

June 29, 2007

Executive Summary

The Ogden Valley Growth with Excellence Mandate (GEM) Committee is pleased to present this report and recommendation for Sewer in Ogden Valley in response to the request of the Weber County Commission.

The objective has been to make a recommendation which addressed the Commission's concern that continued approval of small sewer systems and creation of new Districts with the Commission serving as Body Politic does not serve the residents well because the County is not in a position to provide the required services. The Committee identified several other issues which have also been addressed.

The Committee studied 4 alternative solutions:

1. Current – Continue using the current approach while asking the County to fund and form a Department which could serve the needs of users and the County.
2. Consolidated Valley District – Provide a single larger treatment system in the Valley to serve the Valley floor and resorts.
3. Central Weber – Implement a Valley wide collection system and treat the effluent in the Central Weber facility.
4. Combination – A single district referred to as 'The Valley Master District', which would operate as a stand alone district alongside all existing operating districts, requiring no change for existing districts or onsite users, capitalize on new technology, and be implemented in a distributed fashion.

Alternative 4 was selected.

The GEM Committee recommends the Commissioners form a new County Sewer Improvement District (the Valley Master District) by resolution under the provisions of State Law 17B-2-101 and subsequent sections, and an Interlocal Board which would serve all the Sewer Districts in the Valley. The Committee recommends membership in the Interlocal Board should not be optional.

The GEM Committee recommends the Commissioners pursue a professional feasibility study which includes revenue and expense projections and pursue the public process with assistance of experienced technical and legal advisors to form the new County Sewer Improvement District and a new Interlocal Board to serve the needs of the Ogden Valley. Further, we recommend the new Interlocal Board be asked to work closely with the Commission to develop a master plan for sewer in Ogden Valley.

A summary of the existing sewer Districts and Systems is included as Attachment 1. A map of the proposed new District and existing Districts is included as Attachment 2. The 7 existing operating Districts plus one operating System have an estimated 1686 current connections. They have estimated capacity of 6748 connections installed or financially

committed. There are an additional 8 systems for which the County is body politic which have 0 current connections with an estimated capacity of 1051 connections. The owners of these 8 systems have signed agreements with the County to become part of a new District. The Committee recommends that every existing District or system be invited to join the proposed District. Huntsville town is not included in the proposed District, but might also be invited to join.

The Committee thanks a long list of expert advisors who have provided technical and legal understanding, training, and advice during the study. Of particular mention are Curtis Christensen the County Engineer, Brian Cowan of Weber/Morgan Health, and Louis Cooper of the County Planning Commission.

Background

In September of 2006 Commissioner Camille Cain asked the Ogden Valley GEM Committee to make a recommendation regarding sewer in the Valley. She explained the difficulty the Commissioners have in providing the service citizens expect when the County becomes the Body Politic for small sewer systems. Neither the citizens nor the Commissioners are happy with this arrangement.

The Committee discussed the request, determined that such a study and recommendation would generate a great deal of fear and controversy among residents, and the majority suggested the Committee would prefer to wait for some time before tackling the assignment. By December it became clear that new development was proceeding at such a high rate that the sewer issue was becoming very urgent. In January 2007 the Committee began serious research and organized to begin generating a recommendation. The Committee met with the Commissioners to validate their continued interest in having a recommendation.

The GEM Committee enlisted the support of technically competent advisors to assist in identifying the issues and providing education. They included:

- Chris Allred – County Legal
- Mark Anderson – Counsel for Central Weber Sewer District, etc.
- Curtis Christensen – County Engineer
- Louis Cooper – Davis County Health, Weber County Planning Commission
- Brian Cowan – Weber/Morgan Health Department
- Eric Johnson – Counsel for new South Willard Sewer District
- James Keller – Keller and Associates Engineering
- Kari Lundeen – State DEQ
- Jim Ormsbee – Elkridge Engineering
- Edward Macauley – State DEQ
- Tim Watkins – Envision Utah
- Lance Wood – Central Weber Sewer District

The Committee extends sincere appreciation to each of these people who have generously contributed their time and expertise.

Definitions

In the interest of clarity the following definitions are provided:

Body Politic – State law requires that any sewer facility shared by more than one home be established under the responsibility of an elected body referred to as the body politic. This entity has the responsibility to see that the system is properly governed and maintained. For small systems like most in the Valley the County Commission is the body politic. Wolf Creek Water and

Sewer District will have an elected board and is an example of a district which will serve as its own body politic.

Onsite – systems used by a single residence. The current septic tank/drainfield systems are a good example.

System – a shared treatment facility such as a common drainfield, which in all but one case is used by a subdivision whose developer has signed a commitment to have the sewer system become part of a new sewer district when it becomes available.

District – a shared treatment entity which requires a body politic and for which the County may be the body politic. Examples are Powder Mountain (has its own body politic), Mountain Sewer (County is body politic), and Pineview West (County is body politic). (See Attachment 1: Existing Sewer Facility Summary for a list of existing and planned Districts.)

EPA Management Level 1 – 5 – The EPA has developed 5 levels of management of onsite and clustered systems in recognition of failure issues and the fact that a growing percentage (estimated at 25% of homes today and 33 percent of new development) of US residents depend on onsite systems (Voluntary National Guidelines for Management of Onsite and Clustered (Decentralized) Wastewater Treatment Systems). The levels are:

1. Homeowner Awareness Model
2. Maintenance Contract Model
3. Operating Permit Model
4. Responsible Management Entity Operation and Maintenance Model
5. Responsible Management Entity Ownership Model

Subdivision level treatment – This is the way things are done today. Developers propose, construct, and fund wastewater treatment for the subdivisions they build. They choose whether to propose a common treatment facility, ranging from individual septic tanks with a common drainfield, to a small MBR system, or individual onsite systems. They choose whether to petition the County to be body politic for any common facility (e.g. Pineview West) or whether to petition the County to become a sewer district with its own Board of Trustees, or body politic (e.g. Wolf Creek).

Regional Treatment – In this model users from more than one subdivision are served by a common facility. The definition could include the entire Ogden Valley, but the Committee prefers to think of it as providing service for a Resort, or a Village, or a few subdivisions.

Interlocal Entity – An entity (like Central Valley - south and west portion of Salt Lake) that serves a number of sewer districts/common systems and may

or may not own treatment facilities. The entity can be a District, a board, or an administrator. Such a board might become the bonding agent for smaller districts or might provide high skill, part time services to small districts.

Existing Districts

See attachment 1.

There are seven operating County Sewer Improvement Districts in the Valley now, plus Nordic Valley, which has no facilities installed and is not operating. They are:

1. Wolf Creek
2. Powder Mountain
3. Green Hills
4. Durfee Creek
5. Mountain Sewer (Ski Lake)
6. Huntsville Hollow
7. Pineview West

Bailey Acres is a common drainfield system in operation today.

There are 8 other systems for which the County serves as body politic which are in various states of construction and approval. They are:

1. Hawkins Creek
2. Basin View
3. Emerson Hills
4. Serendipity
5. Moose Mountain
6. Bison Creek
7. Reserve at Crimson Ridge
8. Powder View

Developers of each of these systems have signed an agreement that the system will become part of a new sewer district when/if such is created.

The operating Districts and system serve approximately 1686 connections with a full buildout capacity of 6748 connections.

The 8 other systems have 0 connections today with an estimated capacity of 1051 connections.

Rounding to the nearest 100, the current total connections are about 1700, with a capacity of about 7800.

Issues

The primary issues identified in discussion and studies are:

1. **Management and oversight** - Small districts/systems, including but not limited to those for which the County serves as body politic commonly have management problems resulting in treatment failure or dissatisfaction of users. Maintenance of these systems requires skills which are expensive to hire or develop and are hard to find. Financial management is also an important issue. The Committee understands most of these systems collect enough fees to cover annual expenses but are not fiscally planning for equipment replacement, failures or other costly expenditures.

The County has no department which is budgeted and charged with responsibility, although Engineering has been asked to fill the gap as best they can. The result is systems which easily fall into disrepair and operate in a failed mode. It is difficult to obtain the cooperation of the homeowners in maintaining the systems.

Community demographics are rapidly changing. City dwellers accustomed to the sewer systems offered in major cities are moving into rural settings and expecting the same service they became used to in more populated areas for a small monthly fee. Many homeowners do not know what a septic system is nor understand their contributions as individual homeowners to the effective operation and maintenance of the system. When individual residential tanks fill allowing sewage to flow directly into the drainfield it can plug the field and cause it to fail. Rehabilitating a drainfield is an expensive project. The Green Hills district (117 connections at full build out) recently rehabilitated one of their drainfields at a large cost (\$40,000). When users do not have adequate understanding of the operative intricacies in system management it is a challenge to recruit qualified board members from within the community sewer district willing to serve in an oversight and decision making capacity.

Jim Ormsbee (Certified Engineer) and Brian Cowan reported that it is common experience throughout the state that small systems (common drainfields, and small treatment facilities) fail because they are not properly maintained. Jim Keller states that in his experience small systems usually fail about 5 years after installation due to maintenance issues.

Brian Cowan (Weber/Morgan Health), Kari Lundeen (DEQ), and Judy Sims (USU) have conducted several seminars to train owners of individual septic systems (onsite systems) in use and maintenance. They offer a \$100 rebate on pumping costs to attendees as an inducement to participate. (Funding is from a limited Federal Grant which is expiring.) They have validated the real need for education and find misconceptions about maintenance are common. Maintenance issues with these systems are not unusual. There is an opportunity for inducement from pumping vendors in the future.

2. **Pineview Reservoir** – While the experts do not agree on the source of impairment, the Committee regards the reservoir as impaired. In 2002 the State DEQ published a water quality study conducted by Tetra Tech, Inc. titled “Pineview Reservoir TMDL”. The TMDL study documented water quality impairments during the summer months due to high temperatures, low dissolved oxygen, and total phosphorus (high concentrations of total phosphorus in reservoirs lead to dissolved oxygen impairment by causing eutrophication). The TMDL study recommended reducing total phosphorus as a means of protecting the reservoir water quality. This recommendation included reducing loading that may be coming from on-site wastewater treatment systems. The TMDL study will be updated every few years as funding permits.

Weber Basin water manager Scott Peterson believes the impairment is due to surface runoff and that the algae bloom apparent each fall can be managed by drawing down the reservoir through normal use. Weber Basin has sampled springs which run into the reservoir and has not seen evidence of pollution.

Personal observation has led many residents to believe pollution of Pineview occurs because of boaters and swimmers who relieve themselves behind a bush on the shoreline instead of using one of the toilets provided by the Forest Service or others. Rick Vallejos, Forest Service, has studied this problem and is of the opinion that this annoying issue is a very minor source of pollution but warrants continued efforts to motivate recreational users to use provided facilities.

While the experts do not agree on the source of pollution in Pineview, it seems to the Committee poor judgment to wait until evidence of wastewater pollution is incontrovertible.

3. **Carrying capacity for Septic Systems** – The Ogden Valley General Plan concludes that there are about 17,000 developable lots, of which about 3,000 have been developed. Neither of the studies of wastewater carrying capacity reflects ability to approach full buildout. In 1998 Janae Wallace and Mike Lowe of the USGS studied the potential impact of onsite systems and concluded the Valley could support about 9,500 onsite systems. Hansen and Luce studied the valley using another “mass balance” approach and concluded the valley could support about 6,200 onsite systems if they were spaced about one per three acres. The Committee believes common treatment facilities with high quality effluent are required as the Valley grows.
4. **Onsite drainfield useful life** – As onsite system drainfields age their ability to function decreases based on a number of factors, including the habits of the home occupants. When a drainfield fails it is always a difficult and expensive job to construct a new one in a landscaped yard. Brian Cowan, Weber/Morgan Health, reports that the expected life of a drainfield is about 20 years. Anecdotal evidence

would indicate a large standard deviation from that number, but more detailed data is not available.

5. **Growth** – Currently the Valley is home for about 7,000 residents. At full buildout the recreation element of the Valley General Plan estimates about 40,000 residents. There are about 1.7 million visitor days per year to the Valley as of 2005, a number expected to grow. In addition to the raw growth data there is a desire to see the growth occur while preserving the rural character of the Valley. The General Plan concludes, and the Committee agrees, that this is best done by promoting growth of a few densely populated villages and resorts with as much open space as possible preserved between the villages. This growth pattern will accelerate the need for common treatment facilities to support the villages and resorts.
6. **Cost of collection and treatment** – The Committee has reviewed a few treatment and collection system cost estimates and concludes that the design and costing of any system(s) should be performed by professionals under the County’s supervision. In general we see treatment costs and collection costs approximate each other, and for a system to support 5,000 users one should plan in the order of \$15 million. Hansen and Luce concluded that it would cost \$11 million to collect wastewater for 5 square miles of the Valley and construct a pipe down the canyon to connect to other Central Weber facilities, a number judged low by today’s estimates.
7. **Pressure on zoning changes** – The Committee is very sensitive to the fear that the existence of sewer will cause developers to request rezoning to much smaller lot sizes. There is historical evidence of this happening in the western side of the County. Therefore the Committee has favored those proposals which limit the possibility of this happening and point out that other factors may limit rezoning, such as the growth of air pollution and the use of Transferred Development Rights (TDR).
8. **Keeping water in the Valley** – The surface water and groundwater in Ogden Valley is essentially “spoken for”. Weber Basin, irrigation companies, Ogden City, and others own the rights. It will be a significant advantage to keep as much water in the valley as we can without sending it down the canyon in a pipe. The demand for secondary water can be expected to increase, and some treatment technologies offer effluent suitable for such use. Reuse of culinary water rights is a complex issue that needs to be legally researched.
9. **Local Management** – Valley residents have developed a strong desire to participate, even manage, the development of critical resources such as sewer planning and systems. The consensus of the Committee is that any future sewer district should be managed by Valley residents.

10. **Impacts of new technology** – Many of us think of sewer systems as a pipe that connects to the home which moves sewage by gravity to a large treatment facility in a remote location. Maintenance and day-to-day management of the facility is by professionals, and our responsibility is to pay a monthly fee and annual tax. Those of us experienced with onsite systems think of devoting a large portion of the yard to a primary drain field and a backup drainfield site with tank pumping about every 3-5 years. Technology of onsite systems has moved to the point that systems can now be located in areas with high water tables, while other treatment methods support tens to thousands of users with bio-reactive membrane filters and passive filters. The bio-reactive membrane systems (called MBR systems) are capable of producing effluent of drinking water purity. The relatively low cost of these new systems make them attractive in much smaller configurations than the older treatment plants such as those used by Central Weber. The Committee feels any proposal for sewer in the Valley should embrace the new technologies and should provide for management needed to support good land use planning and to prevent failure of these (usually) smaller systems.

11. **Citizen Concerns** – When sewer is discussed with Valley residents three common themes rise to the surface;
- a. “I am all for water quality and eventually a waste water treatment facility but do not put it near my house.”
 - b. “Will I be forced to connect to it?”
 - c. “What is the cost per home owner in hook-up fees and monthly usage?”

These issues can be addressed through awareness and education programs and a valley wide master plan.

Alternative Solutions

1. Alternative Definitions

- a. **Current** – Continue to implement wastewater treatment as is currently being done. Specifically, developers will continue to have the option of deciding to use onsite septic, common drainfields, small treatment plants, or, for larger projects, MBR systems. The County would agree to continue serving as body politic for shared systems and would address their issues with management and maintenance by funding a County department to deal with the growing body of small systems and districts. Existing larger districts like Wolf Creek, Powder Mountain, and Mountain Sewer (Ski Lake) would continue to grow. Onsite systems would be managed by owners. (A variation of this alternative would have new onsite systems monitored by the County.) Impairment of Pineview Reservoir would continue to be monitored.

- b. **Consolidated Valley District** – Provide a single larger treatment system in the Valley to serve the Valley floor and resorts like Powder Mountain and possibly Snow Basin. Over time all the smaller districts/systems would merge into the consolidated district. Outlying areas would continue to be served by onsite systems managed by owners.
- c. **Central Weber** – Construct a line down Ogden Canyon and extend the boundary of Central Weber District to include the Valley.
- d. **Combination** – Valley Master Sewer District – A single sewer district (referred to as the Valley Master County Sewer Improvement District or Valley for short). It will operate in addition to existing sewer districts and systems in the Ogden Valley Township. It would be a County Sewer Improvement District, wholly contained within the County. This is the recommended alternative. See Attachment 2: Map of Proposed Ogden Valley Master Sewer District. This recommendation refers to a County Sewer Improvement District as described in State Code 17B-2-101 and subsequent sections.

It will operate in the following ways:

- i. New development, from a single home or business to a large subdivision or resort will make a choice to be annexed into an existing district or system or will by default become part of the new Valley district.

This is like the Current alternative in the sense that each new subdivision will make its own decision on wastewater and will fund and construct the facilities. Subdivisions which choose on-site septic systems will receive far less service from the district and users will be assessed a nominal fee for inspections. Subdivisions which choose common facilities will provide their own treatment system, or at the district's option be treated in nearby facilities. Users will pay cost based fees covering treatment and operation.

Near high density mixed use nodes (if the TDR ordinance is adopted which includes node definitions), or near the present town of Huntsville and the hamlets of Eden and Liberty, regional systems will be planned which will permit easy expansion. These systems would be located to utilize gravity flow and would cause minimum disruption/inconvenience to nearby residents.

The new Valley district will begin by operating common systems recently approved by the County (some of which have not yet been constructed). On a map the current district would look like a series

of islands mixed with the new Valley District.

- ii. Existing onsite septic systems and districts or other common systems will be able to continue as they are today or request services from the new Valley district. If accepted by the district, onsite system owners will be able to contract for a desired level of service by the district to range from inspection to normal pumping. Repair or replacement of drain fields would be by bid.

When existing homes using onsite systems are sold or transferred inspections will be required at the time of sale and thereafter at a frequency to be determined by the new District, perhaps every 3 to 5 years. At this point the property will become part of the new district. (Currently financial institutions may ask for such an inspection as part of the sale.)

To repeat, owners of existing onsite septic systems will not be asked to change or be inspected. Should owners ask for inspection services or if the home is sold or transferred then an inspection would be performed. A number of current owners have expressed concern about how invasive an inspection would be, and who would pay for it. If the system is well documented and the owner can uncover the tank inspection port(s) inspection may be straightforward and costs would be expected to be about \$50. If pumping is also required to see the baffles the cost would be about \$285.

Many users of current onsite systems are unaware of the location of their septic tank and the details of their drainfield. In this case plans can often be obtained from Weber/Morgan Health Department, or tracking devices can be used to go from a cleanout in the home to the tank to determine the location of the tank (\$260). The tank inspection port(s) and baffles can then be uncovered and inspected. In the worst cases a failed field can be detected from the tank inspection or walking around the field to see if effluent is surfacing. In some cases failure is indicated by backflow from the field into the tank as it is pumped. Digging a cross section of a drainfield line will show the state of failure as well. Costs will vary depending on how much is known about the system, maintenance history, etc., but would range from \$50 to \$1000 and would be paid by the owner. If required, repair work would also be paid by the owner. The state of the system would be a factor in determining the frequency of future inspections.

- iii. Existing districts or common systems may ask in writing to be annexed by the Valley District and will be accepted at the option of

the Valley district.

- iv. Management of the new Valley District would be by a board which would be appointed by the County Commissioners and after a period of 6 years the Commissioners might decide to have the board elected by residents of the District. A 6 year period of attentive oversight by the Commissioners would provide an increased level of start-up stability for the new District.

The District would negotiate with Weber/Morgan Health Department to provide services other than permitting and inspection of new onsite systems, which are legal responsibilities of the health department. The role of the County Commissioners as body politic for those small systems/districts which choose not to be part of the new District would not change.

- v. The town of Huntsville is not included in the new Valley District. If the town decides to be included it would become an Included Municipality and would be given 1 seat on the board.
- vi. Over time, as the number of seasonal residences increases, provision may be made to devote a seat(s) to that population, even though their primary residence is not Weber County.
- vii. Cooperation and communication between all the districts in the Township will be encouraged and supported by an “Interlocal Board”. The Interlocal Board would be made up of representatives from each sewer district/common system in the Valley. The number of seats for each district, or alternatively the number of votes provided to each entity, would be determined by the annual revenue of the entity and their corresponding financial contribution to the Interlocal Board. Any fees assessed member districts are expected to be nominal, with the majority of the revenue coming from billable services provided to the member districts. Members of the Board would be appointed by the County Commission and subsequently appointed by the member entities. Responsibilities of the Board would be to provide more favorable bonding for each member entity and to provide contract services to member entities who wish them. The Board may own and operate capital facilities as the members’ desire. It is possible that over time the Board may be dissolved as member entities merge with the new Valley District.

Because of the very large differences in size and management of the existing districts it is likely the larger districts may not wish to be part of the Interlocal Board. Some existing districts have a

history which causes some long time residents to view the district with distrust. The Committee acknowledges the existence of these issues but suggests that for the greater good of the Valley they must be addressed. The Committee recommends membership on the Board not be optional, as the combined group especially needs the assistance of the larger districts.

Legal counsel would be required to establish the management framework and legal basis for both the new District and the Interlocal Board.

- viii. Revenue – While both the Valley District and the Interlocal Board would have powers of taxation it is expected that revenue would be obtained solely by collection of cost-based fees. In this way all remaining property in the Ogden Valley can be included in the new Valley District and users will pay only for the services for which they contract. The Committee is concerned about the financial plan for the District as there will be nearly 0 active connections and inevitable start-up costs as operation begins.
- ix. All the collection and treatment facilities, except those for whom the district provides contract services, will be owned by the District or Board.
- x. This option provides EPA management model Level 1 for those existing onsite systems whose owners choose not to contract for services, Level 2 for all new onsite systems and those existing whose owners choose to contract for services, or for existing homes when sold/transferred, Level 2 for those districts or systems who choose to have contract services and Level 5 for other facilities.
- xi. The new Interlocal Board will assist the County in developing a Valley-wide sewer master plan.

Analysis of Alternatives

The key criteria for evaluation are:

1. Risk of Reservoir pollution.
2. Relative degree to which body politic management issues are alleviated.
3. Relative expense to existing and new residents, including forced connection.
4. Relative impact on existing onsite users, Systems, and Districts.
5. Promotion of the rural character of the Valley by minimizing rezone requests and support of the General Plan.
6. Degree to which water is preserved for reuse in the Valley.

7. Degree of local management.

By using a scale of 1 – 10 where 1 is judged best, for each criteria element we can develop a figure of merit for each alternative.

Criteria	Consolidated Valley	Central Weber	Current	Combined
Pollution Risk	3	3	10	3
Body Politic Issues	2	0	10	4
Relative Expense	8	10	4	5
Impact on current residents	8	10	1	3
Rural Character	10	10	3	1
Water Reuse	2	10	3	3
Local Management	2	10	2	2
Figure of Merit	35	53	33	21

This analysis favors the Combined alternative.

By adding a weighting factor of 1 – 10, 10 being most important, for each criterion we further refine the evaluation. Multiplying the scale elements of each row of the preceding matrix by the weight factors:

Criteria (weight)	Current	Consolidated Valley	Central Weber	Combined
Pollution Risk (10)	100	30	30	30
Body Politic Issues (4)	40	8	0	16
Relative Expense (8)	32	64	80	40
Impact on current residents (7)	7	56	70	21
Rural Character (8)	24	80	80	8
Water Reuse (7)	21	14	70	21
Local Management (1)	2	2	10	2

Criteria (weight)	Current	Consolidated Valley	Central Weber	Combined
Figure of Merit	226	254	340	138

The Combined alternative is even more clearly shown to be desirable.

While this is primarily a subjective evaluation it represents consideration of the factors judged by the Committee to be most important. Evaluation of technical and cost factors needs to be performed by licensed professionals.

Rough Sizing of the New District

Since full buildout of the Valley is estimated at about 17,000 homes (ignoring commercial and other non-residential uses), and estimating about 1500 onsite systems exist today, the opportunity for a new district would be between 7,700 and 13,800 additional connections. To these numbers one would add the 1051 potential connections currently committed to join a new district. One might think in terms of a 10,000 connection new district over 30 years with the assumption that none of the existing operating Districts opt to join a new district. The Committee notes that the economics of such a district have not been studied and recommend the Commissioners ask professionals to do this.

Recommendation

The recommendation of the Committee is for further study and consideration of the Combined, or Valley Master County Improvement Sewer District alternative. Selection of this alternative offers clear benefits:

1. Does not require current users of existing onsite septic or other systems to change or incur new costs.
2. Addresses the issues of successful management of community systems represented by the existing common drainfield systems and small treatment facilities.
3. Provides a body politic with adequate funding and skills to ensure effective service, maintenance, and treatment.
4. Controls the risk of waste water pollution in streams and the Reservoir.
5. Offers onsite users assistance in managing their systems.
6. Creates few and short trunk lines, which have the potential of impacting existing onsite septic users.
7. Creates a good friend and neighbor with existing districts/systems.

It has the risk of becoming too aggressive in extending regional facilities, which could create an impact on existing homes or subdivisions.

The Committee recommends the County Commission pursue a professional feasibility study including revenue and expense, and pursue the public process with assistance of experienced legal advisors for formation of a new County Improvement District and a new Interlocal Board to serve Ogden Valley.

As part of the process of forming the new District the Committee recommends formally inviting each existing District/system and Huntsville town to join the new District.

The Committee recommends the County plan to work with the new Interlocal Board to develop a Valley-wide Sewer Master Plan.