

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on May 10, 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
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
Fire Chief Eric Froerer
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Police Chief Garret Atkin

The purpose of the Work Session was to review the agenda for Council business meeting to begin at 7:00 p.m.; discuss and review the formatting of Syracuse City utility bill; discuss and review the Syracuse City Purchasing Policy; review the following items forwarded by the Planning Commission: Criddle Farms Subdivision, Preliminary Plat Approval and requested fee waiver for General Plan/Zone change, Proposed Ordinance 16-15 amending the Syracuse City General Plan Land Use Map related to 4.7 acres located at 1972 S. 2000 W., Proposed Ordinance 16-15 amending the zoning map of Title 10 of the Syracuse City Code by changing from A-1 (Agriculture) to R-2 (Residential) the parcel of property located at approximately 920 S. 4000 W., review agenda item 12: Proposed Resolution R16-24 authorizing the Mayor to execute a Real Estate Purchase Contract (REPC) related to property located at 507 West 2700 South; review agenda item 13: Authorize Execution of Professional Services Contract for review of unbilled or mis-billed utility services; review agenda item 14: Proposed Resolution R16-11 approving amendments to the bylaws of the Syracuse City Arts Council; review agenda item 15: Proposed Ordinance 16-09 amending Chapter 4.35 of the Syracuse City Municipal Code pertaining to City Parks and Trails; review agenda item 16: Proposed Resolution R16-26 forming an ad hoc committee to advise the Council on the issue of park design.; and discuss Council business.

[9:10:30 PM](#)

Agenda review

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

[9:10:51 PM](#)

Discussion and review of the formatting of Syracuse City utility bill.

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained the City currently has a utility bill that collects all city utilities and the North Davis Sewer District utility. The City Council has shown interest in modifying the utility bill to show it as a dual bill and to add the North Davis Sewer District logo to the bill. Here are some options that we are looking at:

- Option 1: - Change description on utility line to say North Davis Sewer District.
- Option 2: - Put an * next to the sewer charge and have a box below that has the NDSD logo and have it say something like “North Davis Sewer District charges. For questions please call 801-825-0712.”
- Option 3: - Split the top of the bill to have a dual bill with both logos. It could say something like “Syracuse City and North Davis Sewer district combined bill”. You could put the NDSD logo to the right of the wording.

We have provided an example of a revised utility bill for your review. This is only a draft and could be changed and modified as the council wishes.

[9:10:56 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated that he appreciates the options provided by staff and he would like to incorporate option two, but that it may be possible to combine options one and two and incorporate them on the utility bill. Discussion among the Council and staff centered on formatting of the utility bill, with Finance Director Marshall indicating he will consider the feedback provided by Council to include information on the bill to differentiate between City charges and charges from the NDSO.

[9:14:59 PM](#)

Discussion and review of Syracuse City Purchasing Policy.

A staff memo from the Finance Director explained the City last completed a comprehensive review of the purchasing policy on July 8, 2014. I have attached our latest version of the policy for your review. The comprehensive review used the Utah State Auditor's office purchasing policy template as a guide in restructuring the purchasing policy. This document can be found on page 62 in the uniform accounting manual located on the state auditor's website at <http://auditor.utah.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2014/06/Uniform-Accounting-Manual-2014.pdf>. Staff has also compared the purchasing policy with policies used in a few nearby cities and the results of that research is included in the Council packet.

[9:15:12 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo.

[9:15:56 PM](#)

Council discussion of the policy centered on bidding limits and the bid process, with Councilmember Maughan stating he would like to eliminate the requirement for bidders to submit sealed bids for certain projects or purchases. Forcing bids to be sealed can create time constraints for bidders and he would prefer that bidders be allowed to submit electronic bids as well.

[9:21:05 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer suggested that the Council forward additional concerns they have regarding the purchasing policy to Mr. Marshall and Mr. Bovero.

[9:22:07 PM](#)

Review items forwarded by the Planning Commission: Criddle Farms Subdivision, Preliminary Plat Approval and requested fee waiver for General Plan/Zone change.

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

Current Zoning:	PRD
Annexation/Concept Plan Date:	12/10/13
Total Area:	20.61 Acres
Development Agreement Density Allowed:	6.7 units/acre (134 units)
Concept Plan # of Lots:	99 lots
Preliminary Plan # of Lots:	101 lots

Following is the excerpt from the minutes from the April 5, Planning Commission meeting:

COMMISSIONER JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THE PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN FOR CRIDDLE FARMS SOUTH TO ADDRESS THE STATED CONCERNS. (Open Space, Trail location)

4/19/16 -7:44 PM

COMMISSIONER JENSEN MADE A MOTION TO DENY THE PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR CRIDDLE FARMS SOUTH AND RECOMMEND DENIAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL BASED ON THE FACT THAT SPECIFICALLY IT DOES NOT ADEQUATELY MEET THE REQUIREMENTS IN 10.75.040 ADDITIONAL LOT STANDARDS RELATING TO TREES AND LANDSCAPING TO BREAK UP THE LOOK OF THE DEVELOPMENT WITH THE FINDING ADDITIONALLY THAT THE OPEN SPACE AND COMMON SPACE IS NOT OF HIGH ENOUGH QUALITY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT. COMMISSIONER THORSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

7:48 PM

VOTE ON MOTION: ALL WERE IN FAVOR EXCEPT CHAIRMAN VAUGHAN WHO VOTED NAY. MOTION CARRIED WITH A 4 TO 1 MAJORITY VOTE. COMMISSIONER VAUGHAN STATED HE VOTED NAY FOR REASONS BEING BELIEVES THEY HAVE MET ALL THE CONDITIONS. COMMISSIONER JENSEN STATED IT IS ULTIMATELY UP TO CITY COUNCIL IN ANY CASE.

This 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.

An additional staff memo explained the Criddle Farms subdivision is separated into two halves, the "north" half which is 36 acres and the "south" half which is 20 acres. The south half is annexed, has the desired zoning, concept plan, and is at the preliminary plat approval stage. The northern half is not as far down the road for development. It is not currently annexed and the applicant has proposed a general plan map amendment to change from R-1 to R-2. This application was reviewed by the Planning Commission on March 15th and was forwarded to City Council on April 12th with a recommendation for denial. During the City Council meeting on the 12th, an idea was discussed to look at both the north and south zoning together by changing the general plan/zoning map to R-3 for the entire project and create a development agreement outlining the objectives for both parties. This would essentially spread the density more evenly across the project but result in a similar number of development lots while creating a desirable trail amenity for the neighborhood. Both the applicant and city willingly agreed to explore this development option, not as a requirement of approval but as an alternative that could be mutually beneficial. Under this scenario, the applicant would apply for a general plan change from A-1 to R-3 on the north and the current zoning can be designated at time of annexation. For the south parcel, the applicant would submit application for both a general plan and rezone map change from PRD to R3. The fees associated with those three applications would total approximately \$1,500. Permission is requested at this time, for the council to waive the zoning/ general plan map fees associated with the R-3 development scenario.

[9:22:32 PM](#)

City Planner Steele reviewed the staff memos.

[9:23:59 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated the documentation provided to the Council regarding this development indicated that the majority of the concerns expressed by the Planning Commission have been addressed. He asked if that is the case. Mr. Steele answered yes, but reiterated the Planning Commission still recommended denial of the application. They expressed concerns regarding open space and landscaping plans. Discussion centered on the provision of open space in the development and Mr. Steele indicated that the Council could grant approval of the application tonight with the understanding that the City will continue with negotiations with the application relative to a development agreement for the project. Councilmember Gailey stated he has attended Planning Commission meetings during which the plan for this development has been discussed and the plan meets the City's ordinances, with the exception of those items listed in the staff report. He stated that given that the project has met the criteria included in the ordinance, he does not see how the Council could deny the application at this time. Mr. Steele agreed that the project meets the quantifiable criteria in the ordinance; there may be other requirements that are not quantifiable and those are the issues that the Planning Commissions debate of the project has centered on.

[9:30:50 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer stated that the project originally planned for the subject property was planned to be a Planned Residential Development (PRD) and the development agreement for the project included stipulations relative to quality of construction. He asked if the Council will have an opportunity to consider those items at a future date. Mr. Steele answered yes; the initial development agreement calls for an additional development agreement that must include architectural standards, a detailed landscape plan, and an open space plan.

[9:32:38 PM](#)

Mr. Steele asked if the Council is willing to consider a fee waiver for the general plan amendment the applicant would be required to pursue for the project. Discussion centered on that request, with the Council ultimately indicating they are comfortable waiving additional fees as fees were initially paid at the onset of the project.

[9:33:13 PM](#)

**Review items forwarded by the Planning Commission:
Proposed Resolution R16-20 amending the Syracuse
City General Plan and land use map related to 5.21 acres
located at 1972 S. 2000 W.**

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

Location: 1972 S. 2000 W.

Current Zoning: R-2
General Plan: R-3
Requested GP: PRD
Total Area: 5.21 Acres
R-2 Density Allowed: 14 lots (3 lots/gross acre)
PRD Density Allowed: 31 lots (6 lots/gross acre – developer indicated he is proposing only 16)

This property is adjacent to the Craig Estates development. The applicant wishes to join the Craig Estates HOA and extend a similar product onto their property. The HOA president for Craig Estates has shown support for the project. The initial proposal did not include sufficient acreage or access from an arterial street that is required in the PRD zone. For those reasons, the PC forwarded a recommendation for denial. The City Council reviewed the project and tabled it to give the applicant a chance to amend their application. The applicant revised their request to meet the minimum acreage and frontage requirements. Before any construction could begin for this project, there are multiple future layers of review that are required. The applicant would be required to submit application and receive approval for current zone change, concept plan, preliminary plan, and final plan. Now that the applicant meets the minimum acreage requirements, it is a legislative decision of whether or not this land use and density is desirable at this location.

[9:33:26 PM](#)

Mr. Steel reviewed the staff memo and emphasized the only issue before the Council this evening is the General Plan amendment and the Council should not be considering the design of a potential subdivision at this time. This decision is a legislative decision regarding a requested land use. The Planning Commission initially recommended denial of the application based on the property size, but they have since recommended approval since the size of the property has been increased.

[9:37:29 PM](#)

**Review items forwarded by the Planning Commission:
Proposed Ordinance 16-15 amending the zoning map of
Title 10 of the Syracuse City Code by changing from A-1
(Agriculture) to R-2 (Residential) the parcel of property
located at approximately 920 S. 4000 W.**

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

Location:	920 S. 4000 W.
Current Zoning:	A-1
Proposed Zoning:	R-2
General Plan:	R-2
Property Acreage:	23.1 Acres
Permitted Maximum R-2 Density:	3 units per acre
Potential Gross Units with R-2 Zoning:	69

Following is the excerpt from the minutes from the May 3 Planning Commission meeting:

COMMISSIONER DAY MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 920 S 4000 W FROM A-1 TO R-2 RESIDENTIAL. COMMISSIONER JENSEN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

The applicant has requested a rezone from A-1 Agriculture to R-2 Residential with the intention of developing a residential subdivision in accordance with the allowances in the R-2 Zone. The surrounding area is zoned R-1 and R-2 with development that complies with the densities allowed in those zones. There are 2 roads stubbed into the property at 4 locations (Killarney Drive and 3695 West). The development will be required to connect these roads. This would provide the majority of the neighborhood easier access to Rock Creek Park.

[9:37:51 PM](#)

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo.

[9:39:29 PM](#)

Review agenda item 12: Proposed Resolution R16-24

authorizing the Mayor to execute a Real Estate Purchase Contract (REPC) related to property located at 507 West 2700 South.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the City's Transportation Master Plan has identified the need to expand 500 West, including the road to the East of a residential property located at 507 W. 2700 S. An opportunity to purchase the property through amenable terms has arisen. The property owner has informally agreed to the sale of the property to the City for \$150,000.00. Approval of this Real Estate Purchase Contract, and authorization to execute all necessary, subsequent documents in order to complete the land transfer, will permit the City to move forward with the acquisition. Obtaining property under these circumstances is favorable to both parties; the land owner need not complete otherwise required upgrades to the property, and the City need not relocate a family or resident as part of the future widening project or pay for the increased value of those upgrades which the property owner would otherwise make. As we mentioned in our April 12 memo, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended the acquisition. By approving this resolution, you will authorize the Mayor to sign the REPC and all other documents necessary in order to complete the property sale. We anticipate that the transaction will be completed quickly after receiving your approval.

[9:39:42 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed the staff memo. Council discussion briefly centered on the road widening project that is cause for the property transaction.

[9:43:02 PM](#)

Review agenda item 13: Authorize Execution of Professional Services Contract for review of unbilled or mis-billed utility services.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the City recently posted a Request for Proposals for companies to help identify unbilled or misbilled utility services (specifically, culinary water). As its name suggests, utility services which are either misbilled or unbilled will result in some people inappropriately getting free or reduced price water. These can arise from inadvertent actions, such as mistaken connections by homebuilders, or they can arise from deliberate actions such as homeowners intentionally bypassing the meter, using unmetered hydrants, or similar schemes. ISI Water Company provided the only response to the City's RFP. They are an experienced company with a record of analyzing utility data and assisting in correcting misbillings based upon both accidental and intentional conduct. It is proposed that the Council authorize the Mayor to execute an Agreement with ISI Water Company, consistent with the terms provided by that company in its proposal. ISI proposes that it share in increased revenues associated with accounts after corrective action is both recommended and taken, for three years from the date of correction. It proposes that it receive 60% of the increased revenue. As this is a performance-based proposal, ISI would only receive compensation if its information led to actual revenue generation from the identified account. Ultimately, the cost of misbilled or unbilled service is passed along to all other users of the water system. Thus, implementing this service may serve to postpone rate increases as the cost of delivery continues to rise. The agreement will be terminable after a short amount of time, such as one year, if the City is not satisfied with the service or if it proves to be administratively burdensome. By approving this resolution, you will authorize staff to draw up, and the Mayor to sign, an agreement with ISI to provide this service, consistent with the general terms provided in the proposal.

[9:43:13 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo.

[9:45:18 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated he likes the idea of addressing the problem of mis-billing, but the proposal indicates that action to collect for unbilled services will be applied retroactively and he is not sure how that can happen. Mr. Roberts stated that retroactive billing would only be considered in the event there is evidence someone has intentionally tampered with equipment to skew billing data. For all other instances, billing amounts will only be adjusted going forward.

[9:46:19 PM](#)

Councilmember Anderson asked if it will be possible to require the consultant to report when they find cases of overbilling. Mr. Bovero stated he will confer with the consultant regarding that matter.

[9:46:59 PM](#)

Councilmember Bolduc inquired about the sharing of private information of utility users with the consultant. Mr. Roberts indicated the contract calls for some information sharing, but confidentiality measures are included in the agreement.
[9:47:46 PM](#)

Continued high level Council discussion centered on the terms of the agreement, with the Council ultimately concluding they would like Mr. Bovero to visit further with the consultant regarding revenue sharing terms included in the agreement.

[9:53:18 PM](#)

Review agenda item 14: Proposed Resolution R16-11 approving amendments to the bylaws of the Syracuse City Arts Council.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained The Syracuse Arts Council previously prepared draft amendments to its by-laws. They have since revised their requested amendment. A previous staff memo (March 8, 2016) went through the changes included in their last request. Rather than highlight all amendments, I will highlight the differences between this amendment and the one previously submitted. For easy reference, the document uses a different color to highlight recent changes.

- The Arts Council’s second objective has been further redacted to remove the phrase “workshops and other appropriate means.” (Art. II, § 1(B)).
- The third objective has replaced “engage in and subsidize” with “encourage and sponsor,” and also removed a redundant provision that says they will comply with the law. (Art. II, § 1(C))
- Provides that votes to remove board members must take place in a public meeting, although discussions of competence may take place in a closed session. (Art. IV, § 3)
- Allows Board to appoint Interim Board Members while the appointment process moves forward with the Mayor and Council. As discussed in Council meeting, this would be limited to up to 20% of the vacant Board positions. (Art. IV, §5)
- Elimination of distinction between Working Funds and Permanent Funds. (Art. VII, §2)
- Broadens scope of offering by replacing the term “plays” with the term “shows” or “productions.” (Art. IX, § 1; Art. XIII, § 1)
- Removes the goal of fostering the enjoyment of production staff (Art. XIII, § 1(E)).

The other recommended amendments have not been modified.

[9:53:33 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo and summarized the changes to the bylaws document. Councilmember Maughan stated the Arts Council has reviewed the recommended changes as well and they are comfortable with them. Discussion briefly centered on the section of the document that specifies that no member of the Arts Council group should have the ability to profit in relation to their position, with Mayor Palmer indicating that due to lack of time it will be necessary to conclude discussion of the matter during the business meeting.

[9:58:16 PM](#)

Review agenda item 15: Proposed Ordinance 16-09 amending Chapter 4.35 of the Syracuse City Municipal Code pertaining to City Parks and Trails.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained during a Council meeting last year, the Council and staff discussed several provisions of City code which apply to parks, trails and city-owned open space. This spurred potential amendments to the code to address some of the issues raised during Council meeting. As we were amending the chapter, we identified numerous other potential amendments and provisions for which we require policy direction. This memo – while not exhaustive – will identify the major changes or requests for direction located in the draft changes.

- Rulemaking authority & barring groups/individuals - § 4.35.020 & 4.35.030(D)
 - The Council has reserved the right to promulgate rules and to make a decision of whether to bar an individual or group from making reservations at facilities. These are tasks which could be delegated to the Parks & Recreation Director, City Manager, or another city official.
- Smoking - § 4.35.040

- Current code does not list smoking as unlawful in city-owned parks, trails or recreational facilities. The City may prohibit smoking, if it wishes to do so.
- Nuisances - § 4.35.060
 - Current code includes some ambiguous terms which arguably could lead to suppression of protected speech under the constitutions of both the United States and the State of Utah. It is recommended that the language punishable under City code be limited to threats. Obscene or lewd acts are only prohibited if they fall under well-established state laws.

The current code also prohibits people from loitering while under the influence of alcohol or drugs (this is not limited to illegal drugs in the code), or who disturbs park users by soliciting, making undue noise, or engaging in disruptive activities. It is strongly suggested that this provision be amended to prohibit only aggressive soliciting, as an outright ban against soliciting in a public forum is likely unconstitutional. Multiple courts have upheld similar bans against aggressive solicitation – which refers to a person following, touching or pervasively antagonizing the person being solicited. It is unclear to what type of conduct “disruptive activities” refers, and it is recommended that this be removed, as well.

Staff also recommends putting a timeframe for the park to remain quiet, regardless of whether the park is open at this time. We have recommended quiet time between 10 PM and 7 AM.

- Trespass Notices - § 4.35.065
 - When individuals violate the rules of the park, a citation does not prohibit them from returning the next day and committing the same offenses. This section expressly allows peace officers or the Parks Director to issue trespass notices against those who repeatedly violate rules, who are threatening, or who violate state laws.
 - The public generally have an interest in not being unlawfully excluded from a park. In order to provide lawful trespass notices, there must exist a right to appeal the decision to a neutral decision-maker. If we lacked this level of basic administrative review, then there exists the possibility that this would be deemed a due process violation. Due process exists to ensure that no improper motives were involved in the decision to ban someone from the park. As an example, an employee who banned an ex-spouse from the park out of spite would be properly reversed by an appeal, as would an official who banned someone for belonging to a certain political party or on the basis of race, gender, national origin or religion.
- Signs & Advertising - § 4.35.080
 - This change is also necessary to remove the blanket prohibition against solicitation.
- Animals - § 4.35.090
 - A minor amendment is recommended, as this would prohibit anyone from allowing their animals to come close to trees or shrubs, rather than only prohibiting the actual damaging of those plants. A small amendment also expands the prohibition against trapping, shooting, poisoning or injuring animals to include all animals, rather than just wild animals.
- Personal Profit or Gain - § 4.35.120
 - Current code prohibits someone for reserving park areas and multi-use spaces for personal profit or financial gain. This policy could be re-visited in order to capture additional revenue from those who wish to make reservations of city facilities for financial gain. For instance, if a person wanted to rent the Jensen Pond Nature Center in order to hold a seminar for prospective clients, this would be prohibited by the ordinance. Rather than prohibit the use, the City could establish a separate fee for business uses of City facilities.
 - If the City wishes to retain the prohibition, then it should also consider whether non-profits or charitable organizations are similarly barred from holding fund-raisers at city facilities. This would arguably fall under the term “financial gain.”
- Hours of Closure - § 4.35.130
 - Staff recommend closing hours to be from dusk until dawn, rather than between midnight and 5:00 am. Although this results in opening hour adjustments throughout the year, it encourages park users to leave when night-time hours have set in. This rule does not apply to trails, or to areas which are posted with different hours, such as the Jensen Nature Pond (which allows for around-the-clock fishing). It also would not apply to scheduled events or city events (such as the Pumpkin Walk).
- Park Availability - § 4.35.140

- This recommended change makes it clear that facilities may be closed due to the season and maintenance needs, rather than limiting reservations to specific dates. It also indicates that facilities for rent may be identified by referring to the Consolidated Fee Schedule. A further amendment requires organized sports teams to reserve and pay for City facilities. Team practices and games have a significantly greater impact on fields.
- Entertainment & Similar Activities - § 4.35.150
 - A recommended addition makes it clear that we are not prohibiting free speech events, protests or other First Amendment protected activities in public parks, which are considered public fora.
- Skatepark - § 4.35.190
 - These changes remove the prohibition related to bikes or scooters in the skatepark. It requires users to follow the rules, and encourages individuals to report dangerous conditions to the City.

When it comes to safety equipment, staff recommends that ordinance only strongly recommend the equipment. The underlying reason for this recommendation is that city staff do not have sufficient resources to enforce that type of rule. If the city cannot enforce the rule, then it is not recommended that we adopt a rule which could potentially open the city up to liability for negligent supervision. The specific violation section has been removed, but a chapter-wide enforcement section is added later, which still includes skateparks.

- Trails - § 4.35.210
 - We recommend a more succinct statement regarding Council establishment and termination of trails.
 - We also recommend removal of the prohibition on alcohol and drugs – not in order to encourage their use on trails – but due to it being duplicative of the rule already provided in section 4.35.040.
 - We further recommend that city officials be permitted to post signs on the trail, and that we provide an exception for medical emergencies that impede or obstruct the trail.
- Equestrian Park - § 4.35.220
 - As above, we needn't repeat the ban on alcohol, drugs or gambling, in light of section 4.35.040.
- Violations – Penalty - § 4.35.230
 - This proposed section makes any violation of park rules an Infraction. By state law, any infraction may be punished by up to \$750, but does not carry with it the possibility of jail time. Alternatively, the City could impose up to a \$1,000 fine for violations of city code.
 - The section makes it clear that the city could pursue other remedies, such as injunctions, trespass notices, or both administrative and criminal actions.

[9:58:48 PM](#)

Parks and Recreation Director Robinson and City Attorney Roberts reviewed the staff memo and the proposed changes to Title Four of the City Code and Council discussion of the proposal centered on park reservations and policing of reservation activities.

[10:05:30 PM](#)

Review agenda item 16: Proposed Resolution R16-26 forming an ad hoc committee to advise the Council on the issue of park design.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained The City Council may create subcommittees of an ad hoc nature to advise the Council generally. Two councilmembers have requested the formation of a Park Design Committee, which would function on an ad hoc basis. As such, there will not be a need to adopt an ordinance or go through more rigorous processes associated with standing committees, commissions and boards. Details as to the membership, scope, and length of time for service should be established by the Council in its resolution. A draft resolution with basic provisions and its anticipated scope is included in the packet. The resolution will need to be finalized between the Work and Regular sessions if you wish to take action on it during the May 10 meeting.

This item was not discussed during the work session meeting.

[10:05:52 PM](#)

Council business

The Council had a brief discussion regarding the format of City Council meetings, with Councilmembers Lisonbee and Maughan suggesting that the Council no longer hold a work session meeting on the second Tuesday of the month in

City Council Work Session
May 10, 2016

favor of convening in a business meeting only that will begin at 6:00 p.m. They also suggested that the meeting schedule on the fourth Tuesday of the month be maintained, but that the Council reserve the option of holding a special business meeting on those evenings to deal with pressing items.

The meeting adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: June 14, 2016