

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on January 24, 2017 at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Andrea Anderson  
Corinne N. Bolduc  
Mike Gailey  
Dave Maughan

Mayor Terry Palmer  
City Manager Brody Bovero  
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:

Finance Director Steve Marshall  
City Attorney Paul Roberts  
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley  
Police Chief Garret Atkin  
Fire Chief Eric Froerer  
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments, discuss the first draft of the Culinary and Secondary Water Master Plan update, discuss proposed State Road (SR) 108 betterment agreements with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), review items forwarded by the Planning Commission: General Plan Map Amendment for property located at approximately 700 South and 4000 West; Proposed amendment to Syracuse City Code 10.72 – R4 Residential Zone; and Proposed Amendment to Syracuse City Code 10.25.030 - Yard Setbacks - Determination of Non-Conformance, receive a report on grant writing activity for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, discuss Councilmember appointments and assignments, and discuss the City wage scale.

#### 5:59:32 PM

Councilmember Bolduc led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. Councilmember Anderson provided an invocation.

#### 6:00:35 PM

Councilmember Maughan asked that the Council consider striking items e.iv and h from the agenda as those items were requested by a Councilmember who is no longer a member of the Governing Body. Councilmember Bolduc objected to the removal of the items as she supported the addition of the items to the agenda. Mayor Palmer stated that the item regarding industrial architectural standards is being considered by the Planning Commission at this time and it may be more appropriate to wait for a recommendation from that body before discussing the issue further. Councilmember Maughan stated that the request to consider adjustments to the industrial architectural standards did not have support from a majority of the Council and he is not supportive of considering such amendments; he hesitates to direct the Planning Commission to spend time considering the amendments if the Council will ultimately not support the amendments. The Council engaged in high level discussion regarding the amendments to the industrial architectural standards that would ultimately be considered by the Planning Commission, with Councilmembers Gailey and Bolduc indicating they are comfortable removing the item from tonight's work session agenda and waiting to discuss the item further until a formal recommendation has been provided by the Planning Commission. Discussion then centered on item h relating to the City's wage scale and Councilmember Bolduc stated that she would still like to have the discussion about vacant positions that may be included in the wage scale. She would like the Council to have input on the approval of new employment positions in the City and how those positions would be funded. The Council briefly discussed the issue and ultimately concluded to leave the item on the agenda for further discussion.

#### 6:05:00 PM

#### **Public comments**

Jamie Nagle read the following written statement: "Mayor Palmer, members of the Council, thank you for your time tonight. Last week I learned that Karianne Lisonbee intended to stay on the Council after she was sworn in to the Utah Legislature. Doing so, as you know, would have been a violation of the Utah Constitution. Many residents spoke out to the

Attorney General, Legislative Counsel, the County Attorney, and the Speaker of the House. Ultimately, Ms. Lisonbee was pressured into following the law. Tonight, I stand before you with two requests. First, I ask that the Council consider adopting an ordinance that will forever eliminate the possibility of a member of the City Council from holding another elected office. Second, but undoubtedly a much more difficult request, I ask that as you seek to replace Ms. Lisonbee that you look to find an individual that will help undo some of the damage that Ms. Lisonbee has done while elected to the Council. Someone who will represent all citizens and not a select few. Someone who will not engage in whisper campaigns in an attempt to ruin individuals lives. I ask you to find someone who will recognize that our City employees are the most valuable asset that the City has and that when employees, Council, and Mayor are equally yoked and pulling together, there is nothing that can't be accomplished. Mayor Palmer and members of the Council, some of you may believe that I am "going after Ms. Lisonbee" as you have been led by her to believe horrible things about me. However, whether you believe those things to be true or not, tonight I stand before you as a citizen of Syracuse petitioning my elected officials. As a citizen, you represent me. You represent every citizen in Syracuse. I ask you to please consider by comments, all Syracuse residents, and the future of our City as you look to replace Ms. Lisonbee. For too long this Council has been shackled by a few members furthering an individual agenda rather than an agenda that is good for all residents. As elected officials or our City, your obligation is to listen to not only the 15 to 20 angry voices in front of you, but also the other 25,000 members who are too busy running kids to soccer, working two jobs, and juggling work and extracurricular activities to attend Council meetings. WE rely on you to be strong, to be fair, to be balanced, and to be transparent. I thank you for your service to our City; you have thankless jobs, however, it can also be the most amazing experience you have ever had. I truly hope you get to enjoy that now."

[6:08:25 PM](#)

Chad Scholer stated that he has been in discussions with Mayor Palmer and City Manager Bovero about a situation at his property, but he would like for the Council to consider the issue as Mayor Palmer and Mr. Bovero have not been able to address it. He explained that a pipe that feeds Jensen Pond was installed on his property several years ago, and there were agreements made at that time that there would be a large pond and a recreation complex at Jensen Park and that is why he agreed to allow the pipe to be installed on his property. He stated those agreements have been violated and he now feels the City needs to come up with a solution. He found over the years that his property was not the primary location considered by the City and that the reason that the pipe was not installed on another property was that the owner wanted to charge the City for the easements needed for the pipe. This resulted in the pipe being installed through yards in a brand-new subdivision with \$300,000 homes. This devalued the properties; the other property is still undeveloped and it is an option for the City to relocate the pipe to that property. He suggested the City make the decision to relocate the pipe to appease 10 homeowners in his neighborhood. He stated that many of them did not know what the pipe was to be used for when it was installed, but the agreement he made with the City was based on falsehoods and lies. As he investigated the issue further after the City sold the property surrounding the existing Jensen Park, he met with the City Attorney and found that a garage built on the property abutting his property is encroaching on his property and it was not built according to City Code. He stated that issue must be addressed as well. He asked that he be given the opportunity to discuss both subjects with the entire Council at a future date since he cannot seem to resolve it with Mr. Bovero and Mayor Palmer.

[6:12:23 PM](#)

Gary Pratt stated he wished to commend Ms. Lisonbee for her service to the City; he agrees with the comments that were made by Ms. Nagle except for those comments demeaning Ms. Lisonbee's position and how she has represented the community over the years. He stated he has lived in the community for nearly 10 years and he served on the Planning Commission and other committees and of all the people he worked with, Ms. Lisonbee was the only person who attended Planning Commission meetings and committee meetings to represent everyone in the City and not just a select few. He stated he has been in her home to discuss ideas that he and others had and Ms. Lisonbee was always very receptive and desirous of knowing more about issues before the City. He stated she always seemed to be the most prepared as far as knowledge about City Code and other laws. He thanked her and commended her for her service and congratulated her for being elected to the House of Representatives.

[6:14:32 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated that prior to closing the meeting tonight he would like the Council to discuss Mr. Scholer's issue and the possibility of scheduling a meeting with him. Councilmember Anderson stated that discussion may be more appropriate for a closed session. Mayor Palmer stated he will entertain a discussion about scheduling a meeting with Mr. Scholer.

[6:14:40 PM](#)

### **Culinary and Secondary Water Master Plan update.**

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained the City's current culinary and secondary water masterplans were completed in 2007. It is important to routinely update these plans to assure the existing systems are meeting current demands and to properly plan for future growth. JUB has been retained to update the City's culinary and secondary water masterplans. This is the first reading of the draft Master Plans. This is anticipated to be presented to council at an upcoming business meeting for consideration of adoption of the Impact Fee Facility Plan, along with the Impact Fee Analysis for both culinary and secondary systems.

[6:14:51 PM](#)

Mr. Whiteley reviewed his staff memo and JUB Engineers representative, Nate Smith, used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide the Council with an overview of the first draft of the City's Culinary and Secondary Water Master Plan update. There was general Council discussion throughout the presentation with a focus on topics such as the need to build a new water storage tank in the City, data used to calculate build-out projections for the City, current water storage capacity of the City, agreements between Syracuse City and Clearfield City for the joint use of storage facilities and whether the availability of water in a shared tank should be included in the City's calculation of available water, current supply and demand for secondary water throughout each watering season and how the demand can fluctuate depending on weather conditions, and projected costs of recommended infrastructure upgrade projects.

[7:03:24 PM](#)

At the conclusion of the presentation, the Council discussed a plan for proceeding with consideration of adopting the updated Master Plans at a future business meeting. Councilmember Maughan stated he is not comfortable proceeding at this point, but he is concerned that delaying action on the Plans will result in continued problems with the City's secondary water system in the coming watering season. City Manager Bovero indicated that anything listed as an existing deficiency will not be considered in the development of updated Master Plans that will be used to inform the impact fee process; the City can move forward with projects to address existing deficiencies in the coming year and only items or projects to address future deficiencies need be considered in this process. Councilmember Maughan stated that the Council has talked for months about not moving into another water season without having a clear understanding of the condition of the City's secondary water system, but the updated plan documents indicate that there are problems with the system. Mr. Whiteley agreed and discussed the action the City can take immediately to address problems with the system; this includes installing an additional pump at Jensen Pond (\$100,000), which will address demand during peak times. Councilmember Maughan stated he would like to continue discussing this issue at the February 14 meeting. Councilmember Gailey stated that the document that has been presented tonight was intended for a first read and he suggested the Council accept the document for first read and review before continuing discussion. Mr. Bovero then reviewed the proposed timing of continuing discussion of the Plan documents, reiterating it is possible to proceed with projects that will address existing deficiencies at this time. He stated that City Administration is planning to recommend a budget opening during the March 14 meeting and funding for the pump at Jensen Park could be included in that action.

[7:11:29 PM](#)

Mr. Whiteley concluded the City has advertised a request for proposals (RFP) for a consultant that would perform a study of the existing water shares available to the City. Staff will provide a report regarding the findings of that study at a future date. He added that staff could also proceed with design of water storage tanks prior to adoption of the Plans; design, bidding, and construction of tanks typically takes between 12 and 18 months and it would be good to get started on the process now.

[7:14:15 PM](#)

The Council consented to including a request for funding for the Jensen Pond pump in the March 14 budget opening and indicated their willingness to consider awarding a contract for that project on the same night.

[7:14:26 PM](#)

**Discussion regarding proposed State Road (SR) 108 betterment agreements with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT).**

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the following summarizes the draft agreement related to utilities within the SR108 project:

- UDOT agrees to incorporate scheduled City improvement projects into the SR 108 scope of work. The City's utility upgrades will be performed by UDOT's contractor.
- The City will pay UDOT for the utility work within the project area.

- The total net cost for the scheduled projects is approximately \$1.44 million.
- The City receives a \$607,510 discount on the total project cost because these improvements save UDOT from having to needing to complete certain work on underground utilities.

The City's total budget for these improvements is \$2,000,000. Based on the savings from the UDOT contract, \$554,261.43 will be remaining for other capital projects in the City's 5-year plan. Following is a summary of the draft agreement related to maintenance of storm drainage improvements and associated landscaping:

- City agrees to accept storm water flows into the City's system.
- UDOT will construct storm water improvements, including storm water detention ponds.
- The City agrees to landscape and maintain the storm water detention ponds.
- UDOT agrees to turn fee simple title of the landscaped areas over to the City.
- Costs for landscaped areas will be paid for by UDOT in a separate agreement.

The City's decision to assume ownership of the landscaped basin areas along 2000 West would be based on the desire to improve the image of the City as travelers arrive in the center of the City, beyond what UDOT would do. The overall look and feel of the community translates into intangible perceptions such as community pride or status, as well as tangible benefits such as increased property values. Following is a summary of the draft agreement related to utilities within the SR108 project:

- UDOT will provide baseline funding to the City based on the project budget. UDOT will also provide budgeted aesthetic enhancement funds to the City, and additional funds for mineral bond seal coating of City streets that tie into SR 108.
- The City will design and install landscaping, including replacement trees, within the project area.
- The City will complete installation during the Fall of 2018.
- \$75,759 will be withheld from the payment to the City to cover betterment costs related to upgraded street lights, traffic signals, and school crossings.
- Total payment to the City will be \$169,190.75.

UDOT did not agree to budget irrigation lines in the landscaped areas since they would not irrigate the land if they were to retain ownership. The City will need to plan additional funding to enhance the area beyond what UDOT would do. A general discussion of estimated cost to install and maintain the landscaped areas will be provided at the meeting.

[7:14:42 PM](#)

City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo.

[7:18:53 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan asked if the City has freedom to adjust the scope of the project somewhat given that UDOT will be turning money over to the City to complete certain aspects of the project. Mr. Bovero answered yes; the Council can make the decision to make certain upgrades to fencing, landscaping, and other features along the corridor. This is a prominent entrance to the City as well as a walkway for school children and the City may have an interest in taking control of the project to ensure it is completed to a high standard. He and Community and Economic Development (CED) Director Mellor facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding their desires for installing quality landscaping and features in the area to improve its appearance; there was a focus on the types of trees, shrubs, and grass to be planted as well as irrigation and maintenance options for the landscaping. He stated that based on a landscape plan developed by City Administration, the project would cost \$250,000 in excess of the amount being provided by UDOT. Ongoing maintenance would cost between \$8,000 and \$10,000 per year, which includes snow removal of the paved trail. Discussion also centered on the use of decorative sidewalk at the intersection of SR193 and 2000 West; Councilmember Bolduc questioned whether the cost of the feature is worth its benefit. City Engineer Bloemen stated that he believes it is worth the benefit because the appearance of the sidewalk signals to motorists and pedestrians the fact that there is a pedestrian crossing in the roadway. Mr. Mellor added that the decorative feature will be in a UDOT roadway, which means UDOT will be responsible for ongoing maintenance.

[7:33:06 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero concluded that an item will be included on the February 14 agenda to give the Council the opportunity to take action on the agreements.

[7:33:16 PM](#)

**Review items forwarded by the Planning Commission:  
General Plan Map Amendment for property located at  
approximately 700 South and 4000 West.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provided the following information regarding the application:

Location:	700 South 4000 West
Current Zoning:	PRD on south; north not annexed so does not yet have zoning designation.
General Plan:	PRD on south; north is R-1
North property area:	36.94 acres
South property area:	20.06 acres
Total property area:	57 acres

The city has received an application to change the general plan map for the entire "Criddle Property" to R-3. The general plan map is currently in an open amendment period until January 31st. Currently the southern half of the property is zoned PRD and the north half is planned to be R-1 once annexed to the city. The southern property was annexed into the city in 2013 along with a development agreement that included approval of a concept plan for 99 units. In May of 2016, a preliminary plat including 101 units was approved for the property. The PRD zoning is denser than the surrounding development and there was some concern about the suitability of the density at this location. A draft development agreement to remove the PRD and enable R3 over the entire property was initiated after the preliminary plat was approved but the agreement was not completed because the original developer decided not continue with the project. The main points of the agreement were: supersedes original PRD agreement, maximum of 205 total units, 10% open space, 2.5 acre park with artesian well, and a trail system. This information is included here for documentation of where negotiations were left off. A new agreement will have to be negotiated in the future. The memo explained the Planning Commission considered this General Plan change request in their meeting on January 17, 2017. They entertained multiple motions but could not find consensus until a motion for essentially denial of the request was presented. They were uncomfortable with the R-3 density because of its location on the edge of the city. They felt that an R-2 would be more appropriate for this neighborhood. The motion carried with a 4/2 vote. If the General Plan change is approved at this time, the northern property will need to be annexed and a new development agreement penned. The southern portion's zoning would need to be changed to R-3. After that, the standard concept, preliminary, and final subdivision applications would be processed.

#### 7:33:31 PM

Councilmember Maughan stated that his is disappointed that the applicant submitted a plan for consideration by the Planning Commission and that body chose to disregard that plan and recommend something entirely different than what was requested. He stated that it is important that the Planning Commission perform their administrative duty of evaluating applications as they are presented and determining whether they comply with City Code; in this instance the Planning Commission took on a legislative role and that must stop. He stated he would prefer to consider the applicant's original proposal, which is to rezone the property to R-3, which he feels is the best use of the land. Councilmember Bolduc agreed and stated that she feels the issue should be addressed with the Planning Commission Chair. City Attorney Roberts stated that this is a legislative decision and the Planning Commission simply provided a recommendation to the City Council; however, they realize that the Council will make the final decision. He stated the Planning Commission did not support the use requested by the applicant, so they offered an alternate recommendation. Councilmember Maughan stated that he feels the Commission's role is to make a recommendation based upon whether an application complies with City Code and they did not do that in this case. He stated he is concerned about the liability that type of action creates for the City. Councilmember Bolduc stated the Planning Commission could have simply recommended denial of the application if they did not support it rather than providing an alternative recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Mellor agreed, but noted that a majority of the Commission was not supportive of denial of the application. Mr. Roberts concluded that he does not feel that the Planning Commission acted outside of their scope and the recommendation that has been provided could be interpreted as a denial by the body. Continued high level discussion centered on the role of the Planning Commission relative to various types of applications they are charged with considering, after which Councilmember Maughan suggested that an item be included on the Council's next business meeting for consideration of the R-3 zoning requested by the applicant.

#### 7:42:59 PM

### **Review items forwarded by the Planning Commission: Proposed amendment to Syracuse City Code 10.72 – R4 Residential Zone.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained that There is a property located north of the proposed CVS that is currently zoned r-4 and will be impacted by UDOT's expansion of 2000 W. The expansion leaves an option for the land owner to either leave an existing house (that is in need of serious repair and

updating but may have some historical value) or demolish it. UDOT has agreed to cover the costs of demolition. The landowner approached the city inquiring what his options for new construction would be if the home were to be demolished. He would like to build a new 4-plex in the footprint of the would-be-demolished home. Currently the r-4 zone says: "This zoning shall not be permitted for new development and is only applicable to the existing R-4 zones on the zoning map." It also says that "(A) Density. Six thousand square feet for one unit plus 2,000 square feet for each additional unit in the structure. In no case shall the density exceed 11 lots per gross acre." The first issue of "Shall not be permitted for new development". This could be interpreted as meaning no new buildings within an already permitted r-4, or it could also mean no additional property may be zoned r-4. Upon further conversation with the Commission, it is felt that the latter interpretation is more consistent with the intent of the ordinance. The second issue is related to density. The lot is 1.69 acres and multiply that by 11 units per acre gives a total allowed density of 18 units. There is capacity to build 6 more units because there are already 12 units on the property. However, if you do the math for the minimum required unit size, that means that for a four plex, the first unit would have to be a minimum of 6,000 square feet plus 2,000x3 for the subsequent units in the structure gives you 12,000 square feet and then divide that by 4 gives you an average unit size of 3,000. This of course would not be feasible or marketable. The applicant has said that each unit is approximately 600-700 square feet. Therefore, the entire existing development would not have as many square feet as a new four-plex meeting the existing ordinance. The Planning Commission reviewed this item on January 17, 2017 and held a public hearing. Nobody was present to comment during the public hearing. The PC is unanimously recommending the attached amendment to the R-4 ordinance.

[7:43:22 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo and facilitated a discussion among the City Council regarding the implications of the proposed ordinance. Councilmember Maughan indicated he is always hesitant to amend the City Code for one particular situation or property, but he understands the recommendation may be the easiest way to deal with this situation. He added that the property may be prime commercial property in the future and he wants to preserve the opportunity for it to develop in that manner. Mr. Mellor stated that type of development will be market driven and he feels the market is moving in that direction. He indicated that the property could be rezoned commercial, but the apartments could remain; however, no additional apartments could be built in the future and only commercial development would be allowed. Mr. Bovero suggested that the Council ask the Planning Commission to consider a commercial zoning designation for the property. Mr. Roberts added such a rezone action would be allowed unless the owner had a pending application for development contrary to the zoning being considered by the City.

[7:51:48 PM](#)

**Review items forwarded by the Planning Commission:  
Proposed Amendment to Syracuse City Code 10.25.030 -  
Yard Setbacks - Determination of Non-Conformance.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained that in recent years, some of the large roads in Syracuse have been widened or otherwise modified. Due to the farm block layout of the city, many older homes that were built when Syracuse was predominantly a farming community are located on large roads such as 700 South, Antelope Drive, and 2000 West. Historically, these homes were built a fair distance from the two-lane, gravel shoulder roads they fronted. Property lines also generally went to the center of the roadway. As traffic demands increased and the need for paved shoulders, sidewalks, and additional lanes required the acquisition of increased right-of-way, many property lines were adjusted to accommodate the new right-of-way width. In many instances, the widened roads encroached into the yards of historic homes. In these cases, property owners are left with a significantly reduced front yard area, limiting their use of the property in ways that would have been permitted prior to the roadway widening. To avoid variance requests, and to provide property owners with flexibility in the use of their property where limitations on their use were not caused by them, staff would like to explore the possibility of allowing owners of property abutting widened roads to measure setbacks differently in the front yard area. Some municipalities allow property owners to measure setbacks as if the previous property lines still existed. However, staff would recommend that some minimum setback from the right-of-way line be maintained as these widened roadways area usually arterials with high traffic counts. The intent of this discussion is to explore what flexibility could be afforded these property owners who have found themselves in a situation that they did not initiate. During the work session on November 1, 2016 the Planning Commission directed staff to research what types of similar codes exist in the surrounding area. Research has revealed that codes regulating the use of properties after adjacent road widening has occurred do not exist in the Davis County area in the same way as what is proposed. The Code used as a basis for the proposed Code comes from South Salt Lake which, with other cities in Salt Lake County such as Salt Lake City simply establish lots which have lost property to road widening and are thereby nonconforming to be legal nonconforming

without the need for an establishment granted by a decision-making body. This seems to be an attempt to save time and reduce the number of legal nonconforming determination requests. The code as proposed allows properties to be established as legal nonconforming automatically if the nonconformity is created by a road widening, but it also establishes minimum setbacks which are reduced from the current standard. During the November 1, 2016 Planning Commission work session, a suggestion was made to include an increased garage setback to ensure that automobiles parked in front of a garage would not encroach into the right-of-way. This has been included and established as 20 feet to coincide with the minimum parking space depth in SCC 10.40.070.(A). The proposed code would be included in Chapter 10.25 "Nonconforming Lots and Uses and Noncomplying Structures." The exact section is listed below with the proposed code text. During a work session meeting on November 15, 2016 the Planning Commission instructed staff to bring the proposed code forward for a vote with no further changes. The Planning Commission made a positive recommendation for approval to the City Council on December 6th, 2016. The memo concluded that as the ordinance would allow for a simplified legal non-conforming determination process for properties affected by road widening and reduce potential variance requests related to yard setbacks impacted by road widening, staff recommends approval of the ordinance.

[7:52:05 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo. The City Council engaged in discussion of an instance where a road was widened resulting in decreased setbacks that would prevent a property owner from building a porch on the front of their home. The discussion centered on whether the conditions on the property were self-imposed and whether the ordinance should be considered to reduce setbacks or if a variance could be granted for individual properties. The Council ultimately concluded that the property conditions were self-imposed and that the property owner accepted payment for the portion of her property needed for the road widening project.

[7:57:36 PM](#)

**Report on grant writing activity for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017.**

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that below is a brief outline of grant activity thus far for FY 2017.

- Fire
  - Applied for Competitive and Per-Capita grant funding from the Utah Dept of Health, Bureau of Emergency Medical Services (BEMS). We were awarded \$10,998.52 toward funding for a new Lifepak 15 (\$8000), Training (\$1333.52), and Medical Equipment (\$1665). The funds came available to us in July 2016.
  - We have also applied for \$287,000 from the FEMA Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG) for SCBA equipment in 2014 and 2015 but have not been funded.
  - Again, put together a request for the AFG funds through FEMA for Self-Contained Breathing Equipment. Our total application is for \$268,452 from FEMA with a 10% match (\$26,845). Those funds are awarded between March and August 2017.
  - Applied for funding from the Utah BEMS toward the replacement of a third Lifepak 15 Monitor Defibrillator early this spring. If awarded the amount would be \$8000 with similar additional amounts for training and per-capita equipment. Those funds are awarded in May 2017 and released July 1 for agencies receiving funding.
  - Other opportunities of grant funding to help provide for needed services and equipment in the fire department are being sought out.
- Community & Economic Development
  - Applied for Transportation Land Use Connection grant for \$50,000 to do a small area plan for Town Center and develop ordinances for zoning and design. Awaiting decision in 2017.
  - Received approval of a National Park Service technical assistance grant to plan the Great Salt Lake Shoreline trail on the west side of the City. This includes coordination with other stakeholders, such as the County and land owners.
  - Will apply for the Rocky Mountain Power Foundation grant for \$10,000 that will be for the farmers market.
  - Applied for the EDCUtah economic development grant for \$2,500 for additional street banners.
  - Will apply for the Davis County Tourism grant for \$80,000 to conduct a market study of the City for feasibility of tourism related businesses, such as hotels.
- Parks & Recreation
  - Will apply for Land & Water Conservation grant (\$250,000 per grant) for park development in:

- New 50-acre park (Woodside)
- Fremont Park
- Tuscany Park
- Public Works
  - Will apply for CDBG grant through the County for utility project in Ranchettes West. The approximate funding would be \$100,000 - \$150,000.
- Summary
  - Total competitive grant value received thus far:
    - \$10,998.52 Lifepak & Medical Equipment
    - Technical assistance – Shoreline Trail
  - Total competitive grant value currently being sought: \$1,557,952

[7:57:52 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo.

[8:03:45 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan asked if staff has been directed to investigate additional grant opportunities to fund City projects or purchases. Mr. Bovero answered yes and indicated that some of the grant discussed in his report are a result of that direction. Mr. Mellor added that the City has access to a consultant that specializes in grant writing and she advises the City of grant opportunities and application processes. High level discussion centered on various grant programs available to the City.

[8:05:48 PM](#)

### **Councilmember appointments and assignments.**

An administrative staff memo explained that at the beginning of each calendar year, the City Council reviews the list of appointments and assignments and makes changes according to recent election results or other determining factors. Please review the attached resolution in preparation for a discussion regarding which positions you would like to hold. Adoption of the resolution can take place at the February 14, 2017 business meeting to formalize the decisions made during the work session.

[8:05:59 PM](#)

The Council and Mayor reviewed the list of appointments and assignments and indicated their ability to serve in various capacities. City Recorder Brown indicated she will update the resolution according to the information provided by the Council and make it available for adoption at a future meeting.

[8:18:53 PM](#)

### **Discussion regarding wage scale.**

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained that it was requested that administration identify all vacant positions in the wage scale that have been vacant for eight months or longer. The currently vacant positions have been listed and the approved wage scale was also included in the Council packet for reference.

[8:19:04 PM](#)

Councilmember Bolduc stated that she has had concerns about employees being assigned titles that may not be included in the wage scale or positions being created without Council approval. She stated she has also been concerned about City Administration filling a position that may have been vacant for some time and, therefore, not funded. Councilmember Maughan stated City Administration would need to seek approval to fill a position that is not funded. Mr. Marshall added that the City's wage scale is presented to the Council for approval each year and this gives the Council the opportunity to evaluate the need for all positions in the wage scale and/or funding for each position. Mr. Bovero added that some positions may be unfilled, but it is prudent to include them in the wage scale because if another position is vacated there may be an opportunity to opt for the lesser position when filling the vacancy, which would ultimately save the City money. Councilmember Bolduc stated that she understands the need for some positions that may remain vacant and she thanked Mr. Bovero for the clarification. High level discussion among the entire Council centered on hiring practices, with an emphasis on the fact that City Administration cannot fill a position that is not funded in the current fiscal year budget.

[8:27:22 PM](#)

### **Council business**

City Council Work Session  
January 24, 2017

The Council and Mayor provided brief reports regarding the activities they have participated in since the last City Council meeting. The also participated in discussion with staff regarding the process that will be followed to fill the vacancy created by former-Councilmember Lisonbee's resignation.

[8:54:43 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero then discussed various items of legislation being considered by the Utah State Legislature and he asked for Council consent that City Administration be allowed to work with legislators or lobbyists in support of legislation. The Council offered the requested consent.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

---

Terry Palmer  
Mayor

---

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC  
City Recorder

Date approved: February 14, 2017