

**MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY
COUNCIL WORK MEETING**

MAY 19, 2022; 5:35 P.M.

**MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS
PRESENT:**

MAYOR JOY PETRO, ZACH BLOXHAM, CLINT MORRIS, TYSON ROBERTS, BETTINA SMITH EDMONDSON, AND DAVE THOMAS

STAFF PRESENT:

ALEX JENSEN, STEVE GARSIDE, STEPHEN JACKSON, CHAD WILKINSON, KEVIN WARD, DOUG BITTON, ED FRAZIER, AND KIM READ

EXCUSED:

GARY CRANE

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

Mayor Petro opened the meeting.

AGENDA:

COUNCILMEMBER REPORT

No Councilmember Reports were shared.

**INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR THE BILLING AND COLLECTION OF FEES FOR
ADVANCED LIFE SUPPORT SERVICES – RESOLUTION 22-33**

Kevin Ward, Fire Chief, reminded the Council paramedic or ambulance services would no longer be provided by Davis County Sheriff's Office and would no longer respond to calls by the end of 2022. He added this required a billing agreement between all Fire Department entities within the county for paramedic services and shared an example. He pointed out Layton City was the only paramedic and ambulance provider with in-house billing and explained how the fee had been calculated between all county entities. He also reviewed how future fee increases would occur and be implemented.

Mayor Petro expressed appreciation to the Fire Department Staff for their collection efforts.

2022 FIREWORKS RESTRICTIONS – RESOLUTION 22-34

Chief Ward reminded the Council of the firework restrictions east of Highway 89. He explained when aerial fireworks became legal within the State, the City made some adjustments to identify locations for the restriction of aerial fireworks and reported the City had experienced compliance by residents for a number of years. He shared a map reflecting the identified areas in which firework restrictions had been put in place and also a map reflecting two new areas, designated in neon yellow, which needed to be included within the restriction area. He mentioned State Statute had recommended the areas be easily identified in order to eliminate confusion with the public. He informed the Council of firework complaints received last year and mentioned several of those were within these areas where the fireworks were allowed; however, due to the lack of homes there was potential for fires to occur in the open area. He mentioned the other area identified on the map contributed to confusion by residents and indicated Staff was proposing both yellow areas be designated as restricted areas to avoid confusion and protect the City from fire.

He shared the illustration of the new map, Doug Bitton, Fire Marshal, pointed out the area formerly known as the Burn Plant was included, as it had been annexed into the City. Chief Ward also reminded the Council fireworks were allowed to be discharged at Sandridge and Andy Adams Parks for those

residents living within the restricted areas.

Councilmembers Thomas inquired how residents living within the newly designated areas prohibiting fireworks for the first time would become aware of the change. Chief Ward responded an educational component would be distributed via social media platforms, firework vendor tents, etc. and expressed his opinion violators had responded well when informed of non-compliance. Chief Ward informed the Council a total ban of fireworks wasn't allowed by State Statute; although, some cities might attempt to invoke such a policy. Councilmember Smith Edmondson suggested a mailer to the residents which were now included in the restricted area and Alex Jensen, City Manager, suggested implementing the use of CERT (Community Emergency Response Team) District Coordinators for the purpose. Mayor Petro also suggested specifying those designated parks which allowed the discharge of fireworks. A discussion took place whether open areas in the western portion of the City should be considered for restrictions.

PRESENTATION – LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (LTAP)

Stephen Jackson, City Engineer, reminded the Council of the City's previous assistance provided by Utah State University regarding different assessments specific to City services. He explained the benefits of the pavement management system: addressed the conditions and structural assessment of City roads, provides tools to determine prioritization for roads, and recommended treatments. He emphasized the assessment didn't address aesthetics. He shared a map with the Council reflecting different colors and explained the different colors represented the different RSL (Remaining Service Life) value of the road and its corresponding distress related to the RSL designation. He shared an example of the interactive map which illustrated how City Staff used the Program. He also shared a map reflecting those roads within the City which had benefitted from the different road maintenance treatments since 2018 and indicated the City had appropriated additional funding, beyond what was received from the gas tax, for this purpose.

Mr. Jackson reviewed the different types of roads within the City and shared some examples. He also identified the distribution of functional classification on the respective roads and stated the goal was a 20 year service life and pointed out the proposed maintenance options were intended to extend the life of the road. He also shared photos of roads reflecting different stresses or damage and pointed out routine maintenance extended the life of City roads. He again emphasized the RSL wasn't based on appearance.

He reviewed the RSL road maintenance treatment options and briefly pointed out the different pavement distresses with the Council. Mr. Jensen explained the City's procedures of informing utility companies, businesses, and residents when new road construction was going to be completed because the City didn't allow utility cuts within three years following completion to ensure the integrity of a new road. He also reviewed the City's relationship with UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) and shared an example to illustrate how that benefitted the City.

Mr. Jensen inquired about the impact or potential damage on certain City roads from heavy trucks associated with different construction projects within the City. Mr. Jackson responded he didn't anticipate significant damage on City roads because the trucks were allowed to travel on designated roads designed for that type of use. He added the City diligently worked to keep the trucks from using roads which weren't designed for that type of use.

Mr. Jackson identified the different types of pavement distress and reviewed the terms with the Council and explained how the ratings were determined then ranked. He announced 22.5% of City roads were identified with no signs of distress and briefly reviewed percentages and types of pavement distresses for City roads which concluded fatigue and block cracking were some of the most common distresses. He shared an illustration which identified the existing pavement conditions of the City roads and explained how the City prioritized roads which need to be completely rebuilt. He explained the challenges in determining when to no longer appropriate funds for maintenance and move forward with the reconstruction process and a discussion followed.

He pointed out the average RSL for the City had slightly increased the previous three years and Mr. Jensen pointed out the B&C Road Funds were historically inadequate for municipalities to complete road projects. Mr. Jackson concluded the functional classification of the City's roads were within an acceptable RSL which he believed was a direct result due to the City's focus of road maintenance over the previous four years.

He addressed preservation strategies and funding for the City's roads and pointed out construction and pavement preservation costs had significantly increased. He mentioned the small increases in the B&C gas tax fund could only preserve a fraction of roads and identified options other municipalities were considering. He reported the City had appropriated and recommended funding in addition to B&C funds for road maintenance and concluded the City's budget appropriation of approximately \$2.5 million toward road projects wouldn't be adequate within the next six to eight years. He pointed out this circumstance could lead the City to consider large road bonds in order to pay the expensive costs associated with pavement restorations; the disadvantage would be the majority of roads would fail around the same time frame and the funding and maintenance would be a vicious cycle. The study suggested a \$5 million budget in order for the City to maintain the average RSL at the recommended average RSL level of 10 or 11 with no more than 3% of roads within the failed category. The Council discussed road funding options.

DISCUSSION – BUDGET ITEMS

Mr. Jensen reminded the Council of the Public Hearing noticed for Thursday, June 2, 2022, specific to the Budget, prior to its adoption on Thursday, June 16, 2022. He requested direction from the Council on the education messaging regarding the proposed rate increase and when it would like it to be included with the utility billing. He explained the billing cycle and pointed out potential consequences if the messaging was delayed until the budget was formally adopted, including any rate increase, during the meeting on Thursday, June 16, 2022, and a discussion followed. The Council concluded the City should disseminate information with what the Council would be considering as soon as possible. He indicated Staff would email the education language to the Council for its approval prior to it being mailed with the utility bill. He indicated Staff would also be clarifying the water usage guidelines implemented due to the drought conditions and reviewed those with the Council.

CLOSED MEETING:

MOTION: Councilmember Roberts moved to adjourn the meeting and convene in a closed meeting at 6:44 p.m. to discuss the Purchase, Exchange, or Lease of Real Property, Including Any Form of a Water Right or Water Shares. Councilmember Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

MOTION: Councilmember Smith Edmondson moved to open the meeting at 6:59 p.m. Councilmember Bloxham seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

MAYOR'S REPORT

No Mayor's Report was shared.

The meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m.

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder

SWORN STATEMENT

The undersigned hereby swears and affirms, pursuant to Section 52-4-205(1) of the Utah Code Annotated, that the sole purpose for the closed meeting of the Layton City Council on the **19th day of May, 2022**, was to discuss the Purchase, Exchange, or Lease of Real Property, Including any Form of a Water Right or Water Shares.

Dated this 6th day of October, 2022.

ATTEST:

JOY PETRO, Mayor

KIMBERLY S READ, City Recorder