.3	1938		1513	78%	ОК
0+00	12	0.70%	0.009	0.250	5.50	0.79	4.3	1938		1513	78%	ОК

SC Current	% of
Flow (gpm)	Capacity
340	13.1%
342	13.2%
1513	78.1%

APPENDIX D

OPINIONS OF PROBABLE COST

Santa Clara City, Utah Wastewater Impact Fee Facilities Plan

11 North 300 West, Washington, Utah 84780 Tel: (435) 652-8450 Fax: (435) 652-8416 Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost

Valley Line Extension

Santa Clara City, Utah

TOTAL Estimated NO. DESCRIPTION Units **Unit Price** Quantity COST 7,000.00 \$ 7,000 1 Mobilization LS \$ 2 8" PVC SDR-35 Sewer Main 1.000 LF \$ 75.00 \$ 75,000 3 48" Precast Concrete Manhole ΕA \$ 7,500.00 \$ 45,000 6 Connect into Existing Manhole 4 1 LS \$ 5,000.00 \$ 5,000 5 Shoring/Trench Boxes 1 LS \$ 30,000.00 \$ 30,000 6 Imported Pipe Bedding 30 CY \$ 50.00 \$ 1,500 7 Imported Drain Rock 120 CY \$ 65.00 \$ 7,800 8 Untreated Base Course 10 CY \$ 70.00 \$ 700 9 Bituminous Surfacing 10 CY \$ 800.00 \$ 8,000 10 11 12 Sub-Total \$ 180,000 13 Contingency 20% \$ 36,080 14 **Total Construction** \$ 216,080 15 INCIDENTALS 16 Funding & Administrative Services 2.4% LS \$ 8,000 17 Civil Engineering Design 4.5% LS \$ 15,000 18 Engineering Construction Services (No Full Time Observation) 12.0% Hourly \$ 40,000 Studies, Permitting, and Compliance 19 20 SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan) Est. \$ 5,000 21 Environmental Assistance (Not EA or ER) Est. \$ 22 Geotechnical Engineering 23 6,000 Geotechnical Report Est. \$ 24 Geotechnical and Materials Testing \$ 5,000 Est. 25 Survey and Mapping 5,000 26 Construction Staking Est. \$ 27 Property Surveys Est. \$ 28 Land & ROW Acquisition Est. \$ 29 Land & ROW Research & Documents Est. \$ 10,000 30 GIS Mapping \$ 5,000 Est. 31 Aerial Photography Est. \$ 32 egal and Fiscal 33 Bonding & Attorney Fees 8,000 Est. \$ 34 Loan Origination Fee Est. \$ 35 Interim Financing Costs \$ Est. 36 Miscellaneous 37 \$ 10,000 Miscellaneous Engineering Services Est. 38 39 TOTAL PROJECT COST 333,080 S

In providing opinions of probable construction cost, the Client understands that the Engineer has no control over costs or the price of labor, equipment or materials, or over the Contractor's method of pricing, and that the opinion of probable construction cost provided herein is made on the basis of the Engineer's qualifications and experience. The Engineer makes no warranty, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy of such opinions compared to bid or actual costs.

10-Mar-22

MCG/mjw

11 North 300 West, Washington, Utah 84780 Tel: (435) 652-8450 Fax: (435) 652-8416 Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost

Valley Line Replacement

Santa Clara City, Utah

10-Mar-22

MCG/mjw

NO.	DESCRIPTION	Estimated Quantity	Units	Unit Price	TOTAL COST
1	Mobilization	1	LS	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 9,000
2	21" PVC SDR-35 Sewer Main	1,000	LF	\$ 130.00	\$ 130,000
3	48" Precast Concrete Manhole	6	EA	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 45,000
4	Connect into Existing Manhole	1	LS	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,000
5	Shoring/Trench Boxes	1	LS	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000
6	Imported Pipe Bedding	60	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 3,000
7	Imported Drain Rock	240	CY	\$ 65.00	\$ 15,600
8	Untreated Base Course	20	CY	\$ 70.00	\$ 1,400
9	Bituminous Surfacing	10	CY	\$ 800.00	\$ 8,000
10					
11					
12	Sub-Total				\$ 247,000
13	Contingency	20%			\$ 49,480
14	Total Construction				\$ 296,480
15	INCIDENTALS				
16	Funding & Administrative Services	1.9%	LS		\$ 8,000
17	Civil Engineering Design	3.6%	LS		\$ 15,000
18	Engineering Construction Services (No Full Time Observation)	9.7%	Hourly		\$ 40,000
19	Studies, Permitting, and Compliance				
20	SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan)		Est.		\$ 5,000
21	Environmental Assistance (Not EA or ER)		Est.		\$ -
22	Geotechnical Engineering				
23	Geotechnical Report		Est.		\$ 6,000
24	Geotechnical and Materials Testing		Est.		\$ 5,000
25	Survey and Mapping				
26	Construction Staking		Est.		\$ 5,000
27	Property Surveys		Est.		\$ -
28	Land & ROW Acquisition		Est.		\$ -
29	Land & ROW Research & Documents		Est.		\$ 10,000
30	GIS Mapping		Est.		\$ 5,000
31	Aerial Photography		Est.		\$ -
32	Legal and Fiscal				
33	Bonding & Attorney Fees		Est.		\$ 8,000
34	Loan Origination Fee		Est.		\$ -
35	Interim Financing Costs		Est.		\$ -
36	Miscellaneous				
37	Miscellaneous Engineering Services		Est.		\$ 10,000
38					
39		TOTAL PRO	DJECT COST		\$ 413,480

In providing opinions of probable construction cost, the Client understands that the Engineer has no control over costs or the price of labor, equipment or materials, or over the Contractor's method of pricing, and that the opinion of probable construction cost provided herein is made on the basis of the Engineer's qualifications and experience. The Engineer makes no warranty, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy of such opinions compared to bid or actual costs.

11 North 300 West, Washington, Utah 84780 Tel: (435) 652-8450 Fax: (435) 652-8416 Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost

Lava Flow Wash Line Improvement

Santa Clara City, Utah

Parallel Line

NO.	DESCRIPTION	Estimated Quantity	Units	Unit Price	TOTAL COST
1	Mobilization	1	LS	\$ 59,000.00	\$ 59,000
3	15" PVC SDR-35 Sewer Main	4,500	LF	\$ 110.00	\$ 495,000
4	18" PVC SDR-35 Sewer Main	4,300	LF	\$ 115.00	\$ 494,500
5	48" Precast Concrete Manhole	35	EA	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 262,500
6	Shoring/Trench Boxes	1	LS	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 45,000
7	Imported Pipe Bedding	1,800	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 90,000
8	Imported Drain Rock	3,000	CY	\$ 65.00	\$ 195,000
9	Untreated Base Course	100	CY	\$ 70.00	\$ 7,000
10	Bituminous Surfacing	50	CY	\$ 800.00	\$ 40,000
11	Bypass Pumping	1	LS	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000
12					
13	Sub-Total				\$ 1,718,000
14	Contingency	20%			\$ 343,677
15	Total Construction				\$ 2,061,677
16	INCIDENTALS				
17	Funding & Administrative Services	0.4%	LS		\$ 10,000
18	Civil Engineering Design	11.9%	LS		\$ 309,300
19	Engineering Construction Services	3.9%	Hourly		\$ 100,000
20	Studies, Permitting, and Compliance				
21	SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan)		Est.		\$ 10,000
22	Environmental Assistance (Not EA or ER)		Est.		\$ 15,000
23	Geotechnical Engineering				
24	Geotechnical Report		Est.		\$ 10,000
25	Geotechnical and Materials Testing		Est.		\$ 20,000
26	Survey and Mapping				
27	Construction Staking		Est.		\$ 10,000
28	Property Surveys		Est.		\$ -
29	Land & ROW Acquisition		Est.		\$ -
30	Land & RoW Research & Documents		Est.		\$ 15,000
31	GIS Mapping		Est.		\$ 15,000
32	Aerial Photography		Est.		\$ -
33	Legal and Fiscal				
34	Bonding & Attorney Fees		Est.		\$ 8,000
35	Loan Origination Fee		Est.		\$ -
36	Interim Financing Costs		Est.		\$ -
37	<u>Miscellaneous</u>				
38	Miscellaneous Engineering Services		Est.		\$ 10,000
39					
40	Total Project Cost				\$ 2,593,977
42	SANTA CLARA SHARE				
43	Average Percent of Capacity Required	58.0%			\$ 1,504,507

In providing opinions of probable construction cost, the Client understands that the Engineer has no control over costs or the price of labor, equipment or materials, or over the Contractor's method of pricing, and that the opinion of probable construction cost provided herein is made on the basis of the Engineer's qualifications and experience. The Engineer makes no warranty, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy of such opinions compared to bid or actual costs.

10-Mar-22

MCG/mjw

11 North 300 West, Washington, Utah 84780 Tel: (435) 652-8450 Fax: (435) 652-8416 Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost

Tuacahn Wash Line Improvement

Santa Clara City, Utah

NO.	DESCRIPTION	Estimated Quantity	Units	Unit Price	TOTAL COST
1	Mobilization	1	LS	\$ 38.000.00	\$ 38.000
2	12" PVC SDR-35 Sewer Main	5.300	LF	\$ 95.00	\$ 503,500
3	15" PVC SDR-35 Sewer Main	1,000	LF	\$ 110.00	\$ 110,000
4	48" Precast Concrete Manhole	22	EA	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 165,000
5	Shoring/Trench Boxes	1	LS	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 45,000
6	Imported Pipe Bedding	1.000	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 50,000
7	Imported Drain Rock	2,000	CY	\$ 65.00	\$ 130,000
8	Untreated Base Course	100	CY	\$ 70.00	\$ 7,000
9	Bituminous Surfacing	50	CY	\$ 800.00	\$ 40,000
10	Bypass Pumping	1	LS	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000
11				,	,
12	Sub-Total				\$ 1,118,500
13	Contingency	20%			\$ 223,777
14	Total Construction				\$ 1,342,277
15	INCIDENTALS				
16	Funding & Administrative Services	0.6%	LS		\$ 10,000
17	Civil Engineering Design	11.4%	LS		\$ 201,300
18	Engineering Construction Services	5.7%	Hourly		\$ 100,000
19	Studies, Permitting, and Compliance				
20	SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Protection Plan)		Est.		\$ 10,000
21	Environmental Assistance (Not EA or ER)		Est.		\$ 15,000
22	Geotechnical Engineering				
23	Geotechnical Report		Est.		\$ 10,000
24	Geotechnical and Materials Testing		Est.		\$ 20,000
25	Survey and Mapping				
26	Construction Staking		Est.		\$ 10,000
27	Property Surveys		Est.		\$ -
28	Land & ROW Acquisition		Est.		\$ -
29	Land & RoW Research & Documents		Est.		\$ 15,000
30	GIS Mapping		Est.		\$ 15,000
31	Aerial Photography		Est.		\$ -
32	Legal and Fiscal				
33	Bonding & Attorney Fees		Est.		\$ 8,000
34	Loan Origination Fee		Est.		\$ -
35	Interim Financing Costs		Est.		\$ -
36	Miscellaneous				
37	Miscellaneous Engineering Services		Est.		\$ 10,000
38					
39	Total Project Cost				\$ 1,766,577
42	SANTA CLARA SHARE				
43	Average Percent of Capacity Required	31.6%			\$ 558,238

In providing opinions of probable construction cost, the Client understands that the Engineer has no control over costs or the price of labor, equipment or materials, or over the Contractor's method of pricing, and that the opinion of probable construction cost provided herein is made on the basis of the Engineer's qualifications and experience. The Engineer makes no warranty, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy of such opinions compared to bid or actual costs.

10-Mar-22

MCG/mjw

APPENDIX E

PUBLIC NOTICE FOR IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS

Santa Clara City, Utah Wastewater Impact Fee Facilities Plan

Entity: Santa Clara

Body: City Council

Subject:	Business
Notice Title:	Public Notice
Meeting Location:	2603 Santa Clara Dr.
	Santa Clara UT 84765
Event Date & Time:	February 3, 2021 February 3, 2021 09:30 AM - February 17, 2021 05:00 PM
Description/Agenda:	February 3, 2021 Public Notice of the Impact Fees
	Pursuant to the requirements of Utah Code Section 11-36a, this notice is hereby given that Santa Clara City intends to contract to prepare, and then prepare, a Wastewater Impact Fee Facilities Plan & Impact Fee Analysis according to the requirements of the State of Utah. The impact fee service area for this analysis includes the entire city limits.
	Pursuant to the requirements of Utah Code Section 11-36a, this notice is hereby given that Santa Clara City intends to contract to prepare, and then prepare, a Stormwater Impact Fee Facilities Plan & Impact Fee Analysis according to the requirements of the State of Utah. The impact fee service area for this analysis includes the entire city limits.
	Pursuant to the requirements of Utah Code Section 11-36a, this notice is hereby given that Santa Clara City intends to contract to prepare, and then prepare, a Power Impact Fee Facilities Plan & Impact Fee Analysis according to the requirements of the State of Utah. The impact fee service area for this analysis includes the entire city limits.
Notice of Special Accommodations:	NOTICE OF SPECIAL ACCOMMODATION DURING PUBLIC MEETINGS In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify Chris Shelley at 435-673-6712 ext. 203.
Notice of Electronic or telephone participation:	Not available
Other information:	

Contact Information:	Chris Shelley 4356736712 cshelley@sccity.org
Posted on:	February 03, 2021 09:08 AM
Last edited on:	February 03, 2021 09:08 AM

Printed from Utah's Public Notice Website (http://pmn.utah.gov/)

APPENDIX F

IMPACT FEE CERTIFICATION

Santa Clara City, Utah Wastewater Impact Fee Facilities Plan

CERTIFICATION OF IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS BY CONSULTANT

In accordance with Utah Code Annotated § 11-36a-306, Joseph Phillips, P.E., on behalf of Sunrise Engineering, Inc., make the following certification:

I certify that the attached impact fee facilities plan and impact fee analysis:

- 1. Includes only the costs of public facilities that are:
 - a. Allowed under the Impact Fees Act; and
 - b. Actually incurred; or
 - c. Projected to be incurred or encumbered within six years after the day on which each impact fee is paid;
- 2. Does not include:
 - a. costs of operation and maintenance of public facilities;
 - b. costs for qualifying public facilities that will raise the level of service for the facilities, through impact fees, above the level of service that is supported by existing residents; or
 - c. an expense for overhead, unless the expense is calculated pursuant to a methodology that is consistent with generally accepted cost accounting practices and that methodological standards set forth by the Federal Office of Management and Budget for federal grant reimbursement;
- 3. Offsets costs with grants or other alternate sources of payment; and
- 4. Complies in each and every relevant respect with the Impact Fees Act.

Joseph Phillips, P.E., makes this certification with the following qualifications:

- 1. All of the recommendations for implementation of the Impact Fee Facilities Plan ("IFFP") made in the IFFP documents or in the Impact Fee Analysis documents are followed in their entirety by the Santa Clara City, Utah, staff, and elected officials.
- 2. If all or a portion of the IFFP or Impact Fee Analyses are modified or amended, this certification is no longer valid.
- 3. All information provided to Sunrise Engineering, Inc., its contractors or suppliers, is assumed to be correct, complete and accurate. This includes information provided by Santa Clara City, Utah, and outside sources.

- 4. The undersigned is trained and licensed as a professional engineer and has not been trained or licensed as a lawyer. Nothing in the foregoing certification shall be deemed an opinion of law or an opinion of compliance with law which under applicable professional licensing laws or regulations or other laws or regulations must be rendered by a lawyer licensed in the State of Utah.
- 5. The foregoing Certification is an expression of professional opinion based on the undersigned's best knowledge, information and belief and shall not be construed as a warranty or guaranty of any fact or circumstance.
- 6. The foregoing certification is made only to Santa Clara City, Utah, and may not be used or relied upon by any other person or entity without the expressed written authorization of the undersigned.

Sunrise Engineering, Inc.

Acent By:

Dated: _____June 3, 2022_____

