

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY
COUNCIL WORK MEETING**

APRIL 15, 2021; 5:31 P.M.

**MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS
PRESENT:**

**MAYOR JOY PETRO, ZACH BLOXHAM, TOM
DAY, DAWN FITZPATRICK, CLINT MORRIS,
AND DAVE THOMAS**

STAFF PRESENT:

**ALEX JENSEN, GARY CRANE, TERRY COBURN,
STEPHEN JACKSON, TRACY PROBERT, DAVID
PRICE, KEVIN WARD, ED FRAZIER, PAUL
APPLONIE, RYAN PICKUP, SCOTT MAUGHAN,
AND KIM READ**

The meeting was held in the Council Conference Room of the Layton City Center.

Mayor Petro opened the meeting.

AGENDA:

COUNCIL MEMBER REPORT

Councilmember Fitzpatrick shared an update regarding the Communities That Care (CTC) program. She announced Davis Behavioral Health had hired an individual to lead the Latino group for CTC which would result in the City having three groups.

**APPROVE AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN DAVIS COUNTY, FARMINGTON CITY, FRUIT
HEIGHTS CITY, KAYSVILLE CITY, CLINTON CITY, LAYTON CITY, NORTH DAVIS FIRE
DISTRICT, SOUTH DAVIS METRO FIRE SERVICE AREA, SOUTH WEBER CITY, AND
SYRACUSE CITY REGARDING PARAMEDIC SERVICES – RESOLUTION 21-19**

Kevin Ward, Fire Chief, distributed a handout specific to the discussion and announced Davis County's decision to discontinue providing paramedic services. He shared a history of EMS (Emergency Medical Service) Programs within the County, pointing out the mill levy funding these operations would be transferred to the City. He emphasized the mill levy didn't cover all costs associated with the City's paramedic services. He identified the number of paramedic units available within the County and reviewed service comparisons between EMT Advanced and EMT Paramedic. He pointed out the City's paramedics were licensed by the state at the higher level of service which allowed advanced life support techniques including IV (intravenous) access and medication administration.

Councilmember Thomas requested further clarification with how the additional paramedic units operated by other entities would fit with this new proposal. Chief Ward explained other ambulance providers within the county were licensed as EMT ambulances and clarified other cities' paramedics would initially operate as paramedic rescue/squads. He mentioned that was how Layton initially began operating its paramedic services and continued to explain how the City's paramedic services had evolved and explained the City's philosophy specific to paramedic engineer Staff. Alex Jensen, City Manager, emphasized the City had chosen to operate paramedic engines, whereas other entities had chosen to operate paramedic squads and believed the competency level and training level of all paramedics would become consistent across the county and emphasized this was the goal of the effort. He also believed this would raise the level of service throughout the county.

Councilmember Fitzpatrick requested clarification regarding factors which determined whether advanced EMT's or paramedics were dispatched and Chief Ward explained the City's dispatchers were trained to identify the level of service needed and identified the illnesses/ailments to illustrate the differences between them.

Chief Ward explained the "tiered response" model which reflected how the City's Fire Stations were staffed with paramedic engines and workers. He spoke to the overlapping incidents and multi-unit response calls and identified the increase in EMS incidents since 2005 of 170%. He proposed an additional paramedic engine/unit would be requested next fiscal year, July 2022.

He informed the Council of the State Administrative Code which identified standards established by the State and reviewed them. He also indicated the City also adhered to standards identified in the NFPA (National Fire Protection Association) which identified standards specific to response times and also reviewed those with the Council.

He explained that as population growth had taken place in Davis County, the need for both paramedic service and law enforcement had also grown. He identified the issues associated with the county in providing paramedic services:

- Increased response times
- One paramedic response
- Billing and supplies

Chief Ward reviewed the timeline specific to previous discussions which had taken place with the Fire Chief's within the county and explained the financial aspect associated with the county tax. He pointed out the county mill levy would remain the same for Layton City residents; rather than Davis County receiving those funds they would be transferred to Layton City. He emphasized City residents wouldn't recognize an increase in their property taxes.

Chief Ward explained how the four coverage areas were identified:

- North Davis County
- Layton City
- Central Davis County
- South Davis Metro Fire

He explained the units were strategically placed in order to provide appropriate response times and reviewed those with the Council and indicated services to HAFB (Hill Air Force Base) would be provided by North Davis Fire and Layton City. He pointed out South Weber intended to provide its own paramedic services. He stated the long term goal was for a borderless system regardless of geopolitical boundaries. He expressed his opinion he didn't believe Layton City would require much back-up by other entities since it would have three paramedic units and reviewed the requirements for the response units. He mentioned the Davis County EMS Council would provide oversight and reviewed the transition timeline with the Council.

Councilmember Fitzpatrick inquired whether the City anticipated a possible increase in property taxes next year to fund the paramedic services and Alex Jensen, City Manager, responded no. Councilmember Fitzpatrick requested further clarification regarding the county's discontinuation of the mill levy collection. Mr. Jensen explained the funds the City would receive by way of the mill levy would be slightly less than what was currently received by the County and explained how the transactions associated with the transition would take place. He explained the County Commission had agreed to initially provide funding to allow smaller entities to focus on establishing their respective programs. He emphasized nothing would change respective to what Layton City residents would pay.

Councilmember Thomas asked about dispatch services and Mr. Jensen clarified initial discussions had taken place specific to the technology associated with managing dispatch centers using a common server.

He indicated there were currently four dispatch centers in existence within the county and the goal was to consolidate data to one common server which would provide uniformity and consistency throughout the county and a discussion took place. Scott Maughan, Battalion Chief, explained how the new consolidated dispatch center would be able to dispatch proper units based on location and need.

Councilmember Day asked when the system consolidation was anticipated to take place and Mr. Jensen believed this would be a reality within the next year.

Councilmember Morris inquired about unincorporated areas within the county and asked if it would be included in the merging of services and Mr. Jensen explained all property parcels within the county were covered under licensing requirements for respective entities and indicated the City would absorb certain unincorporated areas. He mentioned this would be addressed by a separate agreement.

Gary Crane, City Attorney, clarified the agreement would be similar to a letter of understanding and believed any deficiencies within the system would be addressed at the State level respective to licensing and explained it read more like a set of guidelines. Mr. Jensen added this was necessary because each entity was independently governed and the more accurately the vision was articulated, the expectations would be met by all participating entities.

BUDGET DISCUSSION

Tracy Probert, Finance Director, shared a visual presentation and reviewed the Sales Tax Revenue, to date, with the Council and reported an increase of almost 13% compared to last year. He reviewed the General Fund 2021-2022 Revenue and Expenditures:

- Personnel costs
- Operational costs
- Capital equipment
- Capital projects

He reviewed Fund Balance projections for the 2021-2022 Budget which reflected a 13.70% balance of revenue. He reported Legislation was just passed which allowed a fund balance maximum of 35% and explained Staff's philosophy related to Fund Balance. He asked if there were any questions and there were none.

He reviewed the Pool Fund and mentioned the revenue was lower than previous years. He mentioned the bubble heater system replacement was a significant project. He spoke to the amount of funds to be transferred from the General Fund to subsidize the Pool Fund.

He reviewed the Emergency Medical Fund and mentioned the continued increase in revenues and operational costs and stated the fund was in a great position. He identified the two major projects in that fund: 50% of the fire alerting system and the power-load gurney system for seven ambulances. Mr. Jensen explained how the station alerting system would benefit the City's dispatch center and provide better efficiency during consolidation of services.

Mr. Probert continued to review the Special Revenue Funds with the Council and explained these had an identified source of revenue. He reviewed the following:

- Victim Services Fund
- Alcohol Enforcement Fund
- E911 Fund
- Metro Strike Force Fund
- CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) Fund
- RDA (Redevelopment Agency)
- EDA (Economic Development Agency)
- Impact Fee Fund
- Class "C" Road Fund and reviewed the identified maintenance projects

- Prop 1 Transportation Fund and reviewed those identified projects
- RAMP (Recreation, Arts, Museum, and Parks) Fund and reviewed the identified projects
- Capital Projects Fund
- Debt Service Fund

Mr. Probert explained the Tentative Budget would be adopted during the City Council Meeting on Thursday, May 6. He added a public hearing would be set for Thursday, June 3, 2021 and a budget would be adopted during the City Council Meeting on Thursday, June 17, 2021. He pointed out the City was required to complete the Truth in Taxation process to adopt the Property Tax Rate in conjunction with the mill levy associated with City assuming those funds associated with paramedic services. He stated the Final Budget would be adopted in August. Mr. Jensen stated the City was in a good financial position.

Councilmember Thomas inquired how the new Fire Station project was moving along. Chief Ward responded the bid process would soon close, at which time Staff would review the submissions and expressed his desire to be prepared to award the bid during the City Council Meeting on Thursday, June 3, 2021.

Councilmember Morris pointed out the City was a major sponsor of the Davis Arts Council and believed that was a General Fund expenditure. He inquired whether RAMP funds could be used as opposed to General Fund revenue. Mr. Jensen believed the Arts Council had approached the City every year requesting funding. David Price, Parks and Recreation Director, reminded the Council criteria was designated specific to the application for RAMP funding. He explained funding requests couldn't be applicable to general operating funds; rather, the request should be 'project specific'.

Councilmember Bloxham expressed concern with the City's philosophy associated with the 13% Fund Balance and asked if there was an argument to be made about setting that amount of funding aside and asked why Staff believed that amount of funding was necessary. Mr. Probert explained a City would be less prepared to financially weather downward economic trends such as a recession. He informed the Council those cities that ran leaner than that had experienced significant lay-offs, projects and equipment issues, etc. during the 2008-2009 recession and informed the Council of the benefits of a higher fund balance. Councilmember Bloxham continued to express his opinion that since the additional COVID funding had to be spent, it could be used for equipment purchases allowing the City to complete more projects. Mr. Jensen responded Staff was holding off on appropriating the COVID funds until further direction was provided specific to how those funds could be used and expressed agreement these funds could provide flexibility with funding generational projects. He added the City tried to be mindful in determining 'need' vs 'want' during the budget process and identified a circumstance in which Fund Balance fell to four percent and explained the importance of flexibility and a discussion followed.

Stephen Jackson, City Engineer, reviewed the identified street projects with the Council and mentioned the identified challenges with each of the following:

- 1000 South 2200 West
- Sugar Street
- West Hill Field Road and 3700 West
- Dawson Street
- King Street
- Church Street
- 1675 North

PRESENTATION – WATER CONSERVATION

This item wasn't addressed by the Council.

MAYOR'S REPORT

No Mayor's Report was shared.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder