

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on February 23, 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 (arrived at 6:09 p.m.)
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 to review and discuss the Syracuse Parks Master Plan; review the proposed Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Fire Department budget; review business meeting agenda item two: award contract for Smedley Acres Culinary Waterline Project Phase II; discussion Parks and Recreation consolidated fee schedule updates; review business meeting agenda item three: Proposed Ordinance 16-10 providing a temporary opening for amendments to the General Plan until March 15, 2016; review business meeting agenda item four: Proposed Ordinance 16-12 amending Title Two of the Syracuse City Code relating to appointments to certain local districts, and also amending Section 2.25.070 relating to the decision regarding the manner of voting in municipal elections; review business meeting agenda item five: Proposed Ordinance 16-11 amending provisions governing the Syracuse Parks Advisory Committee; review business meeting agenda item six: Proposed Ordinance 16-09 approving amendments to the bylaws of the Planning Commission; discuss Transportation Impact Fee Categories; discuss street lighting ordinance; discuss tree planting initiative; and discuss Council business.

[6:04:08 PM](#)

Councilmember Anderson provided an invocation.

[6:05:14 PM](#)

A local boy scout led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

[6:05:49 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer reported item F, discussion regarding Parks and Recreation consolidated fee schedule updates, has been removed from the agenda this evening.

[6:06:01 PM](#)

Public comments

[6:06:23 PM](#)

TJ Jensen addressed the item on the agenda dealing with the Planning Commission bylaws and stated he feels it necessary to specify the timeline for holding the next election of Chair and Vice Chair of the body; if that is not done, the current Chair could end up serving in that capacity for 18 months.

[6:06:55 PM](#)

Gay Lindhardt stated he wanted to thank Mayor Palmer for his excellent service; he thinks he is a great individual.

[6:07:14 PM](#)

Ralph Vaughan also addressed the Planning Commission bylaws, specifically section four, item k, dealing with time limits on meetings. This item is not before the Council for consideration, but he wishes they would consider it. Currently the bylaws specify that meetings must end at 9:00 p.m. and he thinks that should be removed because it is too restrictive on

nights when the body has a full meeting agenda. He used the CVS subdivision as an example and noted that it was necessary to table that item because the body could not continue their meeting past 9:00 p.m. Currently one member of the body can make a motion to adjourn the meeting and that motion requires no second or vote. He addressed an additional issue regarding handouts provided to the body by applicants or residents in attendance at the meeting. He noted this practice can be distracting and people should not expect the Planning Commission to review them during the meeting. Handouts should be provided 48 hours before the meeting and given directly to the administrative secretary. He suggested the Council may possibly consider a similar policy. He stated this policy would provide fairness to the body conducting the meeting as well as all in attendance at the meeting who would not otherwise have an opportunity to review the handouts.

6:10:10 PM

Review and discussion of proposed Syracuse Parks Master Plan

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the process used to develop this Parks Master Plan included several sequential steps, the findings of which were each reported back to the Parks Advisory Committee at their conclusion. These steps included:

- **Inventory** - Syracuse City provided the basic information used in this study, which included: City demographics; and identifying existing parks, recreation facilities, open space and trails – including condition assessment, review of park classification system, and recreation programming.
- **Citizen Survey** - The survey was originally drafted by the project team and vetted by the City. Upon completion of the draft, the survey was presented to the Parks Advisory Committee, where survey length and questions were tested on Committee members. After dialogue and feedback from the Committee, the survey was again modified and edited. The final draft received one more review by the internal team and City, and was then ready for import into the online tool used to administer the survey (Survey Monkey). The survey opened on February 23, 2015, closed on April 6, 2015, and was provided to the public in an online format. A hard copy was also mailed to City residents. The project team received a total of 1,185 responses to the online and hard copy surveys.
- **Analysis** - An analysis was completed on both the physical recreational sites and facilities that currently exist within the City of Syracuse, and the citizen survey that was prepared and circulated. Using GIS tools to spatially evaluate the collected data, several maps were prepared that highlight significant findings. Other tasks completed include the following:
 - a) Park classification system – Review and refine definitions, and apply to all parks and special use facilities to determine the appropriate classification for each.
 - b) Recreation program analysis – Evaluate the existing programs for effectiveness and demand, and determine other program needs.
 - c) Calculate current level of service.
 - d) Identify deficiencies and/or surpluses – Determine the areas of the City not currently being served by the existing parks.
 - e) Develop amenity replacement schedule.
 - f) Analyze demands on existing parks and recreation facilities by new development – Identify where new growth is expected to occur, and recommend new park locations to serve those new residential areas.
 - g) Identify Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) – Prepare a capital improvement projects list based on the shortfalls of the various existing park amenities and their current condition. Compare that list with current improvement projects currently listed by the City.
 - h) Develop strategic funding plan – Identify possible funding opportunities for implementing the recommended improvements.
- **Master Plan** – Essentially a compilation of the findings of the inventory, survey, and analysis steps. These are summarized in a brief report, but the GIS format (which will be given to the City at the conclusion of the master planning process) includes all spatial information from the inventory, survey, and analysis tasks. This allows the City to access the data at any time, to correct or update information as it changes, and to produce its own set of maps or spreadsheets according to its own purposes. The GIS is a dynamic, living tool that is intended to be used and updated each time new information is available or changes to the recreation system are made.

- **Stakeholder's Survey** – J-U-B also prepared a stakeholders survey to be administered by the City to various groups having a significant interest in the City's recreation programs and in the development of a large park complex.

The memo summarized the proposed level of service for the City as follows:

- The Current level of service = 3.57 acres/1,000 population. The proposed level of service = 4.95 acres/1,000 population. This should be reconciled with the general plan standard of 7.2 acres/1000 population.
- The Parks advisory Committee has been discussing the acres/1000 population, and will bring you their recommendation at the Tuesday, February 23 council meeting.

The memo referred to Section seven of the proposed Parks Master Plan for the acreage level needed to achieve proposed level of service.

[6:10:32 PM](#)

City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo and introduced Greg Graves and Casey Hansen of JUB Engineers, who are present to provide the draft Parks Master Plan. Mr. Hansen provided an overview of the process he used to develop recommendations included in the Plan. He used a mapping tool to inventory the existing parks in the City as well as the amenities included at each park. Service areas were also examined with the goal in mind of providing neighborhood parks within a half-mile of walking distance and community parks within one mile distance. A map was created to identify the areas in the City that do not have that level of service, which leads to a task of identifying areas that would be prime for development as a neighborhood or community park. This was done with future potential development growth in mind.

[6:22:06 PM](#)

Councilmember Gailey inquired as to how regional parks would fit in the Plan in connection with the level of service. Mr. Graves stated a regional park would be similar to a community park, though it may have a distinctive physical or geologic aspect that sets it apart from community parks.

[6:23:19 PM](#)

The Council engaged in a high level discussion regarding the current level of service, making a point of providing the consultants with information about existing parks or future planned parks that are not included on the maps.

[6:29:38 PM](#)

Mr. Graves then noted that the Plan includes feedback received from the citizens survey conducted regarding their desires for park space and amenities, after which he reviewed the recommendations included in the draft plan, which begin on page 32 of the plan; recommendations are based upon level of service and population projections. These recommendations can be used to prepare for the future of the City, specifically at build-out; the City can identify areas of potential future growth and make plans to secure land that can be used to develop additional parks.

[6:36:52 PM](#)

Councilmember Anderson stated that maps included in the Plan that illustrate the trail system seem to represent that sidewalks are being used as part of the trail system. She asked if that is correct or if a trail will be constructed next to a sidewalk in some locations. Councilmember Lisonbee stated the Trails Master Plan allows sidewalks to be used for connectivity between trails. Councilmember Anderson then noted there is another portion of future trail in the Plan that would be located on federal or otherwise protected land and it may not be possible to proceed with construction of a trail on that property. She then stated that it is so fabulous to have access to a picture of future park and trail expansion opportunities.

[6:39:26 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero stated that staff will eventually be asking the Council to adopt the Parks Master Plan; the General Plan indicates the target level of service relative to parks is 7.2 acres per thousand residents, while the City ordinance calls for 4.95 acres per thousand residents. It will be necessary to reconcile those two numbers in order to finalize the Parks Master Plan.

[6:41:03 PM](#)

Review Proposed Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Fire Department Budget.

A staff memo from the Fire Chief referenced a color-coded review of the Line-Items requests for the Fire Department. The colors correspond with the following categories:

- 1) **Yellow** = **Optimal Service**: These items are not necessary to fulfill the City's mission or the Council's vision for the Fire Department, but do provide an improved level of service to the City.

- 2) **Green** = Mission & Vision Critical: These items are necessary to fulfill the City's mission and the Council's vision for the Fire Department.
- 3) **Blue** = Short-term Survival: These items are critical to provide basic services. Without them, the Fire Department will be able to operate in the short-term, but will suffer in the long run if additional resources are not provided to support the operations.

Any questions pertaining to this categorization of the line items will be welcome discussion during the work session, as well as any other discussion pertaining to the proposed draft budget presented to the Council on Friday February 12. The memo explained the mission statement of the Fire Department is "To provide quality, affordable services for its citizens, while promoting community pride, fostering economic development, and preparing for the future." Under the mission of the City, the Fire Department has reviewed the fire and EMS services provided by the City and created a draft budget that outlines the resources to provide the services effectively. In drafting the budget, Fire leadership followed the guidelines discussed in the November Council Retreat and the following vision statements adopted by Council:

10-Year City-Wide Vision Statements

- *We are a City with well-maintained infrastructure, including roads, utilities, and parks.*
- *In preparation for the West Davis Corridor, we will make provisions for interchanges to accommodate commercial businesses to serve the residents' needs and to support economic stability of the City.*
- *We are a financially stable City, balancing the cost of services with the level of services that we provide. The City will have minimal or no debt.*
- *The City will incorporate improvements, events, and services that create an overall feeling of connection and pride in the City by its residents.*

Fire/EMS Vision Statements

- *Syracuse firefighters and EMS providers are professional, well-trained, and courteous.*
- *The Syracuse FD/EMS has the equipment, training, and personnel to respond quickly.*
- *Syracuse firefighters and EMS providers are part of the community and respected by the public.*
- *The City is prudent with the finances of the FD, and minimizes debt associated with providing fire/EMS services.*

The memo then provided the following overarching discussion points.

- **5-10 Year Plan:** Over the next year, the Administration would like to work with the City Council to adopt a 5-10 year level of service and staffing plan. The plan would serve as an advisory document that outlines the level of service deemed acceptable to the Council. It also would evaluate the proper staffing levels for the FD in order to maintain the acceptable level of service. Finally, the plan would outline measures and triggers that indicate when staffing levels need to be increased or reduced based on service demands.
 - **Additional Cost:** \$0 In-House staff time and minor ancillary costs
- **Eliminate Call-Back Program:** When the FD receives a call, a call-back is issued to all off-duty firefighters to respond to the station in preparation of a potential second call. This program costs approximately \$30,000 per year (2015 numbers) in wages.
- This program provides extra back-up service to the City, however it has a negative effect on recruiting, and is no longer a common practice in Davis County and other Wasatch Front Communities. Most cities have gone strictly to one crew per station, and then rely on mutual aid partners for second and third calls. Recruiting has suffered because of the irregularity of hours due to the call-back policy. Firefighters can find regular, predictable schedules with other cities, which tends to fit better with their personal lives.
- After careful evaluation, Chief Froerer feels that the call-back program is hurting the department more than it is helping it, and proposes elimination.
- **5-Man Staffing Crew:** Currently the FD operates with a scheduled 4-man staffing crew. Rather than describe the entire operation in a memo, Chief Froerer will explain the details of a 4-man versus 5-man crew at the meeting, along with the pros and cons. In summary, however, a 5-man crew allows the City to

respond to two calls requiring medical transport. To transport a patient in the ambulance, two firefighters are needed to lift the patient. To transport a patient in the transport engine, three firefighters are required. With a 4-man crew, the two firefighters in the engine can still respond to a call, but they cannot transport the victim safely.

- With the capability of responding to two transport calls, we estimate the FD could also collect an additional \$10,000 per year on average in medical transport billing. In addition, if an employee becomes ill and cannot work, the FD will not have to call in a replacement, thereby saving additional money. For example, with a 4-man crew, the FD cannot operate safely with only three firefighters, should someone call out sick. Consequently, they need to call in a replacement, which costs extra because the City is paying the paid leave plus the replacement's working hours. This situation occurred 27 times in 2015, costing an additional \$15,552. With a 5-man crew, the FD can still operate safely if they only have four firefighters, should one call out sick.
- Financially, the impact of a 5-man crew looks like this:
 - Additional medical billing revenue: + \$10,000
 - Savings in unplanned leave: + \$15,552
 - 5th Firefighter staffing 24/7, 365 days: - \$116,000
 - 5th Firefighter equip, uniform, etc.: - \$20,000

Net - \$110,448

- The 5-man crew comes at an estimated additional cost of \$110,448. The value consideration of this proposal for the Council is to determine whether the added benefit to the residents is worth the additional cost. We desire to receive the Council's input on this issue.

The memo concluded the draft budget proposal includes a line-item operation budget proposal and a capital replacement budget for Council consideration.

[6:41:25 PM](#)

Chief Froerer reviewed his staff memo.

[6:45:31 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated he appreciates the breakdown provided by the Fire Department in response to his request made during the February 12 meeting.

[6:45:42 PM](#)

The Council engaged in a discussion about various items included in the Department's budget request, with a brief focus on equipment replacement. Councilmember Gailey also asked Chief Froerer to provide additional information about the call-back program currently in operation in his Department. Chief Froerer stated he feels the call-back program is more of a liability than an asset to the Department as it is currently operating. He explained how the Department is staffed under the call-back program, noting the program currently costs approximately \$30,000 in staffing costs, but calls are commonly given to other agencies because the Department does not have enough Fire Fighters available to respond; the value the Department is getting from the program is not worth the \$30,000 spent. He is suggesting eliminating the call-back program by increasing staff levels to provide a five-man crew.

[6:54:42 PM](#)

Review business meeting agenda item two: award contract for Smedley Acres Culinary Waterline Project, Phase II

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained this project will install new culinary and secondary waterlines in 2250 South Street between 2000 West Street and 1800 West Street. Curb, gutter and sidewalk will be replaced/installed to improve drainage and pedestrian safety. The entire road width will be replaced upon completion. The construction will begin as soon as contract documents are in place and be completed by the summer of 2016. Bids were opened on February 16, 2016. Five bids were submitted and the low bidder was KAPP Construction with a bid amount of \$371,624.35. The funding for this project will come from the following sources:

204070 Class C	501670 Culinary Capital	301670 Secondary Capital	404045 Storm Drain Maintenance	401670 Storm Drain Capital
---------------------------	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Total	\$164,099.60	\$126,079.55	\$70,556.20	\$6,389.00	\$4,500.00	\$371,624.35
Budget	\$167,000.00	\$131,191.00	\$73,000.00	\$7,000.00	\$4,500.00	\$375,691.00
Difference	\$2,900.40	\$5,111.45	\$2,443.80	\$611.00	\$0.00	\$4,066.65

The memo indicated the Public Works Department acquired CDBG grant funding for this project in the amount of \$286,295.14. The actual estimated cost to the City for this project is \$85,329.21. The memo concluded staff recommends the City award the contract to KAPP Construction.

[6:54:57 PM](#)

Public Works Director Whiteley reviewed his staff memo.

[6:57:30 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan asked if the City has a history with KAPP Construction. Mr. Whiteley answered yes; they have completed three projects in the City and the City has had a very good experience with them. Councilmember Maughan stated he is simply concerned about contractors that submit a low bid with plans to later increase their costs via change orders for projects. Mr. Whiteley stated he is not concerned about that with KAPP Construction.

[7:00:15 PM](#)

Councilmember Bolduc then noted she has heard from residents who are very pleased by the construction of the sidewalk on Gentile that allows their children to more safely access a crosswalk on that street.

[7:00:50 PM](#)

Councilmember Gailey referenced the portion of the project dealing with sidewalk improvements and he asked if the residents in that area will participate in the costs for sidewalks. Mr. Whiteley answered no and indicated the City has a CDBG grant, the intent of which is to cover sidewalk and other improvements in low to moderate income housing sections of the City.

[7:02:17 PM](#)

Review business meeting agenda item three: Proposed Ordinance 16-10 providing a temporary opening for amendments to the General Plan until March 15, 2016.

A memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained a proposed amendment to ordinance 10.20.060 is being forwarded from the Planning Commission. The amendment will create an open grace period for General Plan Map change applications until March 15, 2016. The City Council discussed this idea during their January 12 meeting.

[7:02:32 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

[7:04:32 PM](#)

Review business meeting agenda item four: Proposed Ordinance 16-12 amending Title Two of the Syracuse City Code relating to appointments to certain local districts, and also amending Section 2.25.070 relating to the decision regarding the manner of voting in municipal elections.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained that as there are two proposed amendments to Title 2, they are being addressed in a single ordinance. One relates to appointments; the other relates to who makes the decision regarding the manner of voting in municipal elections. When it comes to appointments, there are two policy decisions to make as a Council: (1) where the powers of appointment lie for specific appointed individuals, and whether they should be changed; and (2) determining the procedures which should accompany those appointments. I recognize that there are diverging opinions on this matter among the Councilmembers. However, if we are able to come to a consensus on a fair process and have clear policies moving forward, then I hope that we can avoid some future conflicts when the need to fill appointments arises.

As a starting point, there are a variety of positions to which individuals are appointed, and each warrants consideration of the appropriate method of their appointment. The general questions for this body to decide are: Who is the appointing authority? Do we want to change the appointing authority, and why or why not? What procedures will we employ when one of these positions is due to be filled? What are the terms of appointment?

The various positions which can be addressed include:

- City boards and commissions
- City committees
- External boards (local districts, irrigation districts)
- Filling vacancies in elected positions
- Manager and department heads
- Liaisons to external bodies

Some of these positions have the appointing body and basis procedure identified by state code; others do not. Changes to some of these appointments will require a five-member majority of the council or mayor-council consent; others do not.

I propose that the Council establish procedures and policies governing all of these appointments, working together to reach consensus, and pass an ordinance which will draw clear lines to avoid conflict when appointments arise.

On the next agenda, competing amendments have been proposed for consideration as it relates to appointments to local improvement and mosquito abatement districts. One moves the power of appointment for two district board positions exclusively into the province of the voting council-members. The appointment would presumably be made by motion, resulting in an approved resolution. The other confirms that city code vests the appointing power for these positions in the mayor, subject to advice and consent of the council. State law does not specify the procedure for city appointees, so it is left to the City to determine the best course of action to take. As the amendment moving the appointing power exclusively to voting members only would remove a power from the mayor, he will be entitled to participate in the vote.

I leave to the Council the decision of whether to address this issue as a discrete item, or whether to address all of these appointment issues in a global discussion. If the Council wishes to take action and adopt one of those proposals, then the appropriate motion would be to adopt one of those proposals as Exhibit A to the ordinance.

Relative to elections, it has been proposed that a provision be added to section 2.25.070, City Recorder. Their main concern is the City Recorder's ability to choose the manner of municipal elections (either traditional or entirely-absentee), rather than the Council having that power. State code provides: "[A]n elections officer may administer an election entirely by absentee ballot." Utah Code Ann .§ 20A-3-302(1). It also indicates that the decision of whether to administer an election by absentee ballot must be rendered by the election officer. *Id.* § 20A-3-302(2) ("If the election officer decides to administer an election entirely by absentee ballot . . .").

However, there does not appear to be a prohibition against a municipality's governing body directing the election officer in this decision. As such, I have prepared an amendment which narrowly addresses this issue. Specifically, it vests the power to determine the manner of election – whether traditional or vote-by-mail – in the Council. This decision will need to be made well in advance of the election, and the Recorder will likely have a recommendation based upon experience, cost and other relevant considerations.

[7:04:53 PM](#)

City Attorney Roberts reviewed his staff memo. The Council engaged in discussion about procedures used in the City to appoint representatives to various positions, with Mr. Roberts indicating he would like for the Council to consider comprehensive changes to the City Code to provide consistency in the method used to formalize appointments. Councilmember Maughan stated he is in favor of comprehensive changes even if it may take some time to tackle the issue given the fact that there are no appointments looming. The Council discussed the option of creating a sub-committee that could work with the Mayor and Mr. Roberts to develop a proposal for such comprehensive edits to be brought to the Council at a future work session. Councilmember Gailey stated he would like for Councilmember Anderson to be a member of the sub-committee given her legal expertise. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she would be willing to participate on the sub-committee as well, though she would like the Council to take action on the proposed ordinance that is included on the agenda for tonight's business meeting.

[7:13:43 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts then reviewed the section of his memo dealing with changes to the code regarding the election method chosen for the City. The Council discussed the proposed amendment, with a focus on language used to define the election method options, after which City Recorder Brown indicated she would like to state, for the record, that her only concern about this change is the potential for the Council's action to choose an election method to become a political issue in the

future. It is her opinion that the election method chosen is an operational choice, though the Council has the ability to provide their input through the process of appropriating a budget for municipal elections. She worries that there may be a point in the future when half of the Council supports one method while the other half supports another, that may become a political argument. Councilmember Maughan stated that while he respects Ms. Brown's expert opinion on this issue, this is not the time for her to weigh in on this issue; she is the City Recorder and not a voting member of the Council. Mayor Palmer stated he asked Ms. Brown to provide her input as he feels that the change impacts her duties in the City. Mr. Bovero added Ms. Brown is also the City's Election Officer in addition to being the City Recorder. Councilmember Lisonbee stated that she has spoken with Ms. Brown at length about the election process in the City and she appreciates her comments; however, the reason she believes this change is appropriate is that she has received input from residents who feel the Council should make the decision regarding the voting method used in Syracuse. She stated other cities follow a similar process and she does not believe the decision needs to be a political one.

[7:19:12 PM](#)

Review business meeting agenda item five: Proposed Ordinance 16-11 amending provisions governing the Syracuse Parks Advisory Committee.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained this proposed amendment has come out of discussion at our last Council meeting. It adds additional members to the Parks Advisory Committee (PAC), provides for the appointment of committee members to oversee city specific city parks, and clarifies other provisions. An amendment to Section 3.35.020 increases the number of committee members from 7 to 11 or more. It provides that six members constitute a quorum, and that a majority vote is necessary to transact business. If more than 11 voting members are appointed, it requires that an odd number be appointed.

Amendments to section 3.35.030 require the PAC to meet at least six times per year. It does not designate the specific dates, as the PAC may meet more often in the summer or spring, but less frequently in the winter or fall. The PAC would have the discretion to set its calendar to meet its needs. It imposes an expectation of attendance of at least 75% of meetings. No specific action is automatically triggered when a person falls below this threshold.

Amendments to section 3.35.040 include an adjustment to the PAC members' duties. The PAC will now be focused more on the maintenance and care of parks, but will still review the parks master plan every 2 years and make recommendations for future parks and amenities. One major change is the assignment of PAC members to oversee parks. The main responsibilities of an overseer are to monitor and assist with clean-up, identify safety hazards, report criminal behavior, and to serve as a point of contact for the neighborhood. PAC members will have direct access to city staff, and can convey requests and concerns to them directly.

[7:19:28 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo.

[7:20:32 PM](#)

Councilmember Bolduc stated she worked with Mr. Roberts to draft the proposed amendments to the section of the City Code that governs the Parks Advisory Committee and the goal of the changes was to bring the City Code in line with recommendations in the General Plan relating to Parks and Trails. The Council then engaged in a discussion regarding membership of the committee, with a brief focus on the manner in which a member would be assigned to oversee a certain park in the City.

[7:27:32 PM](#)

Councilmember Bolduc inquired as to the progress of interviewing new prospective members for the Committee. Mayor Palmer stated that he has been out of town for two weeks, but has asked staff to schedule interviews for three applicants. Councilmember Bolduc stated that she has heard from two people that she encouraged to apply for the positions who have told her that they have not been contacted by the City for an interview; those individuals are Brian Seamons and Dr. Potter. Mayor Palmer stated Dr. Potter has been contacted and has not responded, but Mr. Seamons has not been contacted and the scheduling of his interview is pending. Councilmember Maughan stated he also submitted three names and those people have not been contacted. Mayor Palmer stated at this point in time he is only aware of three pending applications and staff has been instructed to schedule interviews for those individuals; however, he is concerned about proceeding with recommending appointments until the changes to the City Code are implemented.

[7:30:37 PM](#)

Review business meeting agenda item six: 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.

[7:31:17 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo.

[7:32:35 PM](#)

The Council engaged in discussion about the proposed changes to the bylaws, with a focus on Planning Commission member attendance and the number of affirmative votes required in order for an application to receive a favorable recommendation from the body; the Council concluded they support the idea of requiring four affirmative votes on any application in order for it to receive approval or be forwarded to the City Council. Discussion then shifted to the language included in the bylaws regarding conflicts of interest, with Councilmember Lisonbee stating she would prefer that the bylaws include language directly from State Law regarding ethics and conflicts of interest for municipal officers. The Council then had a high level discussion about the comments made during the public comment period regarding the election of Chair and Vice Chair of the body, the distribution of handouts during meetings, and the ability for any member of the body to motion to adjourn the meeting requiring no second or vote. The Council concluded they support the idea of moving the election cycle for Chair and Vice Chair to January of each year rather than July. The Council discussed rules regarding submission of handouts during meetings, specifying that any handout must also be provided to staff to be made part of the public record of the meeting. Mr. Roberts noted that it is key that the rules regarding handouts specify that the applicant supporting the application to which the handouts are related should have an opportunity to review and respond to the documentation submitted. The Council revisited the issue of election of Chair and Vice Chair, with Councilmember Maughan indicating it is inevitable that there will be a six-month carryover period in an election cycle and the current chair may serve for an additional six months or the next chair will only serve a term of six months from June to January, but that the issue should be left up to the body. The rest of the Councilmembers agreed. The Council then discussed the rule allowing a member of the Planning Commission to adjourn a meeting at 9:00 p.m. without a second or vote on their motion. Councilmember Lisonbee stated the intent of the rule was to limit meetings to a manageable time, but if items on the agenda need additional attention

the body has the opportunity to extend their meetings to address those items. She also indicated she feels the bylaws should be amended to require a second and vote on all motions. The Council concurred.

[7:55:43 PM](#)

Discussion regarding Transportation Impact Fee categories

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained that during the last City Council meeting we discussed and approved the updates to the transportation impact fees with the following categories and amounts:

Industrial	SFD	MFD	Assist Living	Hotel	Church	General Office	Retail / Shopping
\$612	\$743	\$488	\$255	\$444	\$685	\$1,085	\$2,703

The Council asked for further discussion and comparatives from other cities to determine if Syracuse City should have additional categories for different types of commercial businesses. The meeting packet included a comparative of 10 other cities and the fees they charge by category. Every city is a little different and not all cities charge the same fees. Staff recommends the Council discuss potential changes to impact fee commercial categories. If changes are needed, set a public hearing for March 8th to adopt the changes.

[7:55:54 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo. Discussion regarding the data provided by Mr. Marshall ensued with Councilmember Maughan asking if there are options to entertain exceptions or variations to the impact fees for unique situations or businesses that may create a large impact on the City rather than advertising a very high fee that may discourage some businesses from considering locating in the City. Mr. Roberts indicated impact fees are designed to collect fees from all developments that create an impact fee on the City to ensure all users are paying ‘their fair share’. Councilmember Maughan stated he understands that, but he is hesitant about including a fee in the fee schedule that is so high that it may deter a business like a convenience store from considering locating in Syracuse. Mr. Marshall stated the action taken by the Council during the February 9 meeting was to adopt one fee for all commercial uses, which is \$2,700 and that is the fee that will be advertised in the fee schedule. That fee will not adjusted unless the Council chooses to identify outliers for which a different fee should be charged.

[8:05:17 PM](#)

Councilmember Gailey stated that impact fees can sometimes be viewed as being unfair; when he built his dental office in the City his sewer impact fee was \$28,000 and he only has eight stalls. The water usage in the building is 1.5 times what is allotted for residential use, yet he was charged eight different sewer connection fees. He stated he is not creating the type of impact on the sewer system to justify the fees that were charged and he wants to be sensitive to determining the true impact a business has on the City.

[8:07:48 PM](#)

The Council engaged in a discussion about specifying different impact fees for different land uses, ultimately concluding there is no need to identify outliers or make changes to the fees that were adopted on February 9.

[8:09:27 PM](#)

Discussion regarding street lighting ordinance

A staff memo from the Public Works Director provided the City’s current ordinance language for street lights as follows:

Ordinance 8.10.080 Street lights.

The placement of streetlights shall be included as part of the subdivision development. Developers shall be responsible to install, or have installed, streetlights in accordance with adopted construction specifications. Placement of streetlights shall be at each intersection within the development and at the end of each cul-de-sac, providing that the end of the cul-de-sac is at least 400 feet from the entrance thereof. For cul-de-sac lengths in excess of 400 feet with a dogleg street bend of 45 degrees or greater, the developer shall be responsible to install a streetlight at the dogleg of the cul-de-sac in addition to the streetlight at the end of the cul-de-sac. [Ord. 14-23 § 1 (Exh. A); Ord. 13-02 § 1 (Exhibit); Ord. 02-19; Code 1971 § 8-2-8.]

Engineering Standards Section 19.01 General

All outdoor artificial street illuminating devices shall be installed in conformance with the provisions of this section and applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and the current

Electric and Electric Safety Codes adopted by the state of Utah. The spacing and arrangement of streetlights will be designed during the preliminary plat or site plan review phases of a development and shall be a minimum of one light per every 800 feet of roadway, every 400 feet of cul-de-sac depth and at every roadway intersection. For cul-de-sac lengths in excess of 400 feet with a dogleg street bend of 45° or greater, the subdivider shall be responsible to install a streetlight at the dogleg of the cul-de-sac in addition to the streetlight at the end of the cul-de-sac (8.02.080).

The memo provided the following street light statistics:

- 852 Total Street Lights (765 Induction, 87 LED)
- 50 Lights have been installed since Jan 1, 2015
- 97 Identified Deficiencies based upon current ordinance. Most likely due to street lights that were installed prior to current ordinance requirements.

The memo discussed current operation costs; the City spends \$15,000 per year in power consumption costs and \$5,000 per year in maintenance. The approximate cost per light is \$25, which is determined by dividing the total operation costs of \$20,000 by the number of lights, which is 802.

The memo also provided the following street light installation costs:

- \$7000/each Decorative Light
- \$6400/each 30' Cobra Light
- \$8000/each 40' Cobra Light
- \$3000/each Acorn Light in undeveloped land, reimbursed by developers
- \$2000 ± additional per light in areas already landscaped and developed.
- \$1200/each Acorn Light to convert induction to LED

The memo concluded street lights are mapped and have corresponding data in a spreadsheet. These will be available during the meeting for observation and discussion.

[8:09:28 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated he is concerned that there are large stretches of road throughout the City that do not have sufficient state lighting. He reviewed a map provided by Mr. Whiteley to identify various locations throughout the City where a stretch of road can be very lengthy with no intersection and no street lights. He feels such dark spots create a safety issue for residents. Mr. Whiteley then facilitated a discussion regarding the street lighting practices in the City by reviewing his staff memo. He used a mapping tool to identify the locations of street lighting deficiencies according to the City's current regulations. The Council discussed options for adding lights or changing existing lights to provide better lighting throughout the City, ultimately concluding they would like to determine a way to accelerate the addition of street lights to the current system. Councilmember Maughan stated he would like to address the areas that are most deficient and possibly add 10 new street lights using City general fund surplus money this year.

[8:26:02 PM](#)

Discussion regarding tree planting initiative.

This item was added to the agenda by Councilmembers Maughan and Lisonbee. An email from Councilmember Maughan to all Councilmembers and the Mayor laid out his proposal as follows:

The Syracuse Tree Initiative

The number one concern expressed in our most recent parks survey conducted of our citizens was that we need shade in our parks. The only way to rectify the fact that we don't have trees is to plant them now so our children can enjoy mature trees. I am asking the council to approve an initiative to plant trees for the next 5 years starting with 100 trees this year, funded by budget surplus. With forward planning I estimate we can purchase 100 shade trees, (average trunk size of 2" diameter) for approximately \$15,000. I suggest we set aside \$15-\$20K dollars to plant 100 trees in our parks with the least number of trees at present. There are 4 parks I noted that don't even have 10 trees in them. They should get priority. These 100 trees should be planted in the fall of 2016. I would prefer to have public tree planting events to show the citizens we are trying to fix the problem they identified. For the subsequent 5 years I propose we set aside \$3500 to plant 20-25 trees a year for the next 5 years. The result of this commitment would be at least 200 new trees at a cost of less than \$40,000 spread over 6 years. I have heard of grants for cities that maintain commitments to having trees. I think one of them is 'tree city USA'. I don't know if grants could help us get there or help after we plant a certain number. That is something we could look into. My goal would be that we start with 100 and commit to at least planting some trees for the next 5 years. Of course in the event of economic

disaster, or major change we could always vote to suspend the program later, but I would like to set the goal and start this fall if I can get your support. I just wanted to clear up, that I wasn't asking for 100 trees every year, just the first year as a corrective measure and while we have a surplus to spend. Last year this exact amount was set aside for campgrounds and it looks that that won't happen. This is an opportunity to replace that project.

8:26:09 PM

Councilmember Maughan summarized his proposal. The Council offered their support for the proposal and had a discussion about funding mechanisms to purchase a certain number of trees to be planted throughout the planting season. Parks and Recreation Director Robinson stated that her only request would be that staff is not asked to purchase and plant all 100 trees at one time and that the activity be spread throughout the growing season. Councilmember Maughan stated that he is supportive of that idea. Mr. Bovero clarified it is not necessary to amend the budget for this item as money was already allocated in the budget that can simply be shifted to fund this initiative.

8:35:50 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 8:45 p.m.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: March 8, 2016