

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on January 26, 2016, 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
Karianne Lisonbee
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
Community and Economic Development Director Brigham Mellor
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 for the City Council and Planning Commission to receive training regarding the Open and Public Meetings Act, Due Process, Ethics Act, and the Council Rules of Order and Procedure; discuss potential changes to the Planning Commission bylaws; discuss the CVS Subdivision plat; discuss general policy direction from the City Council to the Planning Commission; discuss City Committees and various City Council appointments/assignments; continue Council review of the Mission Statement, Vision Statement, and Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Budgetary Goals; discuss wage compression; discuss a proposed budget opening; discuss proposed amendments to the City's Industrial Architecture Standards; discuss a proposed ordinance amending the City Code pertaining to penalties for violations associated with building improvements; discuss proposed changes to the City Code pertaining to lift stations; and discuss Council business.

6:03:53 PM

Councilmember Gailey provided an invocation.

6:05:23 PM

Public comments

Scott Crawley stated he lived in Syracuse for over seven years and he purchased a home built by Rick and Betsey Thurgood; the purchase has resulted in major problems for him and he is currently in the middle of a lawsuit over hundreds of thousands of dollars related to the fact that the Thurgoods built and improved their property without permits and inspections and much of the work done does not comply with City Code. He stated his insurance company has dropped him because of the problems with the property. He added that he is aware of another similar property built by the Thurgoods in Syracuse in 2013 or 2014 so he filed a Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA) request to get information about the property; he found they had built a bathroom and bedroom in the basement of the home with just a permit, but they did not have the work inspected and they never received a certificate of occupancy. He stated that he spoke with the Building Official about this issue who told him that he did not care and refused to get involved because the issue should be resolved by the new person purchasing the home and the Thurgoods. He stated that he came back to the City one year later and nothing has been done. Syracuse City has laws and ordinance in place to protect residents against this type of behavior, but no action has been taken against the Thurgoods. He continued to file complaints with the City and even asked if he needed to go to the Police about the issue and at that point the Building Official indicated he would take action; however, at a later date he visited with the Building Official about the City's ordinances and the Building Official told him that he did not care about him, his home, and his property, or the City ordinances. He stated that he continued to emphasize the work that had been done in violation of the City's ordinances; after Rick Thurgood passed away, Betsey Thurgood and Fred Panucci completed the basement in the home with no permit or inspections. He stated that the City Council is now considering changing the verbiage in Title Nine of the City Code, which indicates that completing improvements without permits or inspections shall be a class B misdemeanor; he asked if the Council is protecting the residents of the City by changing the

ordinance to make it less restrictive. He stated he feels the ordinance amendment will make it easier for violators to get out of being punished for completing work without a permit. He stated that residents who purchase homes that have been improved without permits are liable for these issues; his mortgage company is threatening to sue him and his insurance company will not cover him. He stated he is living in a home that is illegal and he asked if these are the types of homes the Council wants in Syracuse. He referenced another resident, Chad Schoeler, who lives next to a person who built a garage on his property and he would like to understand what City staff is doing about this issue. He stated these are the types of things he has concerns about; the public should be held responsible for violations, but the Council is considering changing the ordinance to let people get away with committing such violations. He stated the Chief of Police has the duty to apprehend all persons violating State Law and City ordinances; Syracuse City has adopted Title 76 of the Utah Code. He concluded he is completely opposed to the proposed ordinance amendment.

[6:10:31 PM](#)

TJ Jensen stated the Council will be discussing budget surplus later in the meeting and, while this is not an action item, there are some implications of the discussion. He stated right now Syracuse City is growing and will eventually reach build-out population of 48,000 residents. He stated that the City has been issuing the most building permits in Davis County and he thinks now is the time to increase staffing levels in the Police Department to improve the ratio of Police Officer per a defined number of residents. He stated the City collects a public safety impact fee and revenue generated by that fee could be used to this end. He added the Mayor has held a series of town hall meetings and residents have indicated they would like to see an increase in the number of police officers in the City.

[6:12:18 PM](#)

Training on the Open and Public Meetings Act, Due Process, Ethics Act, and Rules of Order and Procedure.

City Recorder Brown and City Attorney Roberts provided the City Council, Planning Commission, and Syracuse City Arts Council with the annually required training on the Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA), Due Process, and Ethics Act. They also reviewed the Rules of Order and Procedure adopted by the City Council. There was brief general discussion throughout each of the presentations during which members of the Council and Planning Commission sought clarification of items covered.

[7:14:45 PM](#)

Discussion regarding potential changes to Planning Commission bylaws.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained that over the past few meetings, the Planning Commission has prepared potential amendments to its bylaws, for Council consideration. The included draft does not include change to the Commission's attendance policy, although there was extensive discussion regarding whether the bylaws needed to be amended to address that issue. As it relates to changes to the attendance policy:

- Three commissioners did not favor a change to the policy, noting that the policy gives the commission the ability to recommend removal of a problematic commissioner on a case-by-case basis.
- One commissioner suggested that the rule be changed to apply if poor attendance becomes "excessive" or a "pattern" of poor attendance.
- One commissioner favored the idea of a threshold percentage of missed meetings, on a rolling 12-month basis, which would automatically trigger action. This action could include: automatic consideration for a recommendation of removal by the commission, referral of the commissioner to the Chair, a referral to the Mayor, or a referral to the Council. Various threshold percentages were considered.
- One commissioner expressed satisfaction with the current policy, but would not resist a change to the policy, either.
- One commissioner wished for the Council to make this decision without the Commission first weighing in on the issue, due to difficulty in building a consensus.

The Commission would like the Council's input on what type of attendance policy is preferred. The paragraphs which would be modified would be III.A., and III.D. With the exception of the attendance policy, the Commission as a whole supports these draft changes. They have not yet come to a vote for official consideration, but the Commission would like the Council's input on these potential changes.

[7:14:47 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo. The City Council and Planning Commission engaged in a discussion regarding the proposed changes to the bylaws and focused on attendance of Planning Commissioners at their regularly scheduled meeting; this included discussion about how to find committed Planning Commissioners to serve. After extensive discussion, the group concluded to include language in the bylaws stressing the importance to members of attendance at Planning Commission meetings; the goal of the language is to incentivize a full panel at each meeting rather than just a quorum of four members. Councilmember Maughan suggested that a quorum be defined as five or more members for the Planning Commission. City Manager Bovero suggested that the Mayor and Council establish a policy regarding required attendance of Planning Commissioners; the Planning Commission Chair could keep track of attendance and provide that information to the Mayor in order for him to act in the event a member of the Planning Commission violates the policy. He stated the required attendance could be set at 75 or 80 percent of all meetings. Councilmember Anderson stated she likes that approach and noted that if an attendance requirement is included in the bylaws, new members will be aware of it or, if an applicant cannot meet the requirements they should not be appointed. Councilmember Lisonbee pointed out that Planning Commissioners should have the option of participating in a meeting via electronic means and that could solve the problem of low attendance. Mr. Roberts stated he can use this feedback to update the amendments to the bylaws and provide them to the Planning Commission at their next meeting for additional consideration and to formulate a final recommendation to the City Council.

[7:56:20 PM](#)

Discussion regarding CVS Subdivision plat

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained CVS is working through the development process on the northeast corner of 2000 West and Antelope Drive. The applicant was postponed a subdivision recommendation from the Planning Commission because the newspaper noticing failed to go out (newspaper staff error). The applicant is asking if the Council is willing to hear, and act on both preliminary and final plat on the February 9, 2016 business meeting. The subdivision is only two lots. Staff recommends the Council agree to discuss both the preliminary and final plat during the same meeting.

[7:56:30 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo. After a brief discussion the City Council consented to consider the preliminary and final plat for the CVS Subdivision during the same meeting.

[7:57:17 PM](#)

General policy direction from City Council to Planning Commission

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained during their last meeting, the Commission members and Chair expressed interest in receiving policy direction from the Council on a number of topics. These specific topics were raised during the meeting, and additional items may be raised by Commissioners during the meeting.

1. **Code Amendments.** What is the Council's expectation of the Commission as it relates to pro-active ordinance revision and drafting? Would the Council rather the Commission focus on reviewing items submitted with applications? Some examples of policy direction include:
 - a. Prepare amendments only upon direct request (either through a resolution or through the liaison);
 - b. Inquire of Council (through liaison) whether an amendment should be pursued, and proceed only when the Council indicates they are interested in such a change;
 - c. Pro-actively identify areas the Commission sees room for changes/improvement and bring code amendments to the Council without specific direction;
 - d. Prepare code amendments in response to lessons learned during planning commission meetings, as the need arises;
 - e. Review potential amendments to the Land Use Code which are generated by the Council.
2. **Noise Ordinance.** A preliminary draft was produced by Chairman Vaughan in order to stimulate discussion of a City noise ordinance. Does the Council desire:
 - a. That the Commission to take the lead on this issue (inserting the provisions into the Land Use Code)?
 - b. That the issue be addressed by the Council as a nuisance provision (located elsewhere in the code)?

c. That the issue not be addressed at this time?

3. Land Use Tables. Does the Council wish to see an amendment to Title 10 which incorporates Land Use Tables as a means to quickly identify appropriate uses for specific zones as a one-stop source?

There will likely be additional questions on related issues. The Commission generally seeks to be productive and helpful to the City, and hopes that additional policy guidance from the Council will aid it in achieving that goal.

7:57:37 PM

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo. The Council provided their feedback regarding the items listed specifically in the memo. Councilmember Maughan indicated he is no comfortable giving the Planning Commission the authority to initiate code amendments; if the Council would like a certain section of City Code reviewed or amended, they can provide that direction to the Planning Commission for land use, or take the issue under advisement on their own. Councilmember Lisonbee agreed and noted the Planning Commission should only considering code amendments under the direction of the City Council. Other Councilmembers agreed; they stated they are welcome to suggestions regarding needed code amendments from the Planning Commission, but extensive work and a formal recommendation regarding a code amendment should only be done after advisement from the Council. Councilmember Gailey stated he would like for communication between the Planning Commission and Mayor or City Council to come from the Chair. Councilmember Lisonbee stated that would be the preferred method of communication, but there may be instances where a Chair is not supportive of communication desired by additional members of the Planning Commission and those Planning Commission members should have the opportunity to communicate with the Mayor or Council.

8:15:33 PM

Discussion regarding City Committees and various City Council appointments/assignments

An administrative staff memo explained 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. This item was briefly discussed during the January 12, 2016 business meeting, but was tabled until January 26 to give the Council more time to review and consider the appointments included in the resolution. 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 9, 2016 business meeting to formalize the decisions made during the work session

Councilmember Maughan has asked for the opportunity to review the scope and responsibilities of each City Committee; please review Title 3 of the Syracuse City Code to become familiar with each Committee or Board in preparation for this discussion. <http://www.codepublishing.com/UT/Syracuse/>.

8:16:02 PM

The Council had a discussion about the assignments included in the proposed resolution. They also engaged in high level discussion about the scope and responsibilities of various City Committees, ultimately concluding to participate in continued discussion or review of each Committee during future extended work session meetings.

9:06:33 PM

Continued review of Mission Statement, Vision Statement, and Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Budgetary Goals

A staff memo from the City Manager referenced a draft resolution regarding the amendment of the City's mission statement, establishment of 10-year vision statements, and FY2017 budgetary goals.

9:06:54 PM

Mr. Bovero reviewed the staff memo and the proposed resolution.

9:08:22 PM

Councilmember Maughan stated that he feels many of the goals are repetitive; the document also includes all goals that were provided by each Councilmember, even though there may have been a few that the group decided not to include. Mr. Bovero noted the purpose of this discussion is to refine the documents and goals. He facilitated a discussion with the Council with the goal of refining the list. He indicated he will use the feedback from the Council to make changes to the resolution, the mission, vision statements, and goals and provide an updated document for consideration at the next Council meeting. Councilmember Maughan concluded that he would support passage of the document if the goals were removed. He suggested the goals document could be used as a working document throughout the upcoming budget preparation process. The Council indicated they can support that direction. Mr. Bovero clarified that staff looks to a goals document to aid them in

preparing the budget for their respective Departments. Councilmember Maughan stated that the goals document could be used as a guiding document.

9:20:19 PM

Wage compression discussion

A staff memo from the City Manager explained The City's efforts to attract and maintain the best possible talent is governed by three documents:

- The Recruitment & Retention Policy
 - Outlines leadership responsibilities of the Council and management team.
 - Set's compensation standards.
 - Outlines team member performance responsibilities.
- The Compensation Plan
 - Sets the 5-year compensation plan, including merit increases, career development, and market benchmark adjustments.
- The Personnel Policies & Procedures Manual
 - Defines standards for employee conduct (e.g. dress, vehicle use, computer use, etc.).
 - Outlines operational procedures & policies (e.g. accident and safety procedures, drug use policy, harassment policy, leave of absence, etc.).
 - Outlines disciplinary and appeal procedures.

In the Recruitment & Retention Policy and the FY 2016-FY 2020 Compensation Plan, the compensation for wages and salary of the City were set at the 60th to 70th percentile of the market benchmark. Due to a variety of factors, the City has not been able to consistently achieve the intent of these policies, and therefore continues to struggle when it comes to attracting and keeping excellent employees. One of the primary factors that creates a barrier to both attracting and keeping excellent employees is the issue of wage compression. For several years, employees of the City did not receive wage increases. During this time, the entry level wage continued to rise along with market conditions. This created a phenomenon in the City whereby experienced and well-performing employees who were loyal to the City during this time period now only make slightly more than the entry-level employee. This tends to create discord amongst team members and encourages high-value employees to look for employment elsewhere. Additionally, the wage compression issue handicaps the City's ability to attract top employees from other organizations for the same reason. Under the current situation, in order to attract an outside employee (even if he/she keeps the same wage that he/she has in the other organization), said employee would come in making a higher wage than our existing employees, who have often times had more experience and are well-performing employees. Management is left with deciding to either give the existing employees raises in order to maintain the balance in the department, or not making the offer to the outside employee. Due to budgetary constraints, we have routinely decided to pass on making the offer to the outside employee. The City Council has asked the Administration to propose a plan to address the wage compression issue. The Administration has conducted the latest market benchmark, and devised an algorithm that factors in each employee's experience, education, job performance, and unique/valuable special skills if any. The algorithm is used as a tool to place a 'value' on each employee and indicates where that employee should be in terms of their wage scale. We feel this is an innovative approach that varies significantly from most other cities, which typically base compensation levels on time/experience in the job alone. This analysis provides us with a target of where the City's compensation should be, based on the standards in the Recruitment & Retention Policy. It also gives us the financial 'gap' that exists in order to properly address the wage compression issue.

Attached to the memo was a wage compression analysis by department. Based on the analysis, the total gap that we face is currently at \$622,218, which includes \$491,347 in salary and wages, and the remainder in benefit costs. Following are the options available to address the wage compression issue:

- No Action: This option leaves the City in its current situation. This option is not recommended as the risk of lost talent, cost of turnover, and the opportunity costs of not recruiting top talent from other organizations will likely equal or supersede the cost of keeping and attracting top talent.
- One-Time Correction: This option corrects the entire \$622,218 financial gap in one action. In order to do this, the City would need to find the resources necessary to address the wage compression issue, and still operate appropriately. Accordingly, this option involves short-term 'pain', but then sets the City free to operate under its current polices going forward as no additional special actions appear to be needed in the future. The downside of course, to this option is the difficulty in balancing the City's financial commitments and services, without requiring revenue enhancements.

- Multi-Year Corrective Action: This option corrects the financial gap over a specified number of years. By doing this, the correction is easier to 'digest' by the City, since it doesn't require a large up-front cost. The drawback to this option is that it drags the issue out a number of years. While progress is certainly being made, the City may not be in position to recruit top talent until the final years of the correction.

In analyzing, the options above, City Administration feels that the one-time corrective action is the overall best option for the City, except that the cost to do so is financially prohibitive without any revenue enhancement. Assuming the Council is not ready to pursue revenue enhancement measures, we are therefore recommending the multi-year corrective action as the preferred approach. An example of such approach is outlined below:

- 4-year corrective action at 25% of the gap per year
 - FY2016: \$156,500
 - FY2017: \$156,500
 - FY2018: \$156,500
 - FY2019: \$156,500

[9:20:18 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo.

[9:25:19 PM](#)

The Council then engaged in a discussion regarding the wage compression issue, with a heavy focus on the options available to the Council to address the issue. The Council indicated they would like to try to tailor the corrective action in a manner that attention will be first paid to those employees in key positions and that it may be possible to identify what positions those are with the algorithm used to determine compression status. The Council emphasized that all employees are valuable to the City, but some positions may be hard to fill than others in the event employees were lost due to compression issues and it is important to address those positions first. Councilmember Lisonbee added that at some point it may also be appropriate to evaluate the option of outsourcing certain services provided by the City. Councilmember Maughan stated he feels City Administration is on the right track and more research is necessary to determine how the compression issue will be addressed. The entire Council agreed.

[9:33:34 PM](#)

Budget opening discussion

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained in this budget opening, there is carryover for projects from FY2015. These projects were started last fiscal year and were not completed by June 30, 2015. Staff is also proposing new projects and updates to approved projects as follows:

- New - Monterey Estates Trail - \$175,000.
- New - Diversion Box at Jensen Pond - \$50,000
- Revised – Rock Creek Park Improvements - \$677,000
- Revised - Surface Treatments of roads - \$408,400
- Revised - Marilyn Acres Phase III - \$1,094,000
- Carryover – 2000 West Storm Drain Impact - \$93,786
- Carryover – Steeds Storm Drain Outfall - \$700,000
- Carryover – Smedley Acres Phase II - \$355,691
- Carryover – 3000 West Project - \$2,805,000
- Carryover – Pavement Preservation Project - \$424,946
- Carryover – Antelope Dr. and 3000 West Intersection - \$296,000
- Carryover – Uncover sewer manholes / main replacement - \$300,000
- Carryover – SR-193 Trail extension - \$10,200
- Carryover – Centennial Park Restroom with pump house - \$250,000

The memo summarized changes to **operational budgets** as follows:

General Fund – major changes

- \$46,000 increase in sales tax revenue.
- \$56,000 increase in building permits.
- \$49,600 increase in plan check fees.
- \$40,000 decrease in court fines
- **\$114,600 total net increase in revenues**
- \$18,150 - Efficiency Audit carryover.

- \$10,000 increase for sick leave cash out program.
- \$10,000 increase for contract for bailiff services.
- \$30,214 increase in salary and benefits for DCED – move code enforcement over to DCED and new Community Services Director position.
- \$19,618 decrease in salaries in Police – move Code Enforcement to DCED. Add 1 new crossing guard at 4000 west.
- \$22,239 increase in salaries for Parks & Rec – overtime costs for snow removal and park maintenance worker I part time position.
- \$11,497 increase in benefits for streets department – employee elected to receive insurance benefits.
- **\$85,482 total net increase in expenses**

Beginning surplus - \$53,470

Change from above - \$29,118

Total revised surplus - \$82,588

The memo also summarized significant changes in all other funds:

- \$30,000 increase for parks master plan carryover
- \$21,250 increase for arborist and to fix cemetery fence and building.
- \$136,172 increase for new gas tax and sales tax revenue for roads.
- \$147,000 increase for CDBG grant – Smedley Acres Phase II.
- \$100,000 increase for additional funding for pavement preservation.
- \$15,000 carryover for transportation impact fee plan update.
- \$10,000 increase for purchase of secondary water.
- \$10,000 increase in culinary and secondary impact funds for IFFP and IFA updates.
- \$19,000 increase in depreciation expense – culinary fund.
- \$20,000 increase in sewer revenues and disposal fees.
- \$23,500 increase for garbage can purchases.
- \$37,986 increase in RDA for payment to Fun Center – revised contract.
- \$30,000 increase in RDA for professional & technical for creation of CDA.
- \$40,800 increase in revenues in capital projects for SR-193 landscaping monies.
- \$192,048 decrease in capital equipment – increase in public works shed and decrease in breathing apparatus for fire department.

9:33:47 PM

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo. The Council engaged in brief discussions regarding various budget items throughout Mr. Marshall's presentation. At the conclusion of Mr. Marshall's presentation the Council engaged in a discussion about how to utilize fund balance surplus monies. City Administration provided a list of options for which the Council could dedicate one-time surplus monies, including:

- Wage Compression (25% fix)
- Development of a 10-year Strategic Financial Plan
- Park Purchase/Acquisition/Development
- Park Cameras
- Historic Building relocation/New Marquee Sign
- Donation to Syracuse Arts Academy Amphitheater
- Antelope Island Market Study
- 2000 West Project Betterments
- West Davis Corridor Interchange Betterments
- Chloe's Sunshine Playground Splash Pad
- Centennial Park Pavilion

The Council provided feedback regarding each of the options, after which a conclusion was reached to further the evaluation of the wage compression issue and determine if it may be possible to use more surplus funding to combat that issue. Mr. Bovero pointed out that wage expenses will be ongoing expenses, but fund balance surplus money is a one-time funding source. He added he would welcome additional suggestions for how to utilize fund balance surplus monies.

10:03:28 PM

Continued discussion regarding Proposed Ordinance 15-27 amending various sections of Title 10 of the Syracuse City Municipal Code pertaining to Industrial Architecture Standards

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained there has been discussion and concern over the appropriate regulation of steel buildings in PC. Some concerns expressed are that the nature of steel building construction results in flat walls and "boxy" building massing. When the standard vertical steel siding is applied to the exterior, building, facades can become monotonous and to some accounts "cheap". Staff has gathered the following information to assist in this discussion.

[10:03:43 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed his staff memo and provided the Council with renderings of how changes to the industrial architecture standards could impact industrial buildings throughout the City. He stated he feels the ordinance will have a very positive impact on architectural standards throughout the City.

[10:08:24 PM](#)

Continued discussion regarding Proposed Ordinance 16-03 amending Title Nine of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to penalties for violations

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained at the December 4, 2015 city council meeting it was request that the staff make changes to ordinance 9.05.090 Violation – Penalty. This ordinance change will make it possible for the council and city to press charges against a party or individual that violates the ordinance and fails to work toward correcting the violation. Before it was possible to interpret the text that the city was required to press charges against the violating individual. On January 12, 2016 – the City council asked staff to add text to address basement finish construction work to 9.05.090 Violation – Penalty. As well as identify the circumstances in which a violator would be subject to misdemeanor charges.

[10:08:34 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed his staff memo. He provided his response to Mr. Crawley's public comments made during the public comment portion of the meeting and indicated that the statements he made about members of City staff are inaccurate and the City has conducted its own investigation and gathered witness statements from employees who witnessed the interaction between Mr. Crawley and the Building Official. He noted that the issue that he is concerned about, relating to improvements made in the basement of a home formerly owned by Rick (now deceased) and Betsey Thurgood have been corrected and the property has been brought into compliance. He noted that Mr. Crawley opposes amending the code that requires a class B misdemeanor be filed against someone violating a certain section, but he clarified that section does not apply to basement improvements and could not have helped him. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she appreciates that clarification and noted it was also her understanding that the code section in question did not apply to Mr. Crawley. She noted that what the Council is considering at this time is an amendment that would allow for penalties for those that make improvements to their basement sans permit. Discussion then centered on instances in the past where the City may have charged residents for improvements to their property without obtaining a permit, with Mr. Mellor stressing it has always been the City's emphasis to encourage compliance rather than being punitive. He stated one solution to this issue may be implementing a fee schedule where residents pulling a permit for new construction could also be required to pay for a permit for building improvements at the same time; this will incentive a resident to pull their basement permit in the future due to the fact that they will have already paid for it. The Mayor and Council indicated they are very supportive of that concept.

[10:17:34 PM](#)

Proposed changes to Titles Four and Eight of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to lift stations

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained as development begins to expand throughout the city and surrounding unincorporated areas, the physical constraints of land topography and drainage infrastructure create challenges to develop under gravity flow conditions. Our ordinance currently does not address lift stations on gravity flow systems, such as storm drain, sewer, land drain, and flood irrigation.

[10:17:43 PM](#)

Public Works Director Whiteley reviewed his staff memo. The Council indicated they are supportive of prohibiting lift stations, though Councilmember Lisonbee wondered if private developments, such as developments managed by Homeowners Associations, should be allowed to utilize lift stations. Mr. Bovero stated the concern about allowing private developments to use lift stations could be problematic for the rest of the City because failure of a lift station in a private development could fail and impact public infrastructure. With this information, the Council indicated they are supportive of prohibiting lift stations regardless of whether a development is public or private.

[10:31:19 PM](#)

Council business

The Council and Mayor provided brief reports regarding the activities they have participated in since the last City Council meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:49 p.m.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: February 9, 2016