

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on February 12, 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
Karianne Lisonbee
Dave Maughan

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

Excused: Councilmember Mike Gailey

City Employees Present:

Finance Director Steve Marshall
City Attorney Paul Roberts
Community and Economic Development Director Brigham Mellor
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Fire Chief Eric Froerer
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Police Lieutenant Heath Rogers

The purpose of the Work Session was to review the agenda for the business meeting to begin at 7:00 p.m.; discuss agenda item 19: proposed refinancing of Municipal Building Authority Series 2006, 2012, and 2014 Lease Revenue Refunding Bonds; discuss agenda item 16: public hearing to consider amendments to Transportation Impact Fees; review items forwarded by the Planning Commission: Proposed Ordinance 16-08 rezoning property located at approximately 1679 Marilyn Drive from R-3 Residential to Neighborhood Services and Proposed Ordinance 16-09 approving amendments to the bylaws of the Planning Commission; discuss Parks & Recreation Consolidated Fee Schedule updates; discuss agenda item 15: public hearing to consider budget amendments for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2016; discuss Fund Balance surplus for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 budget; discuss Committee Guiding Policies and Make Up of each committee per Title Two of the City Code; and discuss Council business.

6:05:00 PM

Agenda review

Mayor Palmer briefly reviewed the agenda for the business meeting to begin at 7:30 p.m.

6:05:48 PM

Discussion regarding agenda item 19: proposed refinancing of Municipal Building Authority Series 2006, 2012, and 2014 Lease Revenue Refunding Bonds.

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained the Municipal Building Authority (MBA) is a separate legal entity from Syracuse City Corporation. It was established in August 2006 to allow the City to streamline the funding and construction of city facilities. The MBA borrows funding, constructs facilities, and leases them to the City. The lease payments made by the City provide the revenue for the MBA to make the debt payments. Eventually the debt will be paid off and the properties will be deeded to the City. The executive board of the MBA is comprised of the Mayor and Councilmen of Syracuse City. The Municipal Building Authority issued bonds in 2006 and 2008 to construct City Hall, renovate the police station, and build an addition to the public works building. Those bonds are eligible for refinancing. This would include a refinancing of the final year of the 2006 bond and also the remaining years on the 2012 and 2014 bonds. It is estimated that the City could save as much as \$600,000 in interest over the remaining life of the bonds. However, this is an estimate based on market conditions. There is a possibility that we would have no bidders and we would not be able to refinance. The bonds could be refinanced either by direct purchase or placing them out in the open market. I recommend that we do a direct purchase because it is less time intensive and allows us to have more flexibility on our call features. For full disclosure, the City could attempt to sell the bonds on the open market. This would cost the City more in closing costs but could attract better rates than the direct bids above. However, rates are volatile and could fluctuate upwards in the time it

takes us to take the bond to market. If we went with this option, we would not be able to sell the bonds until March or even April. The risk is that rates would increase between now and then and erode any potential savings we would realize. Based on that fact, I would recommend going with the direct purchase option. Since the MBA and Syracuse City are two separate legal entities, we have two separate resolutions – one for Syracuse City and the other for the MBA. We will hold a special meeting of the MBA to approve the second resolution separately. The memo concluded staff recommends that the City Council approve the resolution and move forward with the refinancing process. This would include a 30 day public notice requirement and a request for proposal to potential companies to solicit their bids.

6:05:58 PM

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo.

6:07:25 PM

Discussion regarding agenda item 16: public hearing to consider amendments to Transportation Impact Fees.

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained staff is currently in the process of evaluating and updating the impact fee plans for Syracuse City. This update is to our transportation impact fee plan. Historically the City has charged a transportation impact fee. This update is a requirement of the impact fee law. Below is a table that compares our current impact fees with the proposed fees:

Fees	Industrial	SFD	MFD	Assist Living	Hotel	Church	General Office	Retail / Shopping
Current	\$668	\$1,131	\$705	-	-	\$2,428	\$2,428	\$2,328
Proposed	\$612	\$743	\$488	\$255	\$444	\$685	\$1,085	\$2,703

Staff has provided an additional comparison of 21 other cities that charge a transportation impact fee. Syracuse is lower than the average for every category of impact fee. Impact fees can be charged to new development to help pay a proportionate share of the cost of planned facilities needed to serve the growth and development of the city. Impact fees are allowed per Utah Code 11-36A. Under that code, there are two separate plans required in order to charge a public safety impact fee. They are the Impact Fee Analysis and the Impact Fee Facilities Plan. An impact fee enactment ordinance is also required.

According to Utah Code 11-36a-301:

*(1) Before imposing an impact fee, each local political subdivision or private entity shall, except as provided in Subsection (3), prepare an **impact fee facilities plan** to determine the public facilities required to serve development resulting from new development activity.*

According to Utah Code 11-36a-303:

*(1) Subject to the notice requirements of Section 11-36a-504, each local political subdivision or private entity intending to impose an impact fee shall prepare a **written analysis** of each impact fee.*

11-36a-401. Impact fee enactment.

- (1) (a) A local political subdivision or private entity wishing to impose impact fees shall pass an **impact fee enactment** in accordance with Section 11-36a-402.*
- (b) An impact fee imposed by an impact fee enactment may not exceed the highest fee justified by the impact fee analysis.*
- (2) An impact fee enactment may not take effect until **90 days** after the day on which the impact fee enactment is approved.*

The impact fee enactment is attached as Ordinance 16-05 and is accompanied by, Exhibit A – impact fee facilities plan, and Exhibit B – impact fee analysis. The memo also referenced Ordinance 16-06 that amends sections of the Syracuse City municipal code; specifically Title XIII. The packet includes a redline document that shows the proposed changes. These ordinances can both be approved tonight along with the resolution for the consolidated fee schedule; however, there is a 90 day protest period before the ordinances and fee schedule would take effect. This would mean an effective date of May 9, 2016. The memo concluded staff recommends the City Council approve Ordinance 16-05 – impact fee enactment and approve Ordinance 16-06 – updating Title XIII related to impact fees. Staff also recommends the City Council approve resolution R16-07 updating the consolidated fee with the revised transportation impact fee amount. I recommend that these ordinances and the consolidated fee schedule have an effective date of May 9, 2016.

[6:07:37 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff meeting and introduced Susie Becker, the City's Financial Advisory, who used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to review the legal process she and staff have followed to develop the proposal for updates to the transportation impact fee. The State of Utah Impact Fees Act is found in Utah Code §11-36a. Cities must develop an impact fee facilities plan as well as an impact fee analysis. The impact fee facilities plan must:

- Identify existing and proposed service levels.
- Identify any excess capacity in system ("system" improvements only).
- Show demand created by new development and how demand will be met (i.e., consumption of excess capacity and facilities needed).
- Identify facilities and cost for 6 to 10-year time period (funds must be spent within 6 years).
- Discuss funding options.

The impact fee analysis is a proportionate share analysis that includes a "buy-in" excess capacity component, information about new facilities required, information about other costs, i.e., engineering, financial, and fund balances, and information about financing and credits. To determine the impact fee amounts, it is necessary to perform an analysis of trips on City roads and to develop a proposed level of service. Excess capacity projects included in the impact fee facilities plan include 1000 West from State Road (SR) 198 to Bluff Road; 2000 West from 1700 South to 2700 South; Bluff and Gentile Street from 1000 West to 500 West. New construction projects include the SR 193 extension from 2000 West to 4000 West; 2500 West Extension from 700 South to SR 193; 450 South from 1550 West to 2000 West; 1200 South extension to 3000 West; Bluff Street re-route due to West Davis Corridor; 500 West extension to 1700 South; 1000 West from SR 193 to Bluff Street; 2000 West from SR 193 to 1700 South; 1700 South from 3000 West to 2000 West; Bluff and Gentile Street from 1000 West to 500 West; and a roundabout at 3000 West and 700 South. The total cost for all new construction projects is approximately \$62,980,000, with the Syracuse City obligation being \$8,699,391. The total cost per trip based on the total project costs is \$1,456.96. This means the cost assessed for different land uses will fluctuate depending upon the number of daily trips generated by the use. Uses analyzed include industrial parks, single family housing, multi-family housing, mobile homes or RV parks, assisted living centers, hotels, churches, general office buildings, and shopping centers or strip malls. Ms. Becker concluded some cities group land uses together for simplicity purposes, but Syracuse can choose to assign a different fee to each land use or proceed with grouping. She added she can give the Council some comparable information to indicate how other cities define their fees and fee groups, but she noted that Syracuse should adopt fees based upon the impact fee analysis rather than adopting a fee similar to what is charged in other cities. She noted that some cities do not charge the maximum fee allowed by their analysis because they do not want to discourage certain types of economic development.

[6:16:45 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee asked the rationale behind charging a higher fee for certain land uses is that those land uses have a greater impact on a community. She inquired as to why a convenience store would have a higher fee than other types of commercial uses. Ms. Becker stated the Institute of Transportation Engineers Manual (ITE) provides standard traffic counts for different types of businesses. Mr. Marshall directed the Council to the section of their packet that provides traffic counts for business types. Ms. Becker stated the trip counts for different business types are legally defensible and the City has the right to multiply the trip counts by the cost per trip defined in the impact fee analysis. Councilmember Lisonbee stated it may be problematic for the City to charge lower fees to high impact businesses. Mr. Marshall stated that he would prefer to do whatever is most defensible. City Manager Bovero agreed and stated that he feels subcategories would serve the City well and in the event a unique or unusual business is seeking locating in the City and they do not fit within one of those subcategories, the Council could address that issue. The Council had a brief philosophical discussion to debate the method of categorization that is most appropriate for the City, ultimately concluding to continue their discussion during this evening's business meeting. Mr. Marshall referred the Council to information in the meeting packet that provides a comparison of the grouping categorization that other cities use.

[6:26:07 PM](#)

**Review items forwarded by the Planning Commission:
Proposed Ordinance 16-08 rezoning property located at
approximately 1679 Marilyn Drive from R-3 Residential
to Neighborhood Services.**

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

Location: 1679 Marilyn Drive
Current Zoning: R-3
Requested Zoning: Neighborhood Services
General Plan: Neighborhood Services
Total Area: 1.13 Acres
PC Approval: 2/2/16 – unanimous vote

The applicant is requesting to rezone the property from R-3 to Neighborhood Services which matches the General Plan map. They would like to build a small animal clinic on the property which is an allowed use in the Neighborhood Services zone. This application is only for the zone change. The applicant will be required to receive site plan approval from Planning Commission and a positive recommendation from the Architectural Review Committee. As part of the site planning process, the parking, landscaping, lighting, building architecture, and details of the project will be evaluated. They will be required to construct a 6' fence and dense landscaping next to any neighboring residential houses. The proximity of the parcel to neighboring houses (<200') prohibits them from running an animal hospital. The difference between an animal hospital and clinic is that hospitals treat livestock and poultry, and have outdoor exercise runs. An animal clinic would be allowed at this location as long as the walls are soundproofed. The property does not meet the requirements to be a commercial kennel because it is not 5 acres and 200 feet from neighboring houses.

The memo concluded the Planning Commission has recommended approval of the rezone of property located at 1679 Marilyn Drive from R-3 to Neighborhood Services, subject to all applicable requirements of the City's municipal codes.

[6:26:20 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed his staff memo.

[6:28:14 PM](#)

**Review items forwarded by the Planning Commission:
Proposed Ordinance 16-09 approving amendments to
the bylaws of the Planning Commission.**

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained that following the City Council and Planning Commission joint session he made some additional changes to the by-laws based upon his perception of the direction of the Council as a whole. The following parts of the by-laws have been modified/annotated from our previous version:

II.B Duties of Chair – New subsection (14) addressing the procedure by which the Commission seeks preliminary authorization from the Council before it begins any work on code amendments. If an issue is identified as being problematic or in need of attention, the Chair solicits approval from the Council to move forward with code amendments. This is meant to save the time of commissioners, councilmembers and staff, to avoid putting substantial effort into issues which the Council does not think need attention. If the Chair does not agree that the issue should be brought to the Council's attention, then two commissioners may impose upon the Chair a duty to bring the issue to the Council's attention.

III.A Meeting Attendance – This section starts with the expectation that commissioners are expected to attend all sessions of the Commission. It requires the Chair to transmit quarterly reports of attendance. It sets 80% as a threshold which triggers special attention. The by-laws do not call out a specific procedure when someone drops below that threshold. However, it will likely include Chair and Mayoral interviews to determine if circumstances have changed which make it difficult for the commissioner to make the meetings.

IV.F Quorum – It was suggested that one way to improve attendance would be to increase the number of commissioners required to form a quorum. We should discuss this issue further.

IV.G Remote Participation – It appeared that the Council was in favor of providing for remote attendance in cases where an individual is out of town or stricken with a serious illness, if the commissioner wishes to participate. The Council already has a resolution which allows electronic participation in meetings, so the specific procedures need not appear in the by-laws. However, state law requires that the agenda provide notice to the public that one or more members of the Commission may appear remotely. We should either begin noticing this on every agenda (this is a common practice in many

jurisdictions), or require that the request be made before the agenda is published.

VI Voting – There was significant concern expressed over changing the number of votes necessary to transact business before the Commission. There is a concern that reducing the number of required votes only encourages poor attendance. See my comments in the draft.

[6:28:22 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo.

[6:29:19 PM](#)

Discussion regarding Parks & Recreation Consolidated Fee Schedule updates.

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained City Administration is in the process of doing a comprehensive review and update to our consolidated fee schedule. Because it is 15 pages long, we have decided the best course of action would be to split it up into departments and review each of them separately with the City Council. We have reviewed our fees with 11 other cities for comparative purposes. These cities include Clinton, West Point, Clearfield, Layton, Kaysville, Roy, Farmington, Sunset, Centerville, Riverdale, and Bountiful. Based upon this review, we are recommending some changes and updates to the consolidated fee schedule for parks and recreation. This agenda item is for discussion only. Any updates would have to be done at a later date with a public hearing and resolution for approval. The memo concluded staff recommends the Council discuss potential changes to parks and recreation fees and set a date for a public hearing and approval of fee changes.

[6:29:27 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo and a spreadsheet providing the City's current fees, fees charged by the benchmark cities, and the proposed updated City fee. He noted staff is not recommending action on this item tonight; rather, City Administration would like to review each Department's fees individually with the hopes of taking action on the entire fee schedule in June.

[6:31:37 PM](#)

Councilmember Anderson noted that staff compared fees for like programs, but she is aware of programs in other cities with longer seasons than offered in Syracuse. She wondered if that was taken into consideration when recommending fee amendments. Parks and Recreation Director Robinson stated that the sports seasons in all cities are similar to the seasons in Syracuse, with the exception of Kaysville.

[6:32:15 PM](#)

Discussion regarding agenda item 15: public hearing to consider budget amendments for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2016. (5 min.)

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained this budget request does not include approval for uses of our fund balance surplus. The fund balance discussion will be included on a separate agenda item and will be for discussion only. The memo asked that the Council review the detailed capital projects listing attached with this document for recommended changes. In this budget opening, we have carryover for projects from FY2015. These projects were started last fiscal year and were not completed by June 30, 2015. We also are 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
- Changes to **operational budgets:**
 - 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 Development Services Manager 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.
 - **\$87,973 total net increase in expenses**
 - Beginning surplus - \$53,470**
 - Change from above - \$29,118**
 - Total revised surplus - \$80,097**

All Other Funds – Significant Changes

- \$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.
- \$12,000 increase for engineering and design for 500 West extension.
- \$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.

The memo also reviewed proposed changes to staffing levels. Administration is proposing eliminating 4 part-time positions (2 park maintenance worker I and 2 recreation coordinators) in the parks and recreation department and instead hire 2 full-time positions in their place. The new positions would be a full-time recreation coordinator and a full-time park maintenance worker I. The net cost to the FY2016 budget would be 0. We could fund the 2 new full-time positions within the current budget. This is due to the fact that we have been unsuccessful in hiring all 4 part-time positions over the last 7 months and due to turnover in these positions. The net impact to the FY2017 budget and to future budgets is estimated at a total cost of \$44,000. The memo concluded staff recommends the Council approve R16-08 adjusting the Syracuse City Budget for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2016. Administration also recommends approving the request for 2 full-time positions in exchange for eliminating 4 part-time positions.

[6:32:39 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo.

[6:35:41 PM](#)

The Council engaged in a discussion about the items included in the proposed budget opening, with a focus on the proposal to adjust the staffing plan for the Parks and Recreation Department. Councilmember Maughan indicated he understands the dilemma the Department is facing, but he wonders if there are other solutions besides what is being recommended; he would like to explore the issue further before taking action on the recommendation this evening. Mayor Palmer stated the Council can discuss the item in further detail during tonight's business meeting.

[6:41:14 PM](#)

Discussion regarding Fund Balance surplus for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 budget.

A staff memo from the Finance Director referenced the City Council adopted fund balance policy. Our goal is to maintain a minimum fund balance of 16.7%. When our fund balance increases above the 16.7%, the City Council has approved a policy that identifies how that money could be used. It states, "Should the City exceed the 16.7% target level, the City Manager shall prepare a recommendation to the council on how to utilize excess funds for capital improvements or other one-time expenditures." Mayor Palmer and City Manager Bovero have identified several options in which the fund balance could be used. The recommendations are listed in a PowerPoint presentation. Our fund balance policy also states, "Amounts in excess of the targeted maximum of 16.7% of general fund revenues may be spent upon approval by the City Council. Approved uses of fund balance would include capital improvements (i.e. streets, parks, etc), capital purchases (i.e. vehicles, equipment, etc), debt reduction, or other one-time expenditures as identified by the City Council". The City Council should determine and prioritize how the surplus monies are spent. This needs to be done before June 30, 2016 to avoid another finding in our financial audit. Based on the discussion at the January work session, we have amended the recommendation on the amounts in excess of the 16.7%. The memo concluded City Administration recommends the Council consider an appropriation of the following items at this budget opening:

- | | |
|--|------------|
| a. Plan for wage compression fix: | \$156,500 |
| b. Grant/Donation Match for Amphitheater: | \$50,000* |
| c. Grant/Donation Match for Splash Pad at Chloe's: | \$200,000* |
| d. Park Security Cameras: | \$7,000 |
| e. Historic Building/New Marquee Sign: | \$20,000 |

\$433,500 *

*\$250,000 only spendable if grant/donation match is achieved.

City Administration also recommends the Council consider postponing all other items from the January work session to future work sessions to give the Council time to discuss and prioritize.

[6:41:23 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide additional information about City Administration's recommendation, which includes two optional tiers. Tier one includes addressing the wage compression issue, provide a grant match for the amphitheater project, provide a grant donation for the splash pad at Chloe's Sunshine Playground, purchase and install park security cameras, and relocate a historic building and marquee sign to the museum property. The total cost for all tier one options is \$433,500. Tier two includes funding the development of a 10-year strategic financial plan, funding an Antelope Island Market Study (with possible grant funding), complete 2000 West project betterments, fund West Davis Corridor interchange betterments, acquire parkland, and construct the Centennial Park pavilion. The total cost for all tier two options is \$365,000.

[6:44:51 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee stated that she feels really strongly that the City should not fund a splash pad feature at Chloe's Sunshine Playground as it would compete with The Rush, a private business in the City. Councilmember Maughan indicated he is concerned that the Council is being asked to vote on these recommendations tonight without being given the opportunity to have more detailed discussion or provide their own recommendations for use of the fund surplus. Mr. Bovero stated that is the purpose of this agenda item and he is happy to facilitate additional discussion among the Council. Discussion regarding the projects included in both tiers ensued, with the Council concluding they would like to delay action on this item in order to take the time to identify other options for reasonable use of the budget surplus. The Council then engaged in a brief discussion regarding options for addressing the wage compression issue, with Councilmember Maughan indicating he is willing to address 25 percent of the wage compression shortage and, if possible, stretch even further to address more of the shortage. Mr. Bovero stated there will be many opportunities for continued discussion of methods for addressing the wage compression issue.

[6:57:01 PM](#)

Discussion regarding Committee Guiding Policies and Make Up of each committee per Title Two

[6:57:11 PM](#)

Councilmember Bolduc stated that she and Councilmember Lisonbee wanted to talk about the makeup of some of the committees that serve as advisory bodies to the City Council. She stated there are some concerns that the entire City is not represented on some of the committees, specifically the Parks Advisory Committee. She would like to increase the membership of the Parks Advisory Committee from seven members to as many people that are willing to participate. Mayor Palmer stated he hesitates to have too many members on the Parks Advisory Committee as it may cause their meetings to be much longer. Councilmember Maughan stated the scope of the Parks Advisory Committee is narrow and he does not believe their meetings will become too lengthy if the membership is increased from seven. He stated he would prefer to have greater representation on advisory committees. The Council engaged in a discussion regarding the scope of the Parks Advisory Committee, with Councilmember Lisonbee stating she would like to see Syracuse's committee become more similar to parks committees in other cities, where members are assigned to oversee individual parks. She stated she would like to amend Title Three of the City Code to update the scope of the committee and increase the membership of the committee. Councilmember Anderson agreed and stated she likes the idea of giving committee members ownership over individual parks.

[7:05:23 PM](#)

Council business

There was not sufficient time for Council business.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: March 8, 2016