

MINUTES
HIGHLAND CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, April 1, 2014

Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland, Utah 84003

PRESENT: Mayor Mark Thompson, Conducting
Councilmember Brian Braithwaite
Councilmember Rod Mann (via Telephone)
Councilmember Tim Irwin
Councilmember Dennis LeBaron
Councilmember Jessie Schoenfeld

STAFF PRESENT: Aaron Palmer, City Administrator
Matthew Shipp, Public Work Director/ City Engineer
JoD'Ann Bates, Executive Secretary/ Recorder
Nathan Crane, Community Development Director
Gary LeCheminant, Finance Director
Kasey Wright, City Attorney
Shannon Garlick, Secretary

EXCUSED:

OTHERS: Vickie Pincock, Larry Pincock, Ammon Smith, Mitchell Martin, Nick Eldredge, Drew Aarnold, Marcus Graham, Matthew Hoffman, Jim Tullis, David Koch, Nick Koch, Sawyer Adams, Jaxon Smith, Doug Graham, Steve Arnold, Ethan Flitton, Marty Beaumont, Neal Fraser, Ed Barfuss.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Mark Thompson as a regular session at 7:03 p.m. The meeting agenda was posted on the *Utah State Public Meeting Website* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The prayer was offered by Dennis LeBaron and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Ammon Smith, a scout.

SUMMARY

#	Description	Pass/Fail
1.	Motion: Ratify the Mayors Appointment of Kristi Vick to the Open Space Committee	P
2.	Motion: Ratify the Mayors Appointment of Scott Smith to the Library Board	P
3.	Ordinance: Amend Municipal Code 15.04.010, Adopting State Construction Code	P

4.	Motion: Final Plat Approval for Pincock Estates	P
5.	Ordinance: Amend Chapters 12.30 & 13.31, Removal of Neighborhood Trails	P

APPEARANCES:

There were no appearances at this time.

CONSENT:

MOTION: Ratify the Mayor’s Appointment of a member to the Open Space Committee – Kristi Vick.

MOTION: Ratify the Mayor’s Appointment of a member to the Library Board – Scott Smith.

ORDINANCE: Amend the Highland City Municipal Code 15.04.010 – Adopting the State Construction Codes.

Pulled by Tim Irwin for further discussion.

MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the consent items on the agenda.

Jessie Schoenfeld seconded the motion.

Unanimous vote, motion carried.

ORDINANCE: Amend the Highland City Municipal Code 15.04.010 – Adopting the State Construction Codes.

Pulled by Tim Irwin for further discussion.

Tim Irwin stated the City needs to approve the codes, but he would like to understand what the impact would be to the City when adopting those codes before approving them.

Nathan Crane stated every three years the International Code Council amends the codes to address issues that have risen over the last three years. He stated the Utah State Legislature has identified these codes as the ones they want the cities to use. He explained they go through a process where they review it and apply State amendments that apply specifically to the state and are adopted statewide. He stated most of the builders the City deals with are already following the code, because all of the other cities are requiring this as well. He stated there is not a huge impact; it does not change the fees or anything along those lines. He stated there may be some minor differences in construction standards to make the buildings safer.

Tim Irwin questioned if the Code Council highlights the specific changes when they give the code amendments to the cities. He stated if so, he would like to have the changes presented to the Council.

Nathan Crane replied staff has a version that highlights the changes that they can provide for the Council. He stated the changes only apply to new construction.

Tim Irwin suggested the item be continued to the next meeting, so the Council has time to read over the changes.

Nathan Crane stated the Council can continue the item to the next meeting, but the City is obligated to pass the item. He stated staff is happy to provide the changes to the Council, but stated he does not understand what the City gains from waiting. He stated in this case, there is a State Committee, made up of building officials that go through the code and make the appropriate changes.

Tim Irwin stated he is not opposed to the changes; he would just like to understand them before approving it.

Brian Braithwaite stated the Council is responsible to help the individual residents understand the changes. He stated in an effort to be more transparent, the City needs to make sure the residents know where they can get access to the updated information. He stated the residents have to hire someone who follows these changes or build a home with these changes, so they need to know how to access them. He stated there is currently a copy in the library and explained he talked to staff to see if the City could get an electronic version.

Nathan Crane stated staff is looking into the possibilities of an electronic version. He stated the Public Codes Website has the information, but he would like to make sure it has everything and then the City can post a link to the website.

Brian Braithwaite stated part of the motion needs to have a publication on the website pointing the residents to the State. He stated the City is adopting these changes, because the State approved them, so the City needs to give the residents access to where the State approved the changes. He stated the residents can get the Code from to the library, from City staff, or from an electronic version on the website. He stated Jody Bates has put the Code on the website, so any resident of Highland can get access to those books. He stated they need to fix how the residents reach the information on the website, because there has been confusion with the residents, but at least the information is there. He stated he is in favor of accepting the amendments, because if there are things the City does not agree with, they can make amendments when need be.

Tim Irwin clarified the changes apply to all new construction, including remodels and new homes.

Brian Braithwaite clarified the Council does not need to change the Ordinance every time there is a revision. He clarified that whatever is adopted by the International and the State is automatically included in the Ordinance.

MOTION: Brian Braithwaite moved the City Council to approve Ordinance O-2014-* as written as an Ordinance of Highland City amending Title 15 Building and Construction of**

the Highland City Municipal Code by Amending Chapter 15.04 Construction Codes to be adopted; as well as direct staff to clearly identify where the Code can be found at the State through a link on the website, and direct any resident that they can get access to the Code in the City Library or through City staff, and if possible, the City will put a link to a electronic version on the website.

**Jessie Schoenfeld seconded the motion.
Those Voting Aye: Brian Braithwaite, Dennis LeBaron, Jessie Schoenfeld, Rod Mann
Those Voting Nye: Tim Irwin
Motion carried.**

ACTION ITEMS:

MOTION: Final Plat Approval Pincock Estates – 10215 North Alpine Highway.

Nathan Crane stated this is a request for final plat approval for a five lot subdivision just off Sr-74 and 10200 No. (Earl Place). He stated the subdivision was originally approved in 2008 and it has since expired, so it is now being brought back to the Council for approval. He stated it meets all of the City’s standards and requirements and staff is recommending approval with the stipulations specified in the staff report.

Dennis LeBaron questioned what the current wall requirements are against the Alpine Highway.

Nathan Crane stated they currently require a theme wall, which is up to the applicant to design. He stated the wall must be concrete or another durable material.

Brian Braithwaite stated he is in favor of approval. He stated they have already gone through a lot of scrutiny with the process and he does not see any further changes being made. He stated this will be a great addition to the City and the stipulations were well thought out.

MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the Final Plat for Pincock Estates – 10215 North Alpine Highway.

**Dennis LeBaron seconded the motion.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

ORDINANCE: Amend Chapter 12.30 & Chapter 12.31 of the Highland City Municipal Code – Removal of a Neighborhood Option Trail and Designation of Open Space Property for Disposal.

Nathan Crane stated this is a request from the Open Space Committee to clarify the requirements for the disposal of open space property and removal of a neighborhood option trail. He stated there are two sections that the amendment addresses. He explained it removes the lease

agreement option that was originally built into the Ordinance and makes one other minor correction.

Brian Braithwaite explained that because of the ruling from the legal team and the ombudsman, the City can move forward with selling the property. He stated the proposed changes are just to clear out any question of leasing the property and things that would cause confusion. He stated the intent is to have the Open Space Committee members go to each of the subdivisions and talk to the residents, show them the code, and show them the steps in a clean easy process.

MOTION: Tim Irwin moved the City Council to approve the amendment to Chapter 12.30 & 12.31 of the Highland City Municipal Code – Removal of a Neighborhood Option Trail and Designation of Open Space Property for Disposal.

**Jessie Schoenfeld seconded the motion.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

MAYOR/CITY COUNCIL & STAFF COMMUNICATION ITEMS:

- Appraisal Methodology Discussion – Nathan Crane, Community Development Director

Nathan Crane stated he wanted to discuss the methodology the appraiser is proposing to use for the disposal of open space property. He stated it is different than appraising a home, because they do not have comparables. He stated the City is trying to establish a base price for land, regardless of which house is built on the land. He explained the appraisal will be visiting each site looking for surrounding properties to use as comparables. He stated they are trying to determine how much extra a person is paying for extra square footage on a lot to determine the value of the extra land.

Brian Braithwaite questioned if the appraiser is going to look at the land as useable or not useable property or just set a flat price.

Nathan Crane stated yes, the appraiser will look at how well they can utilize the property. He gave an example: Lot 1 and Lot 2 are vacant land and have slightly different square footage, so they will look at what the sale price was for each, what the difference was, and what the marginal price is for square footage. He stated the Beacon Hill Subdivision should be easy, because there are vacant lots that have been purchased recently. He stated the City may have to go back into the history for some of the subdivisions, like Canterbury, that have existed for quite some time. He explained the appraiser will try to get as many examples as they can from the subdivision and then take the mean and medium figures from the comparisons to establish a fair price. He stated they are going to throw out outliers and try to deal with today's numbers, instead of numbers at the peak of the market. He stated the reason he wanted to bring the methodology before the Council, is in case someone wants to get another appraisal for the property, then everyone understands the appraiser is doing the same approach.

Brian Braithwaite questioned if this is a common methodology for an appraisal.

Nathan Crane stated when the City did this two other times because they were trying to establish a right-of-way value and establish the value for additional property, it was hard because there was no vacant land to compare the property to. He mentioned farm land has a different value than this, so this approach actually reflects the true value of the land, based on a comparable that is reflected in reality.

Dennis LeBaron questioned if there were any weighing factors the staff considers, for example, the type of land.

Nathan Crane replied yes, the appraisers will weigh those factors when doing their site inspections. He stated out of the four properties, Apple Blossom will probably weight the lowest, because it is just adjacent to the right-of-way. He stated in Canterbury Circle there may be values that are a little higher, because people can add an acre to their property as opposed to adding 1,000 square feet.

Dennis LeBaron questioned if they are averaging the cost across the subdivision or across all of the subdivisions.

Nathan Crane stated the appraisals will just be done on a subdivision basis. He stated the City's portion of the appraisal costs will be \$500 per subdivision.

Tim Irwin questioned if the appraisals will be given to the Council.

Brian Braithwaite stated the Council will have to approve the sell price which is based upon the appraisal.

- Road Maintenance Presentation & Discussion – Matt Shipp, Public Works Director/City Engineer

Matt Shipp stated they are doing a presentation on where the City currently is on the Road Maintenance Plan. He stated at the end of the presentation staff is going to ask for some direction. He stated the City was going down a certain path with the plan and then it was slightly diverted at the goal setting meeting. He stated they are going to explain the two options the Council has and then let the Council decide how they would like to move forward. He stated approximately four years ago, the Council directed staff to do a road inventory on all of the roads in Highland. He stated the road inventory was completed, which resulted in a number that has been continually tossed around. He explained the road inventory gathered all of the data and then staff was asked to prioritize the roads based on the information. He stated staff has been asked for the report on numerous occasions, but the original report is just a spreadsheet of numbers generated through engineering formulas. He stated staff is trying to prioritize a five year plan and the City has adopted a program where roads rotate on an annual basis as they are completed. He stated every year the City will have an updated five year plan in hand. He stated staff also

decided to break the City into zones, but that is subject to change. He explained the Council will need to decide if they want to choose a number, whether it is \$500,000 or \$700,000 and decide which roads the City will do with that amount or have staff inform the Council how much it would cost to maintain the roads at a C grade and above, and then find the appropriate funds. He stated the Council would then have a budget number and a plan, but the Council has also asked for a Pavement Condition Index (PCI). He stated there is an average PCI for all of the roads in the City, but the Council would like to know what it would cost to keep the roads at the appropriate PCI level.

Rod Mann questioned how often the City needs to reevaluate the road conditions.

Matt Shipp replied the staff would evaluate the roads on an annual basis. He explained it would not be as intense as the original evaluation, but the City would evaluate them based on the work done the previous year. He stated they would update and evaluate the overall Pavement Condition Index for the City annually, but every five years the City would need to do a full evaluation of the roads that were not treated within the last five years. He stated there may be something that could come up and change the plan, for example, the weather, traffic, etc. He explained the Council would see those results during the yearly review. He explained the ordinance the Council passed requires the City do an annual assessment.

Dennis LeBaron questioned how much it cost for the original road evaluation.

Matt Shipp replied that the original evaluation was approximately \$25,000. He stated the original report had a lot of desk work and setting up the models, etc. He stated once those things have been set up it is not as intense and staff can evaluate based on what has been done.

Rod Mann questioned if the City is just inputting data based on what roads the City has worked on every year, but only physically looking at the roads every five years.

Matt Shipp replied the computer model the City has built for this Road Maintenance Plan takes into account road degradation over time. He explained the closer the roads are to the C and lower grade levels, the faster the roads degrade, which the model picks up. He explained every five years staff goes and does a physical review of the roads.

Brian Braithwaite questioned how staff appropriately models the roads without looking at them to some degree. He questioned if there is any physical evaluation to make sure the degradation has not happened quicker than planned in the model.

Matt Shipp replied every five years there is an actual study done, but the staff is out on the roads daily. He stated as things come in staff updates the model, for example, as cuts in the road come in for a new subdivision, the model is adjusted. He stated when the model is built; they test it, and physically check the numbers to make sure they match.

Marty Beaumont, Representative of JUB Engineering, stated the Road Condition Inventory was done in 2011. He stated there is 81.6 miles of Highland City road, both local and collector streets.

Brian Braithwaite clarified the 81.6 is not lane miles, but center line miles or lengths of road.

Marty Beaumont stated there is a standard practice under the American Society of Testing Materials, which JUB Engineering uses when evaluating the roads. He explained there are 19 total distresses of a road which one can evaluate, and they decided to only use the 12 that apply. He stated they evaluated the 12 distresses over all of the roads in Highland. He explained all of the roads within a subdivision should likely be the same type, same condition, and have the same use. He stated the standard told them how many test sections they needed to do in that area in order to come up with the PCI for those roads. He stated if there are ten test areas within a subdivision, they would review each individual one, measure all of the distresses, and then populate all of the data into GIS. He stated they had 170 different sections of road that were tested and there were 550 different locations that were evaluated, which gave the Road Condition Inventory for the City. He stated they decided to rate each of the roads in Highland with a letter Grade from A-F, so they now essentially understand the road conditions for the whole City. He stated based on the inventory, 70% of the City's roads were a grade C and above, 20% were poor, and 10% were failing. He stated the Pavement Condition Index helps determine the grade of the road and how much work needs to be done. He stated the 30% of roads that are in severe distress would take up a substantial, if not all, of the funding put towards roads. He stated they would never catch up, because the good roads are not being addressed. He explained another approach is to look at what the City can do to maintain good roads, because as intermediate pavement practices are done, they are able to maintain the roads at a cheaper cost. He explained after approximately 25 years a road needs to be fully reconstructed, which is expensive, but a necessity. He stated another process would be to come in at year two and put down a sealant to keep the water out and then at year ten applying a minor overlay. He explained although the City needs to deal with their bad roads to some degree, maintaining the good roads keep them from falling into the poor and failing conditions. He explained they are just focusing on the C and above roads at this time.

Brian Braithwaite stated the road is really the base underneath and the asphalt is just a cap on top. He explained the point of the asphalt is to protect the underlying base, so when it begins to crack they fill them or else water gets down into the base making it soft and breaks it up. He explained at that point it does not matter how much asphalt is put on top, it is going to crumble, because it is sitting on top of something soft. He explained that is why they need to do everything they can to protect the water from going down inside. He stated once it is destroyed to a certain point it is cheaper to tear the whole thing out and start over, rather than keep patching. He stated it is important for the Council to understand how the maintenance works.

Marty Beaumont stated what the public does not understand is when there is a good looking road and they are putting a sealant on it while there are other roads seem extremely bad. He stated they want to keep the road surfaced sealed so the water and the frost does not get into the base. He stated there can also be oxidation of the asphalt if it is not sealed properly, which can cause quicker failure of the asphalt.

Rod Mann stated he did not see any indication of the level of a road in the road information, which would impact how fast it would degrade. He questioned if there are things the City can do

for roads in the D and F categories to help them last a little longer rather than ignore them completely.

Matt Shipp stated the spreadsheet is just raw data numbers. He explained the Transportation Advisory Committee came up with a formula that took into account road type and traffic loading, which came into the equation for prioritizing the roads. He replied the City is patching together the D and F roads, trying to keep them glued together. He stated they have also been tasked by the Council to bring a plan towards the end of summer on the poor and failing roads. He stated they will be going through a similar exercise on those roads. He explained that plan will be more difficult on the Council because it will require the Council to find ways to fund the program.

Rod Mann stated he believed the staff would tell the Council the amount in order to do the plan in a reasonable amount of time and if Council cannot get the amount, they would need to prioritize the work.

Marty Beaumont stated the road base is well graded material that locks together so it is not a porous surface. He explained it will hold the moisture in, freeze, and then it will heave and cause damage during the expansion when it is cold. He stated one option the City has is to put down a dollar amount and decide the best way to approach the roads with that amount. He explained the model looks at the current pavement condition, the funding available, and the types of treatments that can be applied to a road and tries to optimize the best use of the funds. He stated they put in the information from the Road Condition Inventory and aged the roads because it has been three years. He stated they then took the model and tested it if they received \$500,000 for the five years to see how it would be best utilized. He explained it makes more sense to best use the funds on all of the roads rather than focusing on zones. He stated they would not just rely on the model, but the model gives the base to move forward. He stated they could put together a five year plan that states we can anticipate a certain amount of budget for the next five years and these are the roads that the City will do. He stated after they do the first year's roads, they would update the model and start with year two and do another five year plan.

Brian Braithwaite stated the city needs to inform the residents of what kind of deterioration would happen if enough money is not applied. He stated there would be roads falling off and then in ten years it will cost a lot more, as opposed to putting in little more money now and fixed the roads. He stated the residents of Highland may turn around and say they don't care, so then the City will have to take what they have to work with and apply it. He stated it is critical to take the information back to the residents and explain the need.

Marty Beaumont stated over a ten year time period with no funding, the PCI would start out at a 71.5% and drop down to a 55%, which would be a poor road average.

Brian Braithwaite clarified that these are just the good roads discussed in the example, not all of the roads.

Marty Beaumont stated if the City took \$300,000 a year over a ten year period, they would go from the 71.5 down to a 62.28. He stated this allows the City to see how much funding they would want to put in to maintain a reasonable average PCI value. He stated with \$500,000 it

drops to a 66; \$700,000 would drop it to a 68 and \$900,000 would drop it to approximately a 69. He stated they want to try to maintain a good average which would be approximately a 65-70 PCI. He stated they do not want the roads that are down in the 60's to drop off into the poor category, because then the costs go up. He stated they recommend the City maintain an average PCI value around the 68 with the criteria of not letting any roads fall into the poor range.

Brian Braithwaite clarified that would be an average of a C+/B- type road.

Marty Beaumont explained it would still be a good ten year road, so there may be some cracking and wear on the road, but as a whole they are maintaining a decent average. He stated a good road should be sealed within 2-4 years of when it is placed and a lot of people put the sealant on right after it is placed. He stated they would then have to do an overlay or micro-surfacing or a different kind of treatment based on the road's grade.

Neil Fraser, Representative of JUB Engineering, stated if they are trying to maintain an average over ten years, then the model states over the first few years they spend less money, but still have the same budget. He explained then over the last few years, they spend more money because the roads have further degraded, but you have the money already saved in the budget.

Marty Beaumont explained if they are going to have \$700,000 applied and they use it every year, the PCI value will be slightly higher at the end of the ten years, rather than reserving some of the funding every year and trying to apply it at the end. He stated they do a better job if they can utilize all of the funding available over the ten years.

Dennis LeBaron stated there is a big difference between the \$500,000 a year as opposed to the \$300,000. He stated at \$500,000 they are still getting a decent average.

Marty Beaumont stated at the \$300,000 level they are mainly just focusing on the bottom roads and trying to keep them from falling off the chart. He explained if they have more money they can start focusing more on the higher grade roads like A and B. He stated if they continue to just put \$300,000 in then the curve drops in the Year 15, as opposed to still looking good at Year 10, because they are not addressing the needs of the roads.

Tim Irwin questioned if there was an estimate in how much work would be done by current employees as opposed to contract work.

Matt Shipp stated it is an average cost and the staff costs are built in. He stated the costs that are plugged into the model are costs that the City has seen over the last few years. He mentioned it takes into account inflation as well. He stated the staff are crack sealing, but they are not able to crack seal everything and they prep the crack sealing for projects coming up. He explained the amount it costs for City staff to do these things is minuscule in comparison to the amount the City allots for roads.

Marty Beaumont stated the actual treatments that are going to be done on the roads will be contract work. He stated the City crews will still be doing the crack sealing and prep for those, but the City does not have the equipment to do the actual seal coat or micro-surfacing.

Brian Braithwaite stated it is the lack of equipment that prevents the City staff from doing all of the work on the roads. He stated the City does not have enough roads to justify purchasing their own equipment.

Dennis LeBaron questioned how long the crack sealing lasts before it needs to be sealed again.

Matt Shipp stated it depends on how good the sealant is and how large the crack is. He stated they will last anywhere from 3-5 years, because there are a lot of different factors involved. He stated typically when they crack seal, they are crack sealing ahead of a project, like micro-surfacing. He stated they typically crack seal in the spring and fall when the weather is cooler and the cracks are wider and then in the summer the cracks close up.

Marty Beaumont stated to not be surprised when a crack seal is done one year and then they have to go back and do another crack seal the next year, because roads continue to crack over time. He stated they would like some direction on a plan from the Council.

Matt Shipp questioned if the Council would like to fund a specific amount every year and find the best way to utilize those funds or if the Council would like staff to come back with a report showing what it would take to maintain the roads at a C grade and better, and then the Council would need to find the appropriate funds.

Tim Irwin stated if the Council was to select the number, then they need to decide if they have the money to do that. He stated part of that process may mean the City needs to tighten their belt in other areas or raise property taxes or a road fee.

Matt Shipp stated the roads are very difficult to model, so at the end of the ten years the model will no longer work, because the C grade road falls off quickly.

Brian Braithwaite stated Marty Beaumont had stated if they maintain a consistent amount of funds over time they will end up with a higher PCI and over time it will not drop off as quickly. He stated the longer the life of the road the more it will cost to maintain the road. He explained they are just discussing a ten year time period, but if the City lets them go from where they are currently at down to a lower level, then it will cost even more the next ten years to keep them at that level and even more to bring it back up to a higher level. He stated he wants to communicate with the residents that if the City does not have the money, they don't have the money, but it is reasonable to put in a little bit more money in now, so they aren't paying a whole lot more in the future. He stated if he cannot get support from the residents, then they will need to decide what money the City does have and apply it the best they can. He stated he needs to know both of the scenarios to help residents decide what choice they want to make. He stated the Council cannot pick one option, because both parts are critical. He stated they want to know what the right amount is to keep the roads at a certain level so it does not drop off and once the City decides what money they have, they can decide how to apply those funds.

Tim Irwin stated keeping the moisture out of the base is a huge issue with preserving the roads. He questioned if the City could crack seal a lot of roads without going over them with a surface

coat and still preserve the roads or if the City always has to immediately follow up with a surface treatment.

Matt Shipp stated the City does not have to follow up with a surface treatment, but it is good practice to do so. He stated crack sealing buys time, but the idea behind asphalt maintenance is starting with the least expensive, crack sealing, and then moving to the next one, like a seal coat or slurry seal, but the roads may continue to fall off. He explained they cannot stop degradation of the asphalt; they can crack seal all they want, but at some point they are going to need to put a surface treatment on the road. He stated a rule of thumb is if they have to chip seal the road more than twice, they need to grind it down and put on a new surface. He explained when they reach the D grade roads they need to grind off the top and put on an overlay.

Brian Braithwaite clarified that the surface treatments are approximately \$1 per square foot, but when they have to overlay the asphalt it is approximately \$3-4 per square foot, and when they need to go into the base to do reconstruction it is approximately \$7-8 per square foot.

Matt Shipp stated they are protecting the base the whole way through. He stated at some point in time the asphalt degrades so far that the little things are no longer effective, so they need to grind everything off, put on a new surface, and start all over.

Brian Braithwaite clarified that the base on the D grade roads may or may not be intact, but it generally has some degradation. He stated at that point they are seeing a lot of cracking that introduces a lot of water into the base.

Marty Beaumont stated with D grade roads they are seeing a lot of cracking that introduces water into the base. He stated the lower grade D roads need the full reconstruct; the small things have little impact because the road is already cracked. He explained even a surface treatment will begin to crack fairly quickly if the road is already in a failed state. He stated they can still maintain the C levels with the less expensive treatments. He stated a C grade road has a PCI of 55-70, a B grade road has a PCI of 70-85, and an A grade road has a PCI of 85-100. He stated just crack sealing to keep the water out will not work, because over time pavements degrade by oxidation as well as traffic. He stated crack sealing does not deal with the oxidation which then introduces micro cracking and so forth. He explained the seal coats are very important in the early years to maintain the flexibility of the pavements.

Tim Irwin stated there are roads in the City that are between 5-10 years old that have cracks, which can cause serious problems because it allows water into the base.

Dennis LeBaron stated there is approximately \$350,000 in the budget, but not all of it goes to roads. He clarified the graph is showing the actual amount of money needed to repair the roads.

Brian Braithwaite stated in the roads budget there is money allocated for taking care of light poles and road signs, etc. He stated how much of the \$500,000 or so is going to the roads and how much is actually going to other things.

Dennis LeBaron stated he wanted to make sure if they say they are going to spend \$500,000 per year, then it is actually \$500,000 spent on road maintenance.

Matt Shipp stated it is spent only on road maintenance, not on fuel or sidewalks or street lights. He stated there are two portions in the budget; one is an operating budget and one is a capital budget.

Rod Mann questioned how much was spent on the roads last year.

Matt Shipp stated they are still in this fiscal year, and they have approximately \$140,000 remaining out of the \$500,000 that was allocated. He stated the \$140,000 will be spent on projects the City has already signed agreements for in May and June.

Rod Mann stated he supports the process Brian Braithwaite stated he would like to follow. He stated it would be appropriate to assume the City will have \$500,000 for roads the following fiscal year. He explained they need to know what the additional cost would be to maintain the roads in good condition, so they can explain the idea to the residents. He stated the City needs a plan for the money they will have in the fiscal year 2014-15, along with a target of how much more money would be beneficial in the long term.

Matt Shipp stated the Council had asked the staff to come up with physical roads the Council can then take to the residents to let them know what the plan is. He stated they can publish the information so everyone knows why the roads are chosen. He stated he would like to give the Council a list of roads and what treatments will be done on those roads during fiscal year 2014-15. He stated they now have a hybrid between the two options. He stated some residents will not do things no matter what, but there is another group that would like to do things as long as they understand what they are paying for, so there will be a lot of education done with the plan. He stated they will give the Council a five year plan with \$500,000 and see what level of maintenance that will create and what will happen at the end of a ten year period. He explained they will let the City know how much it will cost to maintain a certain PCI and stated they feel 66-68 is a good number to try to maintain.

Brian Braithwaite questioned how much more work would it be for staff to give the Council the cost to maintain a PCI of 75, 72, 68, etc. He stated he would like to help the residents understand that it could be a higher number, but the Council has chosen to do something in the middle to be conservative.

Matt Shipp stated it would be easy because the information is already there; they just need to plug it into the model.

Brian Braithwaite explained if they don't keep it at a higher level today, then the road will just drop off in the next ten years. He stated if they maintain the current level it postpones the reconstruction of the roads.

Dennis LeBaron stated they are just trying to keep a level of maintenance that will last them until more funds are made available. He stated the City may be able to pay their debt off by then and have more money to give to the roads.

Brian Braithwaite stated the City does not know what funds will be available in ten years or what costs are going to come up. He stated everything is a risk and sometimes it is wise to push some expenses off now. He explained he would like to have a 20 year look at the road maintenance, because the lower the PCI number is at the ten year mark, the more expensive it will be the next ten years and so on.

Marty Beaumont stated the model is taking in a curve and every road reacts differently to the curve depending on the traffic, the speeds, etc. He stated when the model is put in for a 20 year cycle, it starts to get a little erratic after the 10 years and starts to make incorrect assumptions and becomes unpredictable. He stated they could look at the PCI after spending \$500,000 and try to predict the added value of putting in \$700,000. He explained if they are spending an additional \$200,000 a year for ten years it is \$2,000,000, but the added value could be closer to \$7,000,000.

Tim Irwin stated the Council would like to spend as much as they can to protect the roads, but the real question is how much money they can spend and how much they can tighten their belt enough to get into that range. He explained the Council has put the roads as a top priority, so they need to put their focus on trying to reach that number.

Mayor Thompson stated the model work is model work, but good record keeping tells the City whether it exceeds or falls short of the model. He explained the staff needs to keep good records so they have good data to rely on, if not, they are just making assumptions. He stated if the water eventually gets into the base it does not just disappear, it is absorbed somewhere and begins causing degradation. He stated if there are big cracks in the road and they still want to save the surface, then they need to crack seal, and if they are going to protect the crack seal then they need to do a surface treatment. He stated the City needs to get to a point of keeping really good records in order to diminish the amount of guessing. He stated the report is good because it gives the Council the option of paying now or paying later; the science explains paying more now saves more money, but it is a decision the Council needs to make it. He stated they need to look at what is real and what is not, and thanked the staff for their information.

Matt Shipp clarified they are going to take a set number and give the Council a five year plan, but state in order to keep it at a certain PCI level we need to fund it at a certain amount, and then give a couple of options on the graphing so there is education for the residents.

Tim Irwin stated as Matt Shipp goes along with the process he can give some of the Council members a call and make sure he is following the right path. He stated the Council wants the same thing as staff and wants to make sure their direction is clear, so if they can communicate and work with Council if they have questions or concerns.

Dennis LeBaron stated he is in favor of the direction staff is taking and clarified staff will have a list of the specific roads they are fixing with the allocated funds.

Matt Shipp stated he will have a report ready for the Council by the end of April, so the public has time to comment, and then the Council can say yes or no and implement the plan.

Brian Braithwaite stated it is really important for the Council to have the report within that time, because they are beginning the budgets and will be doing the Open House. He stated they want to be able to communicate the information with the residents as best as possible.

Tim Irwin stated as the City accomplishes things within the plan it would be helpful for the Council to know those things are being done.

Matt Shipp replied he will let the Council know when those things are being done.

Tim Irwin questioned what the City is doing to communicate with the residents that water conservation is still an issue. He stated they want to start the education early, so they are not worrying about not having enough water in July.

Matt Shipp stated the Mayor's message in the newsletter brought the issue up. He stated the Mayor's Water Proclamation is still in effect, so the staff will be communicating that information through the utility bills, the newsletters, and the website. He stated the City is starting out okay, but it depends on what the spring will bring and they have not yet heard anything on water cuts this year.

Tim Irwin stated the City lives in a desert and needs to conserve water as much as possible. He stated the conservation efforts that were put in place last year had a good impact.

Matt Shipp stated the efforts did have an impact. He explained this year there will be more conservation, because they are starting earlier. He stated the continued discussion from last year along with the education should help the City conserve more. He stated they had quite a few neighbors' calling regarding their neighbor's water usage last year, but there were no fines given out. He stated this year after the education portion; the City may need to begin giving out fines for homes that do not comply.

Tim Irwin stated there are may be a few residents that resist, but most residents in the City that really want to do the right thing.

Mayor Thompson stated they need to handle the water conservation like any other emergency. He explained as it gets more drastic, they will use the same level as they would with another emergency; by giving the information out to stakes and wards to get the information to the residents. He stated the residents have signed a contract with the City to justify to the lenders that they could come up with the money to repay the debt and the contract states they give a certain amount of water for their property, either through water they already had and conveyed to the City or they purchase water from the City. He stated they cannot penalize someone for using too much if the City does not reward the people that don't use all of their water. He explained the City is simply a water distributor for the water they already have attached to their properties. He stated the people dedicated a specific amount of water, so on a year that only yields 80% snowpack; they get 80% of the shares they distributed for their property.

Tim Irwin stated if he is entitled to fifty gallons a month it does not hurt him to conserve more water.

Mayor Thompson explained the City is still expanding, so the water rights they have are going to be reduced by 40% simply because the snowpack is what feeds the underground sources is 145,000 acre feet on average per year. He explained the allocation for underground water rights in that same drainage is 245,000 acre feet, so wells that are yet to be drilled will reduce the City's abilities by 40%. He explained the surface flows will not be different and the storage rights will not be different, but the underground component is already over adjudicated by 40%.

Tim Irwin stated it would be helpful if the Council could have the staff presentations ahead of time.

Nathan Crane stated they usually do not have the presentations ready until the day of, but staff will see what they can do.

Tim Irwin questioned what the next steps are for the budget.

Aaron Palmer stated the next step is for Gary LeCheminant and him to go over the budget with the Department Heads and then getting the budget out to the Council members for their review. He stated after their review they can review it with staff and then have it ready for the Budget Open House. He stated they are hoping to have the budgets done by the end of the following week.

Dennis LeBaron questioned if the Council or staff would like to meet on the fifth Tuesdays for a question and answer session with the residents, if there were an interest in addressing a certain issue like the roads or the budget. He stated there is a fifth Tuesday in April, July, and September. He stated it would be more of a relaxed atmosphere for open communication with the residents.

Brian Braithwaite stated he thinks it is a great idea and there ought to be a subject to focus on at each session and then the Council can answer questions. He stated some people may want to come in and listen on a specific subject, rather than hearing people talk about other things. He stated it would not have to be mandatory, just a voluntary meeting of the Council. He explained it would have to be published in case more than two Council members show up.

Mayor Thompson stated it would be a reasonable time, but agreed picking the subject may allow the meeting to focus on something relevant. He stated they would need to set a time, because he does not know that the fifth Tuesdays would be the best time to do it. He suggested they schedule a time close to something they would like to discuss.

Brian Braithwaite stated he had a chance to talk with Gary LeCheminant regarding the budget. He stated if the City is going to hold the Open House in May, the Council needs to have time to look at the budget beforehand.

Aaron Palmer stated he is hoping to have the budget to the Council no later than the following Thursday.

Brian Braithwaite stated the value of having the Open House is having the Council prepared so they can discuss the budget with the residents.

Aaron Palmer stated staff was thinking they could hold a budget workshop on the fifth Tuesday of April.

Dennis LeBaron stated it would be fine to do that instead of the question and answer session, because the budget is the number one priority right now. He stated if it a work session then the residents could come and listen in.

Tim Irwin gave his appreciation for getting the agenda electronically a couple days prior.

Jessie Schoenfeld stated she has been working on forming another Beautification Committee and getting volunteers. She stated she is trying to get it together so the Committee is approved in two weeks. She stated the Beautification Committee would be set up to help plant flowers, weed, and build friendship with citizens. She stated they pick a yard every month in the summertime for the "Best Yard of the Month" and give them a small prize. She stated they just help out the Public Works with maintaining the parks.

Tim Irwin stated he really appreciates that the Public Works crews have gotten out earlier this year.

Dennis LeBaron stated there is some interest from citizens to start an ADHOC Economic Development Committee. He stated he does not know what it takes to get it going, but asked how the Council feels about it.

Mayor Thompson stated they have already started the process so the applications they have on file are some of the individuals that served previously. He stated they will see if those members are still interested in participating and stated the City is ready to put the Committee back together.

Jessie Schoenfeld asked that the City put the Committee out for other people to apply. She stated she has not heard anything about the Committee.

Mayor Thompson stated the City is open to applications anytime and the statement in the newsletter is if they want to come in and get involved they can. He stated if the Council knows someone then they can send them to the City or direct them to the application online. He stated it would be helpful for staff to send out the same packet for the Water Committee to the Council.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Jessie Schoenfeld moved to adjourn.

**Brian Braithwaite seconded the motion.
Unanimous vote, motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:31 p.m.


JoD'Ann Bates, City Recorder

Date Approved: April 15, 2014

