

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on April 26, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Andrea Anderson  
Corinne N. Bolduc  
Mike Gailey  
Karianne Lisonbee  
Dave Maughan

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

City Employees Present:

Finance Director Steve Marshall  
City Attorney Paul Roberts  
Community and Economic Development Director Brigham Mellor  
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley  
Police Chief Garret Atkin  
Fire Chief Eric Froerer  
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson  
Deputy Fire Chief Jo Hamblin

The purpose of the Work Session was to have a follow-up discussion regarding location of proposed Wall Ball structure; discuss Centennial Park restroom facilities; review and discuss the Criddle Farms Preliminary Plat, located at approximately 4000 W. 1200 S.; discuss cul-de-sac standards; hear a report on Town Hall meetings; discuss a request for matching funds to move and save the Raymond James Building; discuss the City's Credit Card Use Policy; discuss the Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Employee Compensation Plan; and discuss Council business.

[6:01:33 PM](#)

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

[6:03:15 PM](#)

**Public comments**

There were no public comments.

[6:03:42 PM](#)

**Follow-up discussion regarding location of proposed Wall Ball structure.**

A staff memo from Parks and Recreation Director Robinson explained Jay Meyer, Lacrosse representative, has submitted an email with his top choices to be considered by the Council for the location of a Wall Ball structure. Staff is seeking approval and direction regarding the location of the Wall Ball structure.

[6:03:52 PM](#)

Ms. Robinson reviewed her staff memo and stated Mr. Meyer has indicated his top two park choices are Rock Creek Park and Freemont. She indicated she agrees Rock Creek would be a good location for the structure, but she is concerned about encouraging excessive use of the park given that it will be reseeded this year and heavy use could keep the grass from growing.

[6:08:07 PM](#)

The Council discussed the request and the pros and cons of each location, with a focus on the best location for the facility in the long term. They ultimately concluded to make a final decision at a future Council business meeting.

[6:26:33 PM](#)

**Discussion regarding request for matching funds to move and save the Raymond James Building.**

A staff memo from the City Manager explained The Raymond James Building located near the corner of 2000 West and Antelope Drive is currently one of the oldest standing commercial buildings in the City. With the UDOT SR 108 Project (2000 West Widening), this building is slated for demolition. Mayor Palmer has worked with the Museum Board to bring public awareness of the historic importance of this building, and has been able to raise approximately \$45,000 from residents and philanthropic groups to help pay for moving the building to another location. The proposed location is adjacent to the museum on the east side, currently owned by the City. In order to move the building, it would need to be placed on a new foundation. A new foundation, along with utility connections, would add to the total cost. It is estimated that the total cost for everything, including the relocation of the building itself, the new foundation, and running utilities is between \$85,000 - \$110,000. As part of the project, the electronic marquee sign would need to be removed. The electronic marquee sign has deteriorated over the years, and is no longer cost-effective to repair. The City's Emergency Preparedness Committee has discussed the need for such a marquee for important notices to the public. The electronic sign can also be used for other important announcements in the City. The cost to replace the sign is estimated at \$20,000 - \$30,000. The memo concluded the purpose of this discussion item is two-fold. First, to discuss whether the Council would consider appropriating matching funds to help relocate the historic building. And second, whether the Council would consider replacing the marquee sign with a new one. If the Council were to move forward, a budget opening would be scheduled in May to appropriate a portion of the fund balance to the project.

[6:26:50 PM](#)

City Manager Bovero and Mayor Palmer reviewed the staff memo; Mayor Palmer stated the he is working with the Museum Foundation to raise funds for the project and they are seeking matching funds from the City.

[6:29:42 PM](#)

The Council reviewed the contributions made to the project thus far and discussed the request for matching funds from the City. Councilmember Gailey spoke to the importance of preserving the building, as it is a great piece of history for the City. Councilmember Lisonbee suggested the creation of a Go Fund Me page for the project to increase fundraising efforts before providing matching funds from the City. Councilmember Maughan agreed.

[6:40:44 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer also invited members of the Museum Foundation to provide their thoughts about the project, which three members did, after which Councilmember Lisonbee stated she feels the City is committed to work hand-in-hand with the Foundation to continue fundraising efforts for the project.

[6:52:13 PM](#)

**Discussion regarding Centennial Park restroom facilities.**

A staff memo from Parks and Recreation Director Robinson and Public Works Director Whiteley explained the concept sketch for Centennial Park restroom has been revised since the March 8, 2016 City Council meeting. The memo referenced the following attachments: conceptual design for Centennial Park with space for a future pavilion included in the concept, and a plan sheet for restroom. The memo concluded staff is seeking input from Council prior to completing the design.

[6:52:21 PM](#)

Ms. Robinson reviewed her staff memo as well as the updated conceptual plan for the project.

[6:52:48 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated he appreciates the changes that were made to the conceptual plan.

[6:54:51 PM](#)

**Review and discussion of Criddle Farms Preliminary Subdivision Plat, located at approximately 4000 W. 1200 S.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department referenced the following information regarding the application:

Current Zoning: PRD

Annexation/Concept Plan Date: 12/10/13  
Total Area: 20.061 acres  
Development Agreement Density: 6.7 units/acre  
Concept Plan # of Lots: 99  
Preliminary Plan # of Lots: 101

During the April 5, 2016 meeting the Planning Commission tabled the application and asked that the applicant provide more detail for what amenities will be offered in the common space, reconfigure design so common space is more accessible and interconnected, and add trail or sidewalks through the common spaces. During the April 19, 2016 meeting the Planning Commission denied the application on a four to one vote based on common open space, landscaping, and parking concerns. The memo concluded the subject property was annexed into the city with a development agreement. The agreement determines the max density, housing type (single family), open space, trail, and concept plan. Nevertheless, the project is required to go through the preliminary and final subdivision process during which modifications to the plan can be made as required by ordinance. Please review the attached documents for additional detail.

[6:55:06 PM](#)

Mr. Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

[6:59:22 PM](#)

The Council reviewed the plat and discussed the changes that have been made since it was initially presented to the Council for consideration. Mr. Mellor stated the applicant will proceed with their preliminary plat application, but another option has been discussed, which entails spreading the density throughout the development and dedicating additional open space. Property to the north would be annexed into the City and be combined with the subject property to make a 55 acre parcel that could be zoned R-3 rather than PRD. This would result in a maximum number of lots of just over 200 lots spread throughout the entire acreage. Councilmember Lisonbee stated that it would also be nice to include elements in the project that highlight the history of the property as well as provide trail connectivity. The Council discussed the concept, with a focus on the timeline for proceeding with the annexation of the property to the north and development of the subject property. Councilmember Gailey thanked Councilmember Lisonbee for her involvement in discussions regarding the project as he feels the current proposal is an improvement over what was originally presented to the Council.

[7:14:18 PM](#)

### **Discussion regarding cul-de-sac standards.**

A staff memo from Community and Economic Development (CED) Director Mellor and Fire Chief Froerer explained there has been a concern brought to staff's attention regarding the cul-de-sac standard for our city. Currently the City's standard is 100' diameter TBC (to back of curb). Two years ago the City's cul-de-sac design standard was 100' to property line allowing only a 78' diameter drivable surface. The City adopted appendix D in the IFC which requires a 96' diameter drivable surface, this changed the size of the cul-de-sacs to accommodate the larger turning radius of our fire apparatuses. We are now being asked by a developer to change the standard back to 100' to property line which would reduce the diameter of the cul-de-sac to 78' face of curb. These are the reasons why the City should continue to use the 96' diameter for the cul-de-sac:

1. The size of our apparatuses and neighboring fire departments' apparatuses has increased, requiring a larger turnaround radius. Currently our first responding apparatus cannot perform a complete turnaround without performing a three point turn in the 78' cul-de-sacs. This is ok if there is open space to do so; however, this is normally not the case.
2. Typically most cul-de-sacs have additional obstacles in them to maneuver around, i.e.; parked vehicles, garbage cans, basketball hoops, snow removal. Depending upon the location of the obstacle and size the 96' cul-de-sacs allows the driver the ability to perform a continuous turn around or the open space to conduct a three-point turn; whereas, the smaller cul-de-sac is not as forgiving. This can be critical for time sensitive responses if a wrong address is given or a wrong turn is taken.
3. Cul-de-sacs are not used just for turnarounds we must also view them as access to buildings that are built on these dead end streets which allows us to get the appropriate amount of emergency vehicles on scene to conduct fire suppression and exposure protection operations. The larger cul-de-sac allows us more room to better position the apparatuses for these operations, while still maintaining workable space around them.

The primary issue here is that we have two separate conflicting code standards:

SMC § 8.15.010

*(L) Cul-de-sacs (a street having only one outlet that terminates at the other end by a vehicle turnaround) shall be no longer than 500 feet from the centerline of the adjoining street to the center of the turnaround. Each cul-de-sac must be terminated by a turnaround of not less than **100 feet in diameter, measured to the property lines.***

VS.

SMC § 7.05.020 And Syracuse engineering standards

*The International Fire Code as currently adopted by the state of Utah is hereby adopted by reference and made part of this chapter. Appendices B, Fire-Flow Requirements for Buildings; C, Fire Hydrant Locations and Distribution; and D, Fire Apparatus Access Roads of the International Fire Code are also hereby adopted. Any successive amendments or editions adopted by the state of Utah are hereby incorporated herein by reference and shall be effective upon the date they are effective as a Utah State Statute. In the event a successive amendment or edition is adopted, **Appendices B, C and D shall also be adopted and are hereby incorporated herein by this reference and shall be effective upon the same date.** Appendices A, Board of Appeals; E, Hazard Categories; F, Hazard Ranking; and G, Cryogenic Fluids – Weight and Volume Equivalents are included as guides. A copy of said code shall be deposited in the administrative office of the City and open for public inspection.*

The memo concluded staff is asking that the Council direct staff to come back for the May 2016 City Council business meeting with a prepared amendment for either SMC 07.05.020 or SMC 08.15.010 to reflect the width the city would like to see going forward - based on the information presented to the council - thus correcting the conflict between the two codes.

[7:14:34 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed his staff memo in conjunction with Developer Mike Schultz, who provided his input regarding his desire for the City to amend its design standards relative to length of cul-de-sacs.

[7:24:46 PM](#)

Deputy Fire Chief Hamblin used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and brief videos to illustrate the turning radius of fire apparatus used by the Department.

[7:34:25 PM](#)

The Council discussed the merits of the request to amend the design standards relative to cul-de-sac lengths, with Councilmember Lisonbee indicating she is comfortable considering amendments that would meet Mr. Schultz's request. Councilmembers Bolduc and Maughan agreed. Mr. Mellor stated he will include an action item on the May 10 agenda to allow the Council to consider code amendments.

[7:44:48 PM](#)

### **Report on Town Hall meetings.**

A staff memo from the City Manager explained Mayor Palmer will provide an overview and report of four town hall meetings that he conducted. The Mayor held four meetings at City hall, with two meetings in November and two meetings in January. For each meeting, a quadrant of the City was invited specifically but any citizen was welcome to attend. In total, approximately 120 residents participated. The following items were included in all of the meetings:

- A statistical overview of the City, with a comparison with benchmark cities. This included city-wide information on crime, fire/EMS response, parks, economic development, tax rates, and utility rates.
- Specific information on crime, utilities, road improvements, park improvements, and new development related to each quadrant.
- A map exercise where participants were able to provide input on what they would like to see in Syracuse.
- A Q & A session where residents were able to ask any questions about the City.

The overall feedback from participants was positive as residents felt comfortable asking questions and getting specific information about the City. Along with the town hall meetings was an online survey with questions about the overall vision for the City. The City received approximately 150 responses, which are attached.

[7:45:02 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer reviewed the staff memo and provided an overview of the topics discussed and feedback received during the four town hall meetings that were held.

[7:50:04 PM](#)

Council discussion centered on some of the comments received during the meetings with a focus on commercial activity or economic development in the City and the number of parks in the City.

[7:52:10 PM](#)

**Discussion regarding City Credit Card Use Policy.**

An administrative staff memo explained Councilmembers Maughan and Anderson asked that an item be added to the agenda to review and discuss the City's Credit Card Use policy. The memo indicated the City's current policy is included in the Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual and was also included in the Council packet for reference.

[7:52:28 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed the staff memo and provided an overview of the City's credit card use policy. Councilmember Maughan stated he did not request the agenda item out of suspicion of abuse of the policy; rather, he attended the Utah Taxpayers Association meeting recently and there was discussion about policies controlling credit card use. He stated he asked for this item for information purpose only. He provided staff with information about the talking points from the meeting, such as the use of gift cards and lack of receipts for credit card charges. Finance Director Marshall stated that his professional background is an auditor and he is very strict in administering the credit card use policy as he understands it is an opportunity for fraud. He stated that all Department Heads are very responsible in the use of the credit cards. Council discussion of the credit card use policy continued as the Council sought to gain an understanding of the controls included in the policy.

[8:07:14 PM](#)

**Discussion regarding Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal Year 2017 Employee Compensation Plan.**

A staff memo from the City Manager explained from time to time the Council should review the Recruitment and Retention Policy to see it needs any modifications in order to recruit and retain the best employees possible. The memo referenced the attached current Recruitment and Retention Policy, along with suggested edits to make clarifications, and updates along with a draft Compensation Plan for FY2017. The Compensation Plan is a key part of the recruitment and retention of good employees. Included in the draft are proposed edits, some of which are for clarification, others are from comments suggested by councilmembers. The memo concluded the purpose of this discussion item is review and find consensus on both documents, preparatory to the adoption of the FY2017 budget.

[8:07:31 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and facilitated a discussion with the Council regarding various aspects of the Plan. Councilmember Maughan wondered if there are opportunities to improve the Plan. He suggested that all skill sets for City employees are not equal and it may be better to pay different classifications of positions at a higher or lower percentile of the market. He stated some positions are harder to fill than others and he may want to pay a higher percentile for 'at risk' positions. Discussion centered on the benchmarking practices highlighted in the Plan, with a focus on the cities that the City directly competes with.

[8:22:27 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee stated it may be necessary to amend the Plan to clarify the maximum merit increase amount an employee can get each year as a result of recent action taken by the Council. Mr. Bovero stated he can adjust language in the Plan to indicate the maximum merit increase will be 2.3 percent; however, he has concerns about including a maximum merit increase or cap in the Plan. Merit increases are the primary way an employee will move through their wage scale and the amount previously discussed and decided upon was a result of research that indicated that with the percentage increases possible, it would take an employee 18 years to move through their wage scale. If the maximum merit increase is 2.3 percent, only the top employees will get through their wage scale in 18 years while others, even good employees, will get through their wage scale in up to 25 years. This led to a discussion regarding appropriate merit increase amounts, with several Councilmembers expressing concerns about providing too great of raises that will result in an employee reaching the top of their wage scale too soon, which would result in them seeking employment elsewhere in order to receive more money.

[8:28:44 PM](#)

City Council Work Session  
April 26, 2016

**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 8:46 p.m.

---

Terry Palmer  
Mayor

---

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC  
City Recorder

Date approved: July 12, 2016