MINUTES OF LAYTON CITY COUNCIL WORK MEETING **NOVEMBER 6, 2025; 5:40 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, CLINT DRAKE, WESTON APPLONIE, LON CROWELL, TRACY; PROBERT, STEPHEN JACKSON, DAVID PRICE, JOELLEN GRANDY, AND KIM READ**

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

Mayor Petro opened the meeting.

AGENDA:

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Petro informed the Council of the following items from the most recent Wasatch Integrated Waste Management Board Meeting:

- The Division of Air Quality was promoting its 'Charge Your Yard' incentive program to promote electric yardwork tools in place of various gas-powered tools. This recycling program would take place February through April 2026 and Wasatch Integrated would be accepting the gas-powered tools for recycling.
- The Material Recovery Facility had recently been audited and reported on the findings.
- Winter hours were now in effect: 7:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- The amount of waste from non-participating entities had decreased significantly which was a direct result of the 'out of district' implemented fee increase.
- Reported on cities which had implemented a 'green waste' recycling program and indicated the District could not accommodate future entities in the program.
- Informed the Council of the new Executive Board for 2026.
- The attorney working with the Wasatch Integrated Waste Management (WIWMD) District announced his resignation effective in six months.

She also informed the Council the National League of Cities and Towns Convention would be holding its National Convention in Salt Lake City toward the end of the month. First and Second-Class City representatives had been requested to attend an event on Friday, November 21, 2025, beginning at 2:00 PM at the Hyatt Regency. Pre-registration was required and requested those interested in attending to notify City Staff.

COUNCILMEMBER'S REPORTS

Councilmember Roberts announced the Davis Chamber of Commerce Legislative Affairs Committee had met earlier today and learned of the Legislatures priorities for the upcoming session:

- Digital ID (Identification)
- Educational program for signature gathering applicable to initiative and referenda to minimize fraud and shared some examples
- E-motorcycle regulation

He also informed the Council of the proposed tax increase public hearing on Thursday, December 11, 2025, at 7:00 PM by Davis Mosquito Abatement at the District's office near 200 North in Kaysville, Utah.

Councilmember Morris mentioned the Utah League of Cities and Towns, in conjunction with the National League of Cities and Towns Meetings, Utah State night would be meeting at the Museum of Illusions in The Gateway at 6:00 PM on Friday, November 21, 2025. He stated members of the Council and their families were invited.

PROPOSAL TO AMEND LAYTON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 18, LAND USE DEVELOPMENT, CHAPTER 18.01 GENERAL PROVISIONS, SECTION 18.01.070 DESIGNATION OF LAND USE AUTHORITY, CHAPTER 18.04 DEFINITIONS, SECTION 18.04.010 GENERALLY, CHAPTER 18.32 LOTS, SECTION 18.32.080 LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT, AND TITLE 19 ZONING, CHAPTER 19.03 LAND USE APPLICATION AND LAYTON CITY DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES AND DESIGN STANDARDS TO UPDATE TERMINOLOGY AND PROCEDURES FOR BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH UTAH STATE CODE 10-9A-523, AND SIMPLIFY THE PROCESS FOR VACATING OR AMENDING A PLAT FOR A STANDARD SUBDIVISION – ORDINANCE 25-22 AND 25-23

Weston Applonie, Community and Economic Development Director, informed the Council recent legislation in 2025 amended terminology and procedures for lot line adjustments, which resulted in three specific terms; however, those changes didn't affect the City's current procedures. The proposed ordinance would remove standards applicable to lot line adjustments identified in Engineering's Development Guidelines and Design Standards. He clarified language in State Code removed the City from involvement in boundary line disputes between two property owners.

He shared an illustration which identified the terms and approval process for each included in the proposed ordinance. He continued to review each pointing out the Review Body, Recommending Body, Designated Land Use Authority, and Appeal Authority. He stated 'boundary establishment' language hadn't been included in the proposed ordinance since the City didn't have that authority. He reiterated the proposed ordinance was how the City was currently operating.

Mr. Applonie stated Staff was also recommending changes to how the new ordinance would be applicable to vacating and amending plats, pointing out the City Council would no longer be the approval authority; rather, it would become an administrative process by City Staff. He reiterated the section applicable to boundary adjustments would be removed from the Engineering Development and Guideline Standards altogether.

He asked if there were any questions.

Councilmember Morris clarified the proposed change authorizing Staff to be the approval authority wasn't mandated by legislation and Mr. Applonie responded in the affirmative.

WASTEWATER MASTER PLAN – SEWER IMPACT FEE FACILITIES PLAN AND SEWER IMPACT FEE ANALYSIS DISCUSSION

Stephen Jackson, Public Works Director, reminded the Council it had approved the Wastewater Master Plan, along with the Sanitary Sewer Management Plan, completed by Bowen & Collins in 2024. It recommended improvements to resolve existing and projected future deficiencies based on the current General Plan. It also included a recommendation to evaluate potential Sewer Impact Fees to assist with funding growth related projects. Historically, an impact fee wasn't necessary because the majority of the City's sewer system had been constructed by development with 8-inch pipes, and the majority of the impact fees had been assessed by North Davis Sewer District (NDSD) for the larger trunk lines conveying the waste to the sewer treatment plant.

He shared a map illustration reflecting the City's existing sewer collection system and reviewed those statistics. He shared another map illustration reflecting existing conditions and spoke to the existing system and future growth which identified proposed system improvements needing to be completed by the City. He announced the four projects identified to be completed in the short term. He informed the Council, Staff had completed the Impact Fee Facilities Plan and Impact Fee Analysis.

He informed the Council there were three components associated with the Impact Fee Facilities Plan and reviewed its purpose:

- Identified needs to accommodate anticipated development
- Existing deficiencies were not included, only growth related
- Complied with Impact Fee Act
- Based on Layton's Wastewater Master Plan growth projections
- Focused on the next 10-year Capital Improvements through 2034
- Did not include operation and maintenance costs
- Defined a level of service to maintain maximum ratio of flow to pipeline capacity of 0.75

He indicated the Plan considered historic flows and available excess capacity which justified the calculation for the proposed impact fees and reviewed those calculations with the Council. He informed the Council of the anticipated growth beyond the 10 years.

He announced the four identified projects were proposed to cost $5.74 million; $1.88 million Impact Fee Eligible within the next 10 years and pointed out the $2.3 million of cost to existing capacity the City would need to pay for; clarifying the remaining $1.4 could be funded through the City and collected at a later date once the impacts had been met. He reviewed the four projects with the Council and shared an illustration which identified those locations.

He identified the current Impact Fees assessed by NDSD.

Mr. Jackson stated the Impact Fee Analysis was the third component to the Impact Fee Facilities Plan and reviewed its purpose:

- Calculated the fees to ensure growth complied with the Impact Fees Act
- Based on Layton City Sewer Impact Fees Facilities Plan
- Based on Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs)
- Impact fees to be spent or encumbered within six years after being paid
- Impact fees cannot be implemented for 90 days following adoption by City Council

He reviewed the proposed Impact Fees and explained the $2.39 million, to be credited by the City over 10 years. He identified the amount for future projects which benefitted existing development and reviewed those calculations. He emphasized the growth and density was driving the implementation of this Impact Fee.

Alex Jensen, City Manager, continued to explain the philosophy, benefits, and purpose of implementing an Impact Fee.

Councilmember Bloxham inquired why the City hadn't previously implemented or needed this type of Impact Fee and Mr. Jackson explained there hadn't been a need for larger or upsizing of these pipelines to accommodate for growth. He continued to explain NDSD had planned well for future development in its upsized trunklines; however, the City's connection to the smaller 8-inch sewer pipeline installed by the developer didn't have the additional capacity.

Mr. Jensen also mentioned the density resulting from development in certain areas of the City required larger diameter of infrastructure beyond what the developer was required to install in conjunction with an initial approved development. He clarified this system improvement could be passed on to new development as opposed to the City accommodating for that cost as a result of growth.

Mayor Petro requested clarification the flow would continue to a larger size to avoid a 'bottle neck' situation. Mr. Jackson continued to explain how the infrastructure would be engineered to accommodate the larger capacity. He added the majority of cities experiencing growth similar to Layton had implemented these types of fees and believed this would be more equitable. He identified how this would affect a single-family homeowner by not only paying an Impact Fee for NDSD, but one to the City as well.

A discussion followed. Mr. Jackson stated a public hearing would be scheduled for a future City Council Meeting.

DISCUSSION REGARDING STATE OF UTAH PROPOSED IMPOSITION OF WATER QUALITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE FEES

Mr. Jackson reminded the Council of previous discussions regarding the proposed water fees of three cents per 1,000 gallons of water to pay for the Division of Drinking Water's operations and functions. He stated this discussion would be specific to the developed Water Infrastructure Plan. He explained the Water Development Coordinating Council (WDCC) had requested cities identify water projects which would potentially need future state funding. He informed the Council that when this plan was presented to City Staff, it was with the understanding that the WDCC was merely collecting projects which could potentially need assistance with State funding, and if the project wasn't on the list, it prohibited the City from ever receiving State funding. He expressed his opinion there were a significant number of projects simply as 'just in case' but which funding would never be sought out or requested. He indicated the City identified 14 projects totaling $35 million; one of those would be to rebuild one of the reservoirs in order to increase its capacity with an estimated cost of $10.5 million. He stated the remainder of the other projects were much smaller and in reality, the City would have programmed those in with the existing fee structure to complete the projects. He concluded the City could easily remove $25 million from the list of projects. He also mentioned the City was requested to provide the list of projects in a quick timeframe.

He continued to explain the law was put into effect during the 2025 legislative session which authorized the fee study; however, to complete the study it required cities to identify the projects. He announced WDCC was proposing a $16.32 fee, monthly fee, per household, which would be equivalent to .75 per 1,000 gallons on water connections, and .37 per 1,000 gallons on all sewer connections.

He informed the Council how the projects would be ranked by the WDCC to be considered for the funding which specifically identified what it considered a 'hardship'. He shared the various calculated costs associated with the proposed water and sewer rate increases, resulting in a monthly rate increase of $39 for water and $46 for sewer. This would be equivalent to a 105% rate increase. This would generate an additional $21 million per year and the total amount of projects on the list was $35 million; therefore, the City would generate enough funds in two years to outright pay for the projects. If the City chose not to institute the rate increase, it wouldn't be eligible to apply for State funding requests. The WDCC would take $4.1 million from the residents of Layton to fund the remaining projects throughout the State. He expressed his opinion the City wouldn't recognize any of the funding to complete any of its projects, based upon the formula. He continued to explain other challenges associated with project eligibility and whether the funding requests would be applicable to regional projects and suggested this would be a funding source for smaller communities. He expressed his opinion it wouldn't be in the City's best interest to double the water and sewer rates with the possibility of not receiving any of the State funding and suggested the City could implement its own rate increase to fund its own projects. He concluded with the WDCC collecting $4 million from Layton City, then requiring the City to compete for its own funds to complete projects, the City would be better off opting out of the Program and financing its own projects.

A discussion followed regarding the proposed fee and/or tax increase and ideas of how the City should be proactive in pointing out the disproportionate fee increases and benefits. Mr. Jackson emphasized the legislation already passed during the 2025 Legislative Session; the Plan was now presented to the Governor for its implementation. He clarified what was originally presented to the City was the WDCC needed to identify needs/projects. The Council discussed inviting the City's legislative delegation to inform them how this proposal would affect Layton City and its tax-paying residents.

OFF-LEASH DOGS IN PARKS STUDY

JoEllen Grandy, Parks Planner, shared a visual presentation and reminded the Council the City allowed dogs in parks only on-leash via ordinance adopted in 2016, with the exceptions of Commons and Ellison Parks, and shared a map of the City which identified those park locations which allowed on-leash dogs.

She stated this discussion would be focused on off-leash dogs in parks facilities and shared three different options for consideration and shared some illustrations of what that could resemble:

- Off-leash fenced area
- Off-leash shared-use park area
- Off-leash open space trail corridor area

She reviewed the summary of the three off-leash options, including capital improvement and operational maintenance costs with the Council. She shared a proposed location for an off-leash open space trail corridor area near the Eastridge Nature Park. She shared some visual illustrations of the area, and proposed costs including a phasing plan, and a discussion followed. The Council directed Staff to move forward with this proposal and submitting for a RAMP (Recreation, Arts, Museum, and Parks) grant.

The meeting adjourned at 7:01 p.m.

____

Kimberly S Read, City Recorder