

MINUTES
REGULAR WORKSESSION
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF YUMA, ARIZONA
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS - YUMA CITY HALL
ONE CITY PLAZA, YUMA, ARIZONA
April 3, 2018
6:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Nicholls called the Regular City Council Worksession to order at 6:00 p.m.

Councilmembers Present: Shelton, Watts, Thomas, Knight, McClendon, Miller, and Mayor Nicholls
Councilmembers Absent: None
Staffmembers Present: City Administrator, Gregory K. Wilkinson
Director of Public Works, Joel Olea
Fire Chief, Steve Irr
Assistant Director of DCD, Dan Symer
Various department heads or their representatives
City Attorney, Richard W. Files
City Clerk, Lynda Bushong

I. CITY ROADS ASSESSMENT

Olea explained that in the fall of 2017 the City hired a third-party consultant to conduct a detailed analysis of the City's entire roadway network and provide recommendations on how to improve its overall condition. He introduced Stephen Smith, Principal Engineer of Infrastructure Management Services (IMS), to provide an overview of the process.

Smith stated that overall the City's roads earn a grade of B+, which falls in the bottom end of the middle third compared to the other cities that IMS has analyzed. This leaves room for improvement, but provides a solid foundation for moving forward. The City has 409 centerline miles of roads, equaling about 10 million square-yards of pavement. Valued at about \$460 million, roads are the City's single largest visible asset and go a long way to define peoples' perception of Yuma. Yuma's score on the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is 61, which falls in the fair to good category, with 10% of roads being at the end of their service life.

The purpose of a pavement management system is to save the City money in the long run. Roads are an investment and they need to be maintained. It can also help to shift Yuma's PCI from fair/good to very good. This will move money from capital investment heavy work to lighter surface treatment and maintenance work, and extend the life of the streets past the traditional 25-30 years. The pavement management begins with the City's objectives, policies, and budgets. Then it moves on to understanding the condition of the roads, priorities, analysis techniques, and reporting.

Street ratings are based on an objective survey of road conditions with a focus on roughness (pavement deterioration), wheel path rutting, alligator cracking, longitudinal and transverse cracking, distortions, bleeding, weathering or raveling, patching and potholes. The PCI is broken down as follows:

- Excellent – routine maintenance such as crack and joint sealing and localized repairs

- Very Good – preventative maintenance activities (crack seal and sealants) to lightweight surface treatments (slurry seal)
- Good – aggregate-based surface treatment (micro surface and chip seals) to thin overlays with an edge mill, minor amounts of patching
- Fair – thin to moderate overlays with increasing amounts of grinding and structural patching
- Marginal – progressively thicker grinding and inlays, often accompanied with structural patching
- Very Poor – partial to full reconstruction through surface removal, base rehabilitation and new pavement, and possibly curb and gutter/drainage rehabilitation

Due to Yuma’s budget constraints, modified rehabilitation practices such as extensive structural patching, thick grind and inlay are being considered in place of full reconstruction to reduce costs. Roads in the Very Poor category are excellent candidates for deferral to allow funds to be focused on those in better condition that will benefit more from less expensive maintenance and prevent them from being further degraded. Most of the streets in Yuma fall into the Fair category which will need a thicker overlay in a year or two. The best place to focus funds are on roads in Good and Very Good condition because the public will get the most benefit for their tax dollars. It may seem counterintuitive to focus funds on roads that are already in good condition, but they can be preserved with relatively inexpensive surface sealant treatments which can greatly extend the life of the pavement.

A sustainable long-term PCI target range for Yuma’s roads is 60-65, preferably closer to 65. The recommended goals over the next five years are to do everything possible to keep the PCI above 60, keep the reconstruction backlog below 10-12%, and aim for 15% of roads in excellent condition. In order to maintain the current road conditions, Yuma needs to complete about 23 miles of paving per year; the current rate is about 1.5 miles per year. It costs about \$360,000 to pave a lightweight local road, so this will require a minimum budget of \$8 million. Every year that rehabilitation and maintenance goes unfunded is the direct equivalent of removing equity from that asset, costing the City money in the long term. The budget required to improve the condition of Yuma’s roads would be about \$13 million per year.

Arterials have the highest priority for rehabilitation, followed by collectors and then local roads. This is due to the amount of traffic typically handled by each type of road. The order of the roads selected for rehabilitation should be determined by the cost of deferral, or the amount that the rehabilitation or maintenance cost will increase by putting it off for a period of time. Even with an \$8 million budget, Yuma’s backlog will increase from 12% to 23% within five years.

II. INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW

Wilkinson presented an infrastructure overview as follows:

- Growth Pays for Growth
 - Generally, it is deemed unfair to pass the cost of new construction onto taxpayers who have already paid for theirs. In order to avoid this, development can be paid for through one of the following ways:
 - Development Fees
 - One developer pays for needed infrastructure and is paid back by future developers
 - City builds and each developer pays their cost share
- The Capital Improvement Program budget for 2018-2019 will be \$14 million
 - This budget amount is possible due to the sale of City-owned land

- The budgets for the following fiscal years will be back down to an average of \$3.7 million
- Other than a small amount for maintenance, there is no funding for residential roads in the upcoming budget
- City Challenges Related to Pavement Conditions
 - The State has been sweeping Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) for the last 20 years
 - There has also been no Gas Tax adjustment since 1991 even though since that time the cost of road construction has doubled, gas mileage on vehicles has increased by 50%, and the cost of gas per gallon has doubled
 - It is expected that by 2019 electric vehicles will be available that are competitive in price and performance to gas vehicles
- 2012 Transportation Plan
 - Modeling was used to develop the 2012 Transportation Plan to predict the impact of proposed road projects
 - Bridges are needed to develop specific areas because Yuma's transportation network cannot support new development without them
- Fire Station Construction
 - For each 15,000 people, the City adds a new engine and nine firefighters (three-man crew times three shifts) plus a fire station to house them
 - Proposed development fees include two stations need based on current population
 - Modeling process used to determine where new fire stations needed to be located based on response time and other factors
- Development Fees
 - In 2011, Development Fees were determined based on the construction of 250 homes per year
 - Fees were reduced in response to a decline in the need for infrastructure due to less development and also to help developers during the economic downturn
 - In 2017, 522 permits were issued for single family dwellings; the Development Fees need to be adjusted accordingly
 - The new Development Fees that have been proposed are still in the process of being refined, and there is still several months of work ahead before the final fees are determined

Shelton requested that a range of Development Fees be provided along with the projects that could be completed at each level to help the community better understand the need for the increase. **Wilkinson** opined that the community will pull together and realize what needs to be done. The goal is to present to City Council something that will provide the needed infrastructure and that the City can live with.

Thomas asked if a construction sales tax is being considered by the stakeholders. **Wilkinson** explained that he does not want to speak for anyone until they bring forward a proposed solution. Many in the development community want to try to help fix this problem because they see what is happening. **Mayor Nicholls** suggested that the City postpone any discussion on the construction sales tax because the legislature is looking at sweeping or moving it. There are other options to consider. **Thomas** asked what the City can do to keep more of its money. **Wilkinson** stated that every year City Council goes to the State and tells the Legislators that the sweeps need to stop. They are hearing it from every city in the state. With an election coming up, **Wilkinson** encouraged voters to attend a debate and ask if the candidates will vote to put HURF back to the original Casa Grande Accord to get the money back to cities and counties. Let them know that if they don't, they may lose a vote. **Thomas** asked how the sweeps play into the Development

Fees. **Wilkinson** stated that they are two separate issues. Development Fees or Impact Fees can only be spent on new construction due to growth and cannot be used for the maintenance of roadways.

III. REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA OF APRIL 4, 2018

Motion Consent Agenda Item B.4 – Cooperative Purchase Agreement: Refuse and Recycling Container Solutions and Related Products, Equipment and Services (authorize the purchase and delivery of 95-gallon containers for an estimated annual expenditure of \$106,100 to Toter Inc.)

Knight asked how many of the 95-gallon containers the City will receive for the \$106,000. **Olea** stated that this will cover about 1,800 containers. **Knight** asked if that amount comes solely from the Solid Waste operational budget. **Olea** confirmed this is correct.

Motion Consent Agenda Item B.5 – Intergovernmental Agreement: City of San Luis – Cooperative Emergency Services (execute an IGA with the City of San Luis for cooperative emergency services)

Motion Consent Agenda Item B.6 – Intergovernmental Agreement: City of San Luis – City of Yuma Public Safety Training Facility (execute an IGA with the City of San Luis for use of the City of Yuma's Public Safety Training Facility)

Mayor Nicholls asked regarding the Cooperative Emergency Services IGA if the Opticom is more of a one-way service whereas we may call on San Luis Fire Department for police and fire assistance as we did with the Mesa Heights fire. **Irr** confirmed that the agreement regarding Opticom allows San Luis to use the City's system. They place the emitters on their trucks and it sends a signal to change the traffic light to green to allow them to proceed through the intersection. **Mayor Nicholls** asked how frequently in the past few years the City has utilized the emergency services agreement. **Irr** stated that the City utilizes San Luis once or twice a year, and the City provides assistance a few times a year in return. **Mayor Nicholls** asked if a fee schedule is established for use of the Public Safety Training Facility. **Irr** stated that there is a fee schedule, but currently the City does not charge for use of the facility in these types of situations. San Luis does not use the facility frequently because they have their own training site, but this agreement allows them to be included in group trainings that facilitate good communication and teamwork in those situations where assistance is needed.

Knight pointed out that the outside agencies do pay for any consumables they might use. **Irr** confirmed this is correct. They bring their own equipment, but if there is something they use they replace it or pay for it. There are not many consumables used at the facility.

Resolution Consent Agenda R2018-003 – Intention to Create Municipal Improvement District No. 104: Desert Sky Unit No. 1 (located at the northwest corner of Avenue 7 ½ E and 40th Street)

Mayor Nicholls asked if the omission of Tract G from the Municipal Improvement District (MID) request was intentional. **Symer** explained that the City is utilizing the attached map instead of the legal description. **Mayor Nicholls** asked if Tract A is a retention basin and if it is currently in use. **Symer** stated that he would find out and get back to City Council with an answer.

Thomas asked if the MID needs to be renewed annually. **Symer** stated that City Council adopts the budget annually, and at that time modifications can be requested through the hearing process. **Thomas** asked how any issues that the residents paying for the MID may have with the contracted landscape maintenance company will be addressed. **Wilkinson** explained that a small portion of the fees will go to pay a City employee who will inspect the retention basins, and the homeowners will be provided with a number to call if they have any concerns.

Introduction of Ordinance O2018-013 – Rezoning of Property: 978 S. 1st Avenue (rezone approximately 0.16 acres located at 978 S. 1st Avenue from Light Industrial/Infill Overlay to Low Density Residential/Infill Overlay)

Mayor Nicholls asked if the surrounding properties will remain zoned for Light Industrial. This seems incongruous as the City generally tries to keep residential areas together. **Symer** explained that the General Plan calls for this area to be rezoned to Low Density Residential.

Watts noted that the area is quite small and asked if there will be just one home on the property. **Symer** confirmed that this is correct.

Introduction of Ordinance O2018-014 – Zoning Code Text Amendment: Title 15, Chapter 154, Article 19 “Personal Wireless Communications” (amend the Yuma City Code to comply with changes to federal and state laws regarding the use of the City’s rights-of-way by wireless communication providers)

Mayor Nicholls asked if the anyCOMM contract will be impacted by this text amendment. **Wilkinson** stated that it will not.

Public Hearing on Resolution R2018-004 – General Plan Amendment: 1421 S. Avenue B (change the land use designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential for property located at 1421 S. Avenue B)

Mayor Nicholls expressed his understanding that there will be a motion to delay the Public Hearing on this resolution. **Wilkinson** confirmed that the applicant has requested to delay the Public Hearing to a future date.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Motion (Thomas/Knight): To adjourn the meeting to Executive Session.

McClendon opined that the Executive Session could be put off to tomorrow night’s meeting due to the late hour.

Voice vote: **failed** 1-6, Shelton, Watts, Knight, McClendon, Miller, and Mayor Nicholls voting nay.

Motion (Thomas/McClendon): To adjourn the meeting. Voice vote: **approved** 7-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

Lynda L. Bushong, City Clerk

APPROVED:

Douglas J. Nicholls, Mayor

DRAFT