

1 Minutes of the Syracuse City Council Work Session Meeting, April 22, 2014

2
3 Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on April 22, 2014, at 7:00 p.m., in the
4 Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

5
6 Present: Councilmembers: Brian Duncan
7 Mike Gailey (participated via telephone)
8 Craig A. Johnson
9 Karianne Lisonbee
10 Douglas Peterson

11
12 Mayor Terry Palmer
13 City Manager Brody Bovero
14 City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown
15

16 City Employees Present:
17 Finance Director Steve Marshall
18 Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
19 City Attorney Clint Drake
20 Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
21 Community Development Director Sherrie Christensen
22 Police Chief Garret Atkin
23 Fire Chief Eric Froerer
24

25 The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; discuss a proposed interlocal agreement with
26 Clearfield and West Point pertaining to SR-193 landscaping maintenance; hear a request to be on the agenda regarding the
27 proposed Stillwater Estates subdivision; discuss potential Title Eight and Title Ten Amendments relative to the PRD Zone,
28 Subdivision ordinance, and Cluster Subdivisions; discuss Freemont Park improvements; have a budget discussion centering
29 on a proposed fund balance policy ad an employee recruitment and retention policy; and discuss Council business.
30

31 7:00:09 PM

32 **Public Comments**

33 Hudson Gooch stated many students from Syracuse High School are present this evening and they are attending the
34 meeting for an assignment in their U.S. Government class.

35 Gary Pratt stated he noticed the new flags at City Hall and he indicated they are a great upgrade, but in order to fly
36 flags at night they should be well lit and the lights at City Hall are currently burned out. He suggested that the burned out
37 light bulbs be replaced before the City continues to fly the flags at night.
38

39 7:02:57 PM

40 **Interlocal Agreement with Clearfield and West**
41 **Point pertaining to SR-193 landscaping**
42 **maintenance.**

43 A memo from Community Development Director Christensen explained that as part of the joint HUD Planning
44 Grant that Syracuse, West Point and Clearfield was awarded for the SR-193 project, phase 2, included the planning for the
45 landscaping of intersections along the North side of SR-193. The three cities worked together to hire JUB engineering to
46 design the landscaping plan. UDOT is providing funds for the installation of the landscaping with an additional small one
47 time allocation for maintenance by the Cities of the improved landscaping. The total of the two sources of funding is
48 \$343,000. This will install landscaping at 2000 West, 1550 West, 1000 West, Center Street & H Street. The proposed
49 interlocal agreement designates which Cities will be responsible for maintenance of the various improvements. Please see the
50 detailed maps which identify the areas suggested for each City. Staff requests feedback from the Council regarding the
51 proposed interlocal agreement for placement on the May 13, 2014 agenda for adoption by resolution.

52 Ms. Christensen reviewed her staff memo and used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to review the landscaping
53 plans for the project and identified the areas that the City will be responsible to maintain via the interlocal agreement. Some
54 of the terms of the agreement are yet to be negotiated, such as connections to secondary water.

1 Councilmember Lisonbee inquired as to the location of the boundary line between Syracuse and West Point. Ms.
2 Christen explained the boundary is just north of the sound wall on SR-193; the entire width of SR-193 is located in Syracuse
3 City. Ms. Christensen stated she received a draft of the cooperative agreement from UDOT this afternoon and it includes
4 information regarding maintenance of the sound wall on SR-193 and she received clarification from a UDOT representative
5 who indicated that any damage to the wall resulting from a vehicular accident would be the responsibility of UDOT.

6 There was a discussion regarding the section of the interlocal agreement that deals with watering the landscaping in
7 the area and the Council indicated they feel West Point should be responsible for dedicating water to the landscaping since it
8 would be much more difficult to connect to Syracuse secondary water. There was also a discussion about locating a
9 'welcome to Syracuse' sign on or near SR-193 and Ms. Christensen stated she will follow up on that issue.

10 Mayor Palmer then stated he would like to approach Clearfield City about increasing the speed limit on Center
11 Street, which ultimately intersects with SR-193. Ms. Christensen stated that she and City Manager Bovero will approach
12 Clearfield City about that issue.

13 Councilmember Gailey asked if the area under the Rocky Mountain Power Corridor is subject to the agreement.
14 Ms. Christensen answered no.
15

16 [7:16:03 PM](#)

17 **Request to be on the agenda: Stillwater Estates**

18 Ms. Christensen stated she provided the Council with a copy of a draft development agreement yesterday and it is a
19 document that has been negotiated between City staff and the developer to date. Mayor Palmer stated the next time the
20 Planning Commission will consider the project is May 6, after which a recommendation could potentially be forwarded to the
21 City Council.

22 Mike Thayne, a representative of Irben Development, stated he simply wanted to ensure that the City Council
23 received a copy of the development agreement prior to the final plat approval being listed on the next Council agenda.
24 Mayor Palmer suggested the Council follow-up with Ms. Christensen with any questions they have about the document once
25 they have had a chance to review it. Ms. Christensen stated the Council was provided with a red-line version as well as a
26 clean draft of the document.
27

28 [7:20:25 PM](#)

29 **Title Eight and Ten Amendments – amending the**
30 **PRD Zone, Subdivision Ordinance, and Cluster**
31 **Subdivisions.**

32 A staff memo from Community Development Director Christensen explained that as part of the Council request to
33 review the process for subdivision approval, in order to clarify the time of vesting of a project, the vesting land use authority
34 and bring the Council into the review process sooner, staff has drafted the attached memo outlining one possible solution.
35 This was scheduled to be discussed with the Planning Commission at the April 15, 2014 work session. Unfortunately the
36 Planning Commission did not have time to fully discuss the proposal prior to adjourning. Staff has emailed the documents to
37 the Commission and requested emailed feedback prior to the Council meeting. At this time staff desires input from the
38 Council as to whether this is an acceptable proposal, prior to devoting staff resources to draft amendments to the ordinance.

39 Along with the Subdivision process, staff and the Commission were asked by the Council to review the PRD density
40 allowances. Staff prepared the attached memo to identify the issues regarding the PRD zone and some possible solutions.
41 Staff has also requested email input from the Planning Commission and requests Council input regarding the forthcoming
42 amendments.

43 One additional issue staff would like direction from the Council is in regard to the Cluster Subdivision regulations.
44 Currently the regulations are drafted as a conditional use. Staff is suggesting a change to those regulations to clarify the
45 approval process with two options:

- 46 • Move the Cluster Subdivision regulations to the Subdivision Title VIII- add process and approval language to
47 be approved by the Council at Preliminary Plat. This option would give the developer and city ample time to
48 negotiate the terms of the development agreement and layout of the subdivision.
- 49 • Change the Cluster Subdivision regulations into a zone similar to the PRD zone. This option will may be more
50 difficult to process, in that it is time consuming to negotiate all of the layout and terms of the development
51 agreement without running the subdivision process concurrently. Once rezoned deference is given to the land

1 owner that meeting the minimum requirements of the zone that the development will be approved, thus vesting
2 the development much earlier in the process.

3 Ms. Christensen reviewed her staff memo.

4 Councilmember Johnson referenced major subdivisions and stated he would like the approval process to mirror the
5 process being recommended for cluster and PRD subdivisions; he feels it is necessary for the Planning Commission to have a
6 chance at offering a final review and making a recommendation to the City Council. Councilmembers Duncan and Lisonbee
7 agreed. Councilmember Johnson noted the Planning Commission has expertise in reviewing engineering diagrams and they
8 should have the opportunity to review the final plat for a major subdivision. Ms. Christensen stated she is comfortable with
9 that recommendation and noted this proposal is simply a starting point and she was hoping to receive direction from the
10 Council before proceeding with drafting a proposed ordinance. Mayor Palmer added that he feels the final plat for a minor
11 subdivision should be approved by the Planning Commission and Council as well. Councilmember Johnson agreed.
12 Councilmember Lisonbee inquired as to when an application would be vested. Ms. Christensen stated an application would
13 be vested at preliminary plat approval. Mayor Palmer stated he has talked to Ms. Christensen about his idea that the City
14 Council should have an opportunity to review the sketch plan for an application. Ms. Christensen expounded on the idea and
15 noted she will create a dropbox folder and when an application is received by staff to be forwarded to the development
16 review committee, it will also be placed in that dropbox folder so that the City Council and Planning Commission can review
17 it and provide feedback or comments to the staff. This will provide more collaboration at an earlier point, but because this
18 collaboration will not take place in a public meeting the application will not be vested at that point. Councilmember Johnson
19 inquired as to the point in the process that a developer begins to spend significant amounts of money on the engineering and
20 design of a project. Ms. Christensen stated that according to the process currently employed by the City, the applicant begins
21 to spend money prior to receiving preliminary approval. Councilmember Johnson stated that he feels the Council should
22 have the opportunity to approve a conceptual plan for a development before a developer begins spending money on the
23 project. Ms. Christensen stated that according to the recommended changes to the policy, a developer would spend a small
24 amount of money prior to sketch approval, slightly more money prior to preliminary approval, and the greatest expenditures
25 will occur after preliminary approval and before final approval. Councilmember Johnson stated he would like for the
26 Council to give approval for a project before any money is expended and he asked how that should be called out in the
27 process. Ms. Christensen stated to meet that request, the Council would need to be the body that grants preliminary approval.
28 Councilmember Lisonbee stated that the proposal does not indicate that the Council will grant preliminary approval for minor
29 subdivisions. Ms. Christensen stated that is because there is not any engineering work to complete for a minor subdivision
30 because all infrastructure should be installed. Councilmember Lisonbee asked if a minor subdivision would be vested at
31 preliminary approval, to which Ms. Christensen answered yes. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she would like the Council
32 to be the body that grants preliminary approval for a minor subdivision. Mayor Palmer agreed that any time vesting is
33 involved, the approving body should be the City Council. Councilmember Duncan agreed. Ms. Christensen stated this
34 means any developer in the City will be required to attend up to four City meetings before receiving final approval for their
35 project. She stated she feels developers will be comfortable with that process as long as they understand the process and
36 rules up front.

37 Councilmember Duncan then stated he would like a change to be made to the ordinance so that cluster subdivisions
38 are not a major conditional use; instead a cluster subdivision should be its own zone. Ms. Christensen stated she has
39 discussed this issue with the Mayor and there are two ways to accomplish what Councilmember Duncan is recommending:
40 the Council could create a R-1 Cluster zone; or a cluster subdivision can be called out as a type of subdivision within the
41 subdivision ordinance and there could be rules regarding when and where such a subdivision would be approved. The
42 approving authority would be the City Council. If the cluster subdivision is made into its own zone, a zone change would be
43 a legislative action and the Council would not understand the terms of a potential development agreement when being asked
44 to approve the zone change. Councilmember Johnson stated the Council may maintain more control over a cluster
45 subdivision if it is simply called out as a type of subdivision within the subdivision ordinance. Ms. Christensen agreed.
46 Councilmember Johnson asked if an overlay zone is an option. Ms. Christensen stated that an overlay zone could still be
47 problematic for the reasons stated relative to a potential cluster zone. City Manager Bovero stated another option would be to
48 list a cluster option within the subdivision ordinance. Councilmember Duncan stated he simply does not want a cluster
49 subdivision to be a conditional use because if a developer meets all the conditions listed in the ordinance the City Council
50 cannot deny the cluster subdivision application. Ms. Christensen agreed and noted that is why she is recommending that the
51 cluster subdivision be listed as a subdivision type in the subdivision ordinance. Councilmember Duncan expressed his
52 concerns regarding R-1 cluster subdivisions and indicated that such a subdivision is not low density housing, in his opinion.
53 Mayor Palmer agreed the conditional use permit is the biggest problem when considering the R-1 cluster subdivision. There
54 was a general discussion regarding the way to proceed in amending the ordinance relative to cluster subdivisions, after which

1 Ms. Christensen stated she understands the direction of the Council and she will draft an amended proposal and work with
2 City Attorney Drake to ensure its legality. Councilmember Duncan stated his preference would be for a cluster subdivision
3 to be a separate zone. Mr. Drake stated he feels that is the safest option. Councilmember Johnson asked if a zone change
4 could be conditioned upon a development agreement and other planning documents. Ms. Christensen answered yes, but
5 noted that process can be somewhat cumbersome and expensive for an applicant to navigate.

6 Councilmember Johnson stated the final section of the document deals with PRD subdivisions and he thanked Ms.
7 Christensen for reducing the allowed density of a PRD subdivision from 12 units per acre. Councilmember Duncan stated he
8 would like for the City to put developers on notice that they are entitled to be granted up to eight units per acre in a PRD
9 subdivision, but they will not automatically receive approval for eight units per acre. Ms. Christensen stated that is included
10 in the proposal. Councilmember Duncan stated he understands that, but would recommend that the language maybe be
11 stronger.

12 Ms. Christensen stated she will proceed with making the recommended amendments and encouraged the Council to
13 call or email with additional recommendations as they arise.

14
15 [7:46:12 PM](#)

16 **Discussion regarding Freemont Park improvements**

17 A staff memo from Parks and Recreation Director Robinson explained the city is considering the future needs of
18 park improvements. In doing so, we have discussed the idea of expanding an existing park at Fremont. A conceptual layout
19 of the park has been developed in order to put together some preliminary ideas on paper for discussion. This concept layout is
20 being presented to the council in order to generate a general discussion of ideas that may function considering the existing
21 conditions as well as potential future conditions that surround this site. The park is approximately 11 acres. It has enough
22 space to include five additional adult sized soccer fields with parking lots, picnic shelters, playgrounds, restrooms,
23 concessions, maintenance storage, and trail connections. The expanded park would blend well with the school by providing
24 the potential for a shared use of the park and parking lots. The probable cost opinion of this layout is approximately
25 \$2.3Million. Considerations could be given to control costs, such as: phasing the park leaving the east end for future
26 completion once the impact of a potential transportation corridor has been determined; consolidating restrooms and
27 concessions into one building; and project scheduling. Park maintenance requirements would increase. Additional staffing
28 and equipment may be required. The memo summarized possible programs or rentals that would be accommodated by the
29 park; the city could expand the recreation programs by offering Adult Soccer, Adult Flag Football, Youth flag football,
30 Competitive leagues, Tournaments, special events and field rentals.

31 City Manager Bovero reviewed Ms. Robinson's staff memo and reviewed renderings of several potential designs of
32 the park expansion, which included the addition of three to five new soccer fields, restroom facilities, a playground, and
33 parking areas.

34 Councilmember Lisonbee stated she received an email from a resident who is very concerned that the City is
35 considering completing Freemont Park prior to the completion of Tuscany Meadows Park, which has been promised to the
36 residents of the neighborhood surrounding it for several years and most recently by the previous Administration. There was a
37 discussion regarding the work that has been completed at the Tuscany Meadows Park to date, which Ms. Robinson noting
38 that Freemont Park has been on the City's park development plans longer than the Tuscany Meadows Park. Council
39 discussion then centered total park space needs in the City and Mayor Palmer indicated he feels the proposed Freemont Park
40 expansion as well as a regional park at another location in the City would be fully utilized by the residents and would also
41 serve as a draw to the area. Councilmembers Johnson and Peterson agreed. Councilmember Lisonbee asked if the
42 Administration is suggesting constructing a regional park in addition to Jensen Park, to which Mayor Palmer answered yes.
43 At the conclusion of the discussion, Mr. Bovero asked for the Council's permission to proceed in considering final design
44 concepts for Freemont Park, which would include preparing more accurate cost estimates for the project. The Council agreed
45 Mr. Bovero should proceed with that work.

46
47 [8:24:48 PM](#) ***The recording for the*
48 *meeting failed at this point; therefore,*
49 *audio for the last two agenda items is*
50 *not available.*

51 **Budget Discussion: Draft Fund Balance Policy**

1 **and Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy**

2 City Manager Bovero provided the Council with the draft version of the City’s Fund Balance Policy; he read the
3 introduction to the policy as follows: “The purpose of this policy is to establish a target level of fund balance for the general
4 fund and to establish a process and criteria for the continued evaluation of that target level as conditions warrant. This
5 policy shall also establish a process for reaching and or maintaining the targeted level of fund balance and the priority for
6 the use of resources in excess of the target.

7 It is essential that Syracuse City (City) maintain adequate levels of unassigned fund balance to mitigate financial
8 risk that can occur from unforeseen revenue fluctuations, unanticipated expenditures, and other circumstances. The fund
9 balance also provides cash flow liquidity for the City’s general operations. This policy shall provide a mechanism for
10 monitoring and reporting the City’s general fund balance. This policy applies only to the general fund.”

11 Mr. Bovero provided a general overview of the remainder of the policy and there was a focus on the section of the
12 policy declaring the City will maintain a minimum unassigned fund balance in the general fund of 16.7 percent of the
13 general fund revenues. The Council indicated they would like some flexibility when determining how to address general
14 fund revenues in excess of 16.7 percent. A paragraph of the draft policy read: “Amounts in excess of the targeted maximum
15 of 16.7% of general fund revenues shall be used for capital improvements (i.e. streets, parks, etc.), capital purchases (i.e.
16 vehicles, equipment, etc.), debt reduction, or other one-time expenditures as identified and approved by the City Council.
17 Once approved, the City Finance Director will reclassify those funds to the assigned fund balance category and remove those
18 funds from the unassigned fund balance category.” The Council directed Mr. Bovero and Finance Director Marshall to
19 change the word ‘shall’ to ‘may’ when referencing how amounts in excess of 16.7 percent will be utilized. At the conclusion
20 of the discussion regarding this section of the policy, the Council indicated they were comfortable with the remainder of the
21 document.

22 Mr. Bovero then reviewed the draft employee recruitment and retention policy. He read the introduction of the
23 policy as follows: “The purpose of this policy is to establish a planned approach to ensure that Syracuse City attracts the best
24 talent possible, and motivates and retains that talent for the overall benefit of the citizens. This policy shall also set forth
25 direction on how the City will best develop the skills and capabilities of its workforce.

26 It is essential that Syracuse City (City) recruits and retains the best talent possible in order to ensure the most
27 efficient use of City resources. Excessive turnover and any lack of direction provided by City leadership will produce
28 inefficiencies that waste City resources, and will degrade the quality of service provided to the citizenry.” Mr. Bovero then
29 focused on the steps the Administration has been taking to complete a benchmark study for current employment positions
30 in the City. He indicated it his recommendation that the salary and wage scales be set so that the minimum, mid-range, and
31 maximum for each position will fall within the 60th to 70th percentile of the benchmark cities. Councilmember Peterson
32 stated he feels that the 60th or 70th percentile is too low and indicates that the City only wants to pay its employees a slightly
33 higher than average wage. Councilmembers Duncan and Lisonbee disagreed and Councilmember Duncan noted that he
34 believes that employees are interested in the culture of the organization they work for in addition to the pay. He stated if the
35 culture is good and the wages are set at the 60th or 70th percentile of benchmark cities, the City will be able to attract good
36 employees. Councilmember Johnson indicated he is comfortable with the proposal to set the wage ranges at the 60th or 70th
37 percentile of the benchmark cities. There was a general discussion regarding pay progression for employees, with Mr.
38 Bovero noting City Administration is in the process of updating job descriptions as well as the employee evaluation system
39 and the system will include set criteria that must be met in order for an employee to be eligible for any pay increase in any
40 given year.

41 Councilmember Lisonbee then referenced the section of the policy dealing with employee benefits and indicated she
42 is not sure it will always be possible for the City to offer a benefits package that is comparable to the packages offered by
43 benchmark cities due to the ever changing costs of health care and other benefits. Mr. Bovero stated this section of the policy
44 was meant to indicate that the City will try to be competitive in the percentage that employees are charged for their benefits;
45 he noted he understands the trend of health care costs inflation and those cost increases are outside of the City’s control. Mr.
46 Marshall noted that the City recently received word that the City’s cost for health care will not increase in the next fiscal year,
47 which will save upwards of \$100,000.

48 Mr. Bovero then concluded by reviewing the proposed implementation timeline for the policy. He noted he
49 anticipates the policy will be formally adopted along with the 2014/2015 Budget; specific components of the policy will also
50 be in place at that time, with other components to be implemented shortly thereafter, following more discussion with the
51 Mayor and City Council. Full implementation of the policy is expected to be completed before the posting of the 2015/2016
52 Draft Budget. The Council thanked Mr. Bovero for his work on the policy and indicated they look forward to continued
53 discussion regarding this topic.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

[9:13:23 PM](#)

Council business

Councilmember Peterson stated he recently attended the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) Conference and there was a lot of good information there.

The meeting adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: June 10, 2014