

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on February 28, 2017 at 5:30 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

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

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

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

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; discuss the Culinary and Secondary Water Master Plan Update; review proposals submitted for Water Shares Audit Contract; hear a presentation by management of The Rush re: plans for use of swimming pool space; review and discuss Interlocal Agreement with Davis County for Animal Control Services; discuss field renovation for Syracuse Arts Academy Junior High Baseball Team; discuss proposed budget adjustments for the Fiscal Year (FY) ending June 30, 2017; discuss proposed amendments to consolidated fee schedule; discuss Victim Advocate Grant and potential interlocal agreement regarding the same; discuss 2017 municipal election administration; discuss Councilmember appointments and assignments; receive training regarding the following: City Council Rules of Order and Procedure, Open and Public Meetings Act, and Ethics Act; and discuss Council business.

5:32:54 PM

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

Mayor Palmer announced that public comments will be heard at 6:00 p.m., following the discussion of the Culinary and Secondary Water Master Plan update item on the agenda.

5:34:30 PM

Culinary and Secondary Water Master Plan update and review of location of City water infrastructure/facilities.

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained the City's current culinary and secondary water masterplans were completed in 2007. It is important to routinely update these plans to assure the existing systems are meeting current demands and to properly plan for future growth. JUB has been retained to update the City's culinary and secondary water masterplans. The first reading of both plans was presented to the City Council on January 24, 2017. This is the second review of the water master plan documents. A representative from JUB will attend to present the report and answer any questions. It is anticipated that the Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP) for these plans will return to the City Council with the IFA in a future work session and business meeting for consideration of adoption during the May 9 business meeting.

5:34:39 PM

Mr. Whiteley used the aid of schematic aerial images to provide a virtual tour of the City's Freeport Reservoir and he identified the area where a new tank could be constructed on the site. He responded to Council questions regarding the site, specifically the ability for the City's water system to be gravity fed from the tank. He also used similar images to provide a virtual tour of the site of the City's water tank near Weber State University (WSU). He then provided a virtual tour of various secondary water infrastructure throughout the City.

6:08:25 PM

Mr. Whiteley then reviewed his staff memo regarding the Culinary and Secondary Water Master Plan update and a representative of JUB provided an overview of the changes made to the documents since the Council's initial review of the subject matter. He also reviewed a map to identify peak pressure points and the location of various projects detailed in the Plans; some of the projects can be split between multiple entities, such as Weber Basin Waster Improvement District, West Point City, and Clearfield City. There was high level Council discussion throughout the presentation as the Council sought clarification on the scope of various projects and the ability of the City to use impact fee revenues for the projects.

[6:48:29 PM](#)

Public comments

There were no public comments.

[6:49:18 PM](#)

Review proposals submitted for Water Shares Audit Contract.

A staff memo from the City Manager provided the following outline of the tasks required in the contract to be entered into with a consultant to provide a Water Shares Audit for the City:

- A. The proposer will examine the current inventory of water shares owned by the City; and, in conjunction with City staff, gain an understanding of the history of the City's pressure irrigation system, along with current and historical ordinance requirements.
- B. The proposer will research water shares owned by the City whose source has not been identified, and identify the land developments/subdivisions that provided these shares to the City. This task may involve examination of the City's land development/subdivision files. This task also may involve contacting and coordinating with representatives of various water companies and purveyors from which the City's secondary water is obtained, and examining their files. Currently, the City owns shares from the following companies: a) Davis & Weber Canal Company (with shares from Clearfield Irrigation Company, and West Branch Irrigation, which convey water from Davis & Weber). b) Layton Canal Company. c) Hooper Irrigation Company. d) Weber Basin Water Conservancy District.
- C. Identify land developments/subdivisions from which insufficient shares were surrendered to the City, if any.
- D. Based on results of the Audit, provide general legal counsel to, and answer questions from representatives of the City regarding any issues derived from the audit.

As indicated in the RFP, each proposal would be evaluated on several factors including, but not limited to the following:

- A. Proposed Timeline and Implementation plan - The grasp of the issues and their solutions, responsiveness to terms and conditions, timeliness of completing the tasks.
- B. Price Proposal – Evaluation of hourly rates and expected overall cost.
- C. Demonstrated Applicable Experience
- D. Personnel Qualifications.
- E. Evidence of good organization and management practices.

The following firms responded to the RFP: Snow, Christensen, and Martineau; Smith Hartvigsen; Mabey Wright and James; and Jones Waldo. After reviewing all proposals, it was determined that all of the firms were well qualified and capable of performing the scope of work. Each firm had personnel with significant experience and knowledge in water law. Our internal review committee felt, however, that Smith Hartvigsen had the overall best proposal. This determination was, in part, based on their demonstrated experience in this specific type of project, and their competitive pricing. While the contract based on hourly rates, it was estimated that the total project would be between \$18,000 and \$20,000. The estimate timeframe for the work 3-4 months.

[6:49:33 PM](#)

City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo. He and City Attorney Roberts facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the terms of the proposed agreement as well as any recourse the City may have if it is found that developers intentionally did not turn water shares over to the City for past projects. Councilmember Maughan asked that the Council receive progress reports throughout the project.

[6:59:31 PM](#)

Presentation by management of The Rush re: plans for use of swimming pool space.

This item was removed from the agenda as management of The Rush was unavailable to attend the meeting.

[6:59:46 PM](#)

Review and discuss Interlocal Agreement with Davis County for Animal Control Services.

A staff memo from the Police Chief explained this is an amendment to the Interlocal Agreement signed last year which authorizes the County to provide animal control services within Syracuse City, including enforcement of the City's animal control ordinances. Animal Control costs are billed based on a calendar year schedule; costs are broken down and paid monthly. This amendment replaces Exhibit A from the original agreement. Animal Control is funded from the following sources:

- Davis County general fund
- Cities within the interlocal agreement
- Fines, fees, and other collections by Davis County Animal Control
- Donations

Contract Cities are responsible for 50% of the projected expenses, after subtracting the revenue received by the County from licenses, fees, etc. Syracuse City's obligation is based on the City's proportion of animal control calls for services, compared with all calls for service county-wide. Wild and nuisance animals are billed separately at \$25.75 per call. A 5-year capital projects fund has been established at \$562,000 and will be funded 50% by the cities, at 20% of each city's obligation per year. The City's obligation is, again, calculated based on the proportional calls for service versus the entire County. An advisory committee has been established to advise the County on budgetary issues. The committee is made up of 2 members from the County and 2 city managers recommended by the city managers group. Every two years, the County will conduct a fee/fine survey to ensure rates are set at market levels. The term of the original agreement is through December 31, 2020 and either party may terminate the agreement; each party holds the other party harmless and indemnifies the other party. The 2017 Calendar year contract amount for the City is:

- Usage Rate-Based Cost: \$58,522.12
- Wild Life Calls: \$2,111.50
- Capital Project Fund: \$4,134.13
- **Total:** **\$64,767.75**

The memo concluded this represents a 9.75% increase over last year, even though the City's overall usage went down. Our increase is due to an increase in Davis County Animal Control expenditures, and a reduction in Davis County Animal revenues.

[7:00:07 PM](#)

Chief Atkin reviewed his staff memo and the Council's discussion of the agreement centered on the possibility of the City to provide animal control services in house or shared with other cities to reduce costs or prevent drastic increases over the next several years. However, the Council reached consensus to approve the proposed contract for the remainder of calendar year 2017.

[7:09:48 PM](#)

Discussion regarding field renovation for Syracuse Arts Academy Junior High Baseball Team.

A staff memo from the Parks and Recreation Department explained the Department staff was recently contacted by a Syracuse Arts Academy's Administrator, Matty Bryant, in regards to possibly using a baseball field for their Junior High team. Matty informed us that the dimensions needed were like that of a High School Level field. These dimensions include: 90-foot distance in between bases, 60.5-foot pitching distance, and a minimum of a 250-foot homerun fence. Unfortunately, the Parks and Recreation Department does not have a field that meets the criteria; there is a field, Field Three at Founders Park, that is close to the desired dimensions needed. However, there are a few things that need to be considered before deciding to renovate this field.

Field Renovation Considerations:

- Base Distances: We would need to create 90' Bases. There are two options for this:

- Option 1: Install Base anchors w/out extending infield dirt.
 - Cost Estimate: \$25
- Option 2: Install Base anchors and extend infield dirt approximately 10'. Also, there would have to be some minor irrigation system alterations.
 - Cost Estimate: \$5500
- Pitching Distances:
 - Requirements: To allow two different pitching distances, we would need to remove, and export, current mound clay. Also, there would need to be a slight renovation to current irrigation system. At this point, we would recommend using a portable mound, and using a synthetic turf surface, so the mound distances can be versatile.
 - Cost Estimate: \$4000-5000 (Portable Mound) & \$1500-2500 (Artificial Turf Square)

The memo referenced an attachment in the Council packet regarding the specifications for a portable mound, after which the memo concluded these costs are not in the current budget. Staff is seeking direction from the council on how they would like us to proceed.

[7:09:55 PM](#)

Parks and Recreation Director Robinson and Assistant Director Smout reviewed the staff memo. Council discussion of the arrangement centered on the party responsible to cover the costs of the proposed field renovations. Councilmember Maughan indicated the school has asked that the City participate in the cost of the renovations. Councilmember Anderson indicated that other individuals or entities have asked for City participation on other park improvement projects and the City has advised them to seek private donations. Discussion and debate regarding cost sharing for the project ensued, with Mayor Palmer noting that the Syracuse Arts Academy has contributed to an amphitheater in the City that will likely be used by City arts programs; he recommended that negotiations with the school regarding the field renovations remain 'friendly' in nature. The Council ultimately concluded to direct staff to pursue negotiations of a contract that details shared use of the field and associated costs as well as use of the amphitheater facilities. The Council also suggested staff seek a 60/40 split of the costs associated with the field renovations with the Academy paying the higher costs.

[7:33:07 PM](#)

Discussion regarding proposed budget adjustments for the Fiscal Year (FY) ending June 30, 2017.

A staff memo from the Finance Director referenced the detailed capital projects listing attached the Council packet. The budget opening includes carryover funds for projects from FY2016. These projects were started last fiscal year and were not completed by June 30, 2016. The budget opening also includes a new project and updates to approved projects as follows:

- New – Secondary Water Pump at Jensen Park - \$200,000.
- Revised – 2000 West Utilities project - \$2,130,000
- Revised – Trailhead at Bluff & 3000 West - \$20,000
- Revised – Tuscany Park Improvements - \$600,000
- Revised – Bluff Ridge Pavilion - \$0
- Revised – Centennial Park Pavilion - \$0
- Revised – Regional Park Development - \$0 (save for future budget)
- Carryover – Marilyn Acres Phase III Project - \$653,000
- Carryover – Rock Creek Park Improvements - \$220,000
- Carryover – Right of Way Acquisition – 500 West - \$70,000
- Carryover – Centennial Park Restroom - \$300,000
- Carryover – Equestrian Park Lights - \$30,000
- Carryover – Monterey Estates Trail - \$345,000
- Carryover – 3016 ADA Ramp Project - \$123,000

The memo also summarized proposed changes to operational budgets:

General Fund – major changes

- \$75,100 increase in sales tax revenue.
- \$60,000 increase in property tax revenue.
- \$200,000 increase in building permits.
- \$150,000 increase in plan check fees.

- \$40,000 decrease in court fines
- \$20,000 increase in Arts Council Revenues
- \$25,000 increase in ambulance billing revenues
- \$106,300 increase in various other revenues
- \$596,400 total net increase in revenues
- \$5,000 – increase Prof. & Tech. for citizen surveys (Regional Park)
- \$5,000 – increase for upgrade to our FTR recording software.
- \$19,100 – increase in ambulance billing expense.
- \$20,000 – increase in Arts Council Expense.
- \$10,000 – increase in wages for F/T building inspector (\$29,000 – 1/3 of year)
- \$7,000 – increase in wages for new P/T passport / deputy city recorder (\$20,000 – 1/3 of year)
- \$14,000 – increase in wages for F/T Event Coordinator (\$42,000 – 1/3 of year)
- Transfer \$1,000,000 surplus funds to capital projects fund
- \$86,300 total net increase in expenses with an additional \$1,000,000 transfer to capital projects fund.

All Other Funds – Significant Changes

- Various changes to capital projects and park projects as discussed in budget retreat:
 - See capital projects list on page 1.
- \$22,000 – water shares consultant
- \$200,000 new water pump at Jensen Park
- RDA tax increment amendments – coming soon.
- Capital Equipment carryover - \$14,000 tree initiative, 97,000 brush truck
- Re-evaluated various utility fund revenues and associated expenses.
- Park maintenance expenses – repair founders pavilion - \$15,000, Founder’s Park baseball field renovation - \$10,000

The memo summarized proposed changes to staffing levels:

- Convert the part time Code Enforcement Officer to a full-time Building Inspector. The net increase in cost for a full year is \$29,000. If we convert them in March, the cost would be ~\$10,000 (29,000/3). This amount is proposed in the budget opening.
- Convert the part time Event Coordinator to full-time. The net increase in cost for a full year is \$42,000. If we convert them in March, the cost would be ~\$14,000 (42,000/3). This amount is proposed in the budget opening.
- Hire a part time passport / deputy city recorder. The increase in cost for a full year is \$20,000. If we hire this position in March, the cost would be ~\$7,000 (20,000/3). This amount is proposed in the budget opening.
- For all of these positions, our existing budgets could handle the increase in costs without a budget opening.

The memo concluded staff recommends the Council discuss the proposed budget opening items and make changes where applicable. Staff also recommends the Council set a public hearing and budget opening approval for the March 14, 2017 business meeting.

7:33:20 PM

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo. Council discussion centered on the scope of various capital projects and equipment budget carryovers, after which Mayor Palmer facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the amount included in the budget opening for the Tuscany Park project. There was heavy discussion and debate of the various components of the project with a focus on the project budget that originally received Council consensus compared to the amount currently proposed for the project. Mayor Palmer argued that the project cost has dramatically increased due to the inclusion of features and components that are not needed at the site of the park while Councilmember Maughan argued that the components and features recommended are based upon feedback received from the community and elected officials as well as research regarding the draw that the components would create for the City as a whole. He also argued that some of the cost increases have been offset by decreases in other areas of the project, such as reduction of the cost of the restroom design and a reduction in the cost of the pavilions to be located at the site. He added he is offended by the assertion that has been made that he has personally increased the size and scope of the project beyond what has been reached the Council’s consensus in the past. He noted that this area of the City has been underserved relative to their access to a nearby park and some of the residents have been waiting up to 40 years to see the project come to fruition. He stated that many events are currently held at the park and that would only increase upon completion of sport courts, pavilions, and a climbing structure.

He stated he is willing to reduce the scope of the project if that is the decision made by the Council, but he asked for support for two sport courts at the site, a larger playing structure, and adequate sized pavilions. He stated he feels as if the message is being sent that this area of the City is second class and they matter less when it comes to providing these types of services. Mayor Palmer stated that is not the case and he noted that he also has a goal to complete park projects in the City, but he feels that the money can be used more wisely to accomplish a larger number of projects throughout the City. He stated he feels one sport court is sufficient at the park and a smaller pavilion than what has been recommended would be adequate. High level discussion among the Council and staff centered on the size of other pavilions and amenities at other parks throughout the City. Mayor Palmer indicated the original cost estimate for the park was \$310,000 but that did not include a restroom, which could reasonably increase the price to \$450,000; the latest cost estimate is \$628,000. Councilmember Anderson stated it would be helpful to see a cost breakdown for that estimate. Ms. Robinson indicated that information has been provided in the Council packet. Mayor Palmer reiterated that he wants to see the park completed, but he feels the current proposal is 'overkill' for the size and location of the park site. Councilmember Maughan stated that he would like funding dedicated to multiple parks in the City, but he feels that the current proposal for Tuscany Park is appropriate. Discussion re-centered on opportunities for reducing the cost estimate for Tuscany Park.

[8:20:05 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall concluded his review of other items included in the proposed budget opening, after which City Manager Bovero asked for Council direction regarding the budget amount to include in the budget opening for Tuscany Park. Discussion centered on maintaining the proposed budget amount with the possibility of phasing the project over multiple fiscal years to spend the entire amount. Mayor Palmer stated that he would prefer to work to decide upon a total amount that can be spent at one time for the park rather than phasing the project. Councilmember Anderson suggested that the cost be reduced to what was originally approved by the Council, which was approximately \$450,000 and if it is necessary to adjust that number after receiving proposals from bidders on the project the Council can consider such adjustments at that time. In conclusion, Councilmember Gailey stated that he wanted to stress that the Council has never taken any action that would give any citizen the indication that there are different classes of citizens in Syracuse City; he campaigned for his position in opposition to that type of sentiment and the fact that Tuscany Park has not been developed is a pragmatic problem related to funding and all Councilmember now support development of the project; however, he cannot support a park cost over \$600,000 and he agreed that it is appropriate to reduce the budget to the \$452,000 amount that originally received Council consensus.

[8:41:11 PM](#)

Proposed amendments to consolidated fee schedule

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained staff periodically reviews and recommends changes to the consolidated fee schedule. Any recommended changes are outlined in red in the attached fee schedule. These changes include:

- Several minor changes to the community and economic development department fees.
- Updating the sign building permit to \$318.00 per permit.
- Move the sign reclamation fees from the sign permit fees to the code enforcement section.
- Updating the late fee from \$20.00 to \$15.00 as approved last year.
- Adding additional GRAMA requests to the police department section.
- Updating our rental fees and deposit returns for the rental of city hall.
 - This change will require an ordinance change to section 4.5.5 of our code. I am recommending charging double the rental fee up from with 50% returned to the renter upon satisfactory cleanup of city hall with no damages.

The memo concluded this is a discussion item only. Any recommended changes will be made and a public hearing will be set for the March 14, 2017 business meeting for discussion and approval. Staff will also notice a public hearing to change our ordinance pertaining to the rental fees for City Hall.

[8:41:26 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo. Community and Economic Development (CED) Director Mellor provided the Council with an explanation of the justification for the changes to the fee schedule for his Department, but indicated he is unsure of the justification for some of the home occupation licensing fees. He stated that he will gather that information and provide it to the Council during the March 14 meeting before the changes are voted upon.

[8:51:09 PM](#)

Council discussion of proposed amendments to the fee schedule centered briefly on the utility fee late charge and historical changes to the fee as well as the changes to the section of the fee schedule related to rental rates for the Council chambers and City Hall lobby. The Council indicated they are comfortable with the changes recommended by City Administration.

[8:57:57 PM](#)

Discuss Victim Advocate Grant and potential interlocal agreement regarding the same

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the Utah Office for Victims of Crime (UOVC) administers grants designed to help local government provide victim advocacy services for those who are victims of crimes committed in those local jurisdictions. One such grant, the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant is a well-established and consistently funded federal grant, for which the City can apply through the UOVC. Local advocates provide services for crime victims above what can be offered at shelter-based advocacy programs. Davis County is currently served by advocates located at Safe Harbor. Shelter-based advocacy is limited to domestic violence cases, and is generally reactive – providing advocacy if the victim contact them. Our officers currently provide information to all domestic violence victims, informing them of the resource at Safe Harbor. Both our Police Department and the City prosecution office recognize the value that local advocates bring to police work and prosecution, and we support this request.

The memo discussed local Victim Advocates and noted while the Safe Harbor advocates do a wonderful job, the role of shelter-based advocates differs from local advocates. For instance, a local advocate will look at police dispatch logs and identify victims of crime. The local advocate will then attempt to make contact with that victim (ordinarily by phone), in order to inform the victim of their rights, the resources at their disposal (such as the Utah Crime Victim's Reparation Fund), and if applicable, counsel with the victim about the cycle of violence that is inherent in domestic violence situations. They can also assist interested victims in obtaining a civil protective order. After a case has been filed, advocates will coordinate between the crime victims and the prosecutor's office. Unlike shelter-advocates, local advocates are permitted to communicate more openly and provide additional information to the prosecution. They inform the victims of court dates, explain what will happen at each hearing, and provide moral support for victims who attend hearings. They collect and present input to the prosecuting attorney related to pre-trial protective orders and potential sentences. They serve as the primary point of contact and establish a relationship of trust with victims. More frequently than we like, domestic violence victims will refuse to cooperate with prosecution once the offender has been taken to jail. In those cases, the advocate explains the cycle of violence, and lets them know that the city will be there if violence recurs.

In Davis County, only Layton and Clearfield currently have local advocates. The County has advocates for victims of violent crimes that are prosecuted by the County Attorney's office (class A misdemeanor or greater). The use of advocates can assist growing cities to keep up with increasing demand for services.

Given the current level of crime, the City alone could not sustain a caseload sufficient to keep a full-time advocate busy. However, we are concerned that a position for a part-time advocate will not attract the caliber of advocate in which the City is interested: a trained advocate with interest in longevity. Consequently, the City has reached out to nearby Clinton and Sunset, to see if they would like to cooperatively apply for the VOCA grant to establish a full-time advocate that would serve our three communities. We have not received affirmative answers from their administrations yet, but we are informed that their police departments are in favor of the arrangement. Syracuse would take the lead in drafting documents and hiring the advocate, should we move forward.

The memo discussed VOCA Grant funding and noted that beginning this year, the VOCA grant will be awarded in two-year increments. The program has an 80-20 match requirement, with the grant providing 80% of the cost. We estimate that the advocate's salary and benefits, which we would anticipate to be entirely covered by the grant, would be approximately \$55,000 annually. The local match would be approximately \$14,000. However, the match is not limited to cash; in-kind and volunteer time can be counted toward the match. In-kind includes office space, equipment (cell phones or laptops), and supervisory time. Any amounts expended on travel/training can be counted, as well. Volunteer time spent in victim outreach and advocacy is included in the match calculation. If we are able to team up with additional cities, then the \$14,000 cost could be split between them. We anticipate that split to be based upon caseload or population (or a combination of the two). As a result, if all three cities participate, we believe that our City's share of the match would not exceed \$7,000 – much of which would be provided through volunteer or in-kind contributions. In return, each city would get access to local victim advocate services whenever the need arises.

We have discussed the prospect with representatives of the UOVC, who have indicated general support for the potential proposal. The UOVC is hoping to expand local advocacy into areas in which it has not been previously provided.

Applying for the grant and coordinating with our neighboring jurisdictions will require an investment of time, so we would like to receive input from the Council before expending it. Specifically, a lengthy grant application will need to be completed in March, and an interlocal agreement would need to be put in place if we coordinate with our neighboring jurisdictions. A statement of general support from a majority of councilmembers during this work session will give us the signal to move forward with the work. If you see the need for additional information before making a tentative decision of support, please make your request for information as soon as possible.

[8:58:09 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo and asked for direction from the Council before investing time and resources to apply for the grant and negotiate an agreement with neighboring cities. Councilmember Maughan stated that he would like assurance that any match the City would need to provide for the grant would not prevent other priorities, such as hiring an additional Police Officer, from being completed in the City. Councilmember Gailey stated he recalls that staff indicated that most of the City's grant match would be provided via in-kind services. Mr. Roberts stated that is correct.

[9:03:10 PM](#)

Councilmember Anderson asked Mr. Roberts his estimation of the number of the people that could potentially be assisted by a victims advocate. Mr. Roberts stated that is difficult to predict; the services of a victim advocate to be extended to any victim of crime in the City and he listed the numbers of various crimes that occurred in the City last year.

[9:06:45 PM](#)

Councilmember Savage echoed Councilmember Maughan's sentiment that so long as the City's contribution to the service does not prevent the hiring of two additional Police Officers, he will support it. The Council reach consensus to direct Mr. Roberts to apply for the grant.

[9:07:13 PM](#)

Discussion regarding 2017 municipal election administration

A staff memo from the City Recorder explained that in a recent meeting with the Davis County Clerk/Auditor's Office, all Davis County cities were informed that election administration options for 2017 municipal elections would be limited when compared to options that have been available in past years. In the past, the County has given cities the option of choosing between an election administered by mail and an election administered with the use of voting machines at a physical location in the local jurisdiction. This year, the County has indicated that use of voting machines is no longer an option and that if the City decides against the By Mail voting method, the County will not offer their services or support of the City's election. This leaves the City with two administration options:

- City Administered: with this option, the City chooses to run the election using paper ballots that will neither be provided or tabulated by the County; the only service that would be provided by the County is printing of official voter registers as required by State statute.
- By-Mail System: with this option the City would choose to contract with the County for election administration. The County would provide a by mail ballot to all active registered voters and would tabulate all ballots returned. One polling location will be provided for in-person voting on Election Day.

City Administration is recommending that the City contract with the County for election administration via the By Mail system. There are several reasons for this recommendation, the most important being to provide consistency to Syracuse City voters. The County has indicated they have no plans to move away from the By Mail system in future elections and the entire State of Utah is moving in that direction as well. If the City chooses to administer its own election, it may be confusing for voters if they are told that they will be required to vote in person for municipal elections, but that they will receive a by mail ballot for County, State, and national elections. Additionally, it would be very difficult for the City to prepare to administer the 2017 election in such a short period of time. Some of the preparations that would need to be made include recruiting, hiring, and training poll workers. This can be a very lengthy and painstaking process and the City would not have access to those that have served as poll workers for the County in the past because the County will be using them in cities that have opted for the by mail system. The estimated cost for poll workers is approximately \$5,670. Additional preparations include vetting and contracting with companies to prepare all balloting materials and tabulating ballots. Options for these services are limited as most cities throughout the state have typically contracted with their county over the past several years. The City Recorder is working to compile costs for these services and will provide any information available during the work session meeting.

The memo concluded Davis County has asked that the City notify them as soon as possible of the administration option chosen so that they can begin preparing to provide service to those cities that will be contracting with them. Administration asks that the Council approve the addition of an action item to the March 14, 2017 business meeting agenda to authorize execution of a contract between the City and County for administration of a by mail election for the 2017 municipal election. The County has indicated the cost of a by mail election will be approximately \$38,400.

[9:07:38 PM](#)

Ms. Brown reviewed her staff memo. She indicated that she has been working to develop a cost estimate for the City administering the election in-house and costs for recruiting, training, and paying poll workers is approximately \$6,000 and the cost to print ballots is approximately \$9,000; however, she has had difficulty in getting a company to respond to her request for pricing for tabulating ballots on Election Day.

[9:12:14 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated he feels the City does not have a choice but to contract with the County for the vote by mail option, but he is frustrated that no better solution is available. He noted, however, that he does not have complete faith in the vote by mail system. High level philosophical discussion regarding appropriate voting methods ensued, with the Council concluding they support City Administration's recommendation to proceed with contracting with the County for administration of the 2017 Municipal Election.

[9:17:34 PM](#)

Councilmember appointments and 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. The attached resolution was reviewed during the January 24 work session and the decision was made to table consideration of the resolution until after an individual could be appointed to replace former Councilmember Karianne Lisonbee. The memo referenced a draft resolution prepared for review and discussion by the Council and concluded adoption of the resolution could take place at the March 14, 2017 business meeting to formalize the decisions made during the work session.

[9:17:51 PM](#)

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

[9:30:21 PM](#)

Training: City Council Rules of Order and Procedure, Open and Public Meetings Act, and Ethics Act.

City Attorney Roberts provided the annually required training regarding the State of Utah Open and Public Meetings Act and Ethics Act. He also facilitated review and discussion of the City Council Rules of Order and Procedure.

[10:22:54 PM](#)

Council business

The Council and Mayor provided brief reports regarding the activities they have participated in since the last City Council meeting. Mr. Bovero also facilitated a conversation among the Council regarding the schedule of budget sub-committee meetings and department biennial reviews over the course of the next several months. He also provided a brief report of legislation being considered by the Utah State Legislature that could have an impact on Syracuse City.

Police Chief Atkin provided the Council with an update regarding the new Police Department program known as Rad Kids; the Department is looking for 10-12 kids to participate in the program at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 10:57 p.m.

Terry Palmer

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC

City Council Work Session
February 28, 2017

Mayor

City Recorder

Date approved: April 11, 2017