

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on June 28, 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

The purpose of the Work Session was to hear public comments, hear a request to be on the agenda by Dan Aamodt of Lone Peak Events re: Ghost Town Triathlon; receive a presentation from a vendor for water utility service review agreement, review the formatting of the City utility bill, have a discussion regarding the Utility Rate and Cost Allocation Policy, have a discussion regarding the Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal Year 2017 Employee Compensation Plan, have a discussion regarding a Master Planned Community Zone in connection with Woodside Homes annexation petition and subsequent development, discuss proposed updates to Code Enforcement regulations, and discuss Council business.

[6:01:55 PM](#)

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

[6:03:48 PM](#)

Public comments

There were no public comments.

Council member Maughan suggested the agenda be amended to move item G ahead of item J. Mayor Palmer accepted the suggestion and declared the agenda amended.

[6:04:46 PM](#)

Request to be on the Agenda: Dan Aamodt of Lone Peak Events re: Ghost Town Triathlon.

Mr. Aamodt approached the Council and indicated the Ghost Town Triathlon held in Syracuse City the second Saturday in May was a great success and he wanted to thank the Council, Mayor, and City staff for allowing Lone Peak Events to hold the event within the City. He stated that his grandparents were longtime Syracuse residents and he has fond memories of the City and a great personal connection to it. He stated he plans to continue to hold the event in the City each year from this point forward, but he would like to rename it so that it bears the name of his grandparents, Ralph and Jetta Walker.

Councilmember Anderson asked why the event was called the Ghost Town Triathlon. Mr. Aamodt stated that the event was previously held near the ghost towns in Tooele; thought it was relocated to Syracuse this year, Lone Peak Events still had memorabilia with the Ghost Town Triathlon name and logo and they wanted to use it this year before changing the name of the event.

[6:07:45 PM](#)

Presentation by vendor for water utility service review agreement.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that while at the International City Management Association conference last September, I met Ron Phillips from The Water Company of America. We discussed a service that they provide, which is similar to the scope of work outlined in the RFP. The idea for this service came from that discussion. In summary the RFP outlines the following scope of work:

- The selected contractor reviews the City's utility billing accounts and, usually with the assistance of software-based analytics, identifies possible problems in the City's water system. Typically, the software identifies anomalies in the billing accounts that flag a potential problem, whether it is a leak in a valve, a faulty meter, or other similar problem.
- Based on the analysis, the specific locations in the field are investigated to see if there is, in fact, a problem.
- Based on the findings, the problems are addressed by the City, and the difference between the recaptured revenue from the fix and the historical revenue is measured.
- The selected contractor is paid only from the recaptured revenue, typically a percentage of the recaptured revenue for a specified number of years. The RFP is set up so that the City has no up-front cost or risk.

This service is designed to improve the operational efficiency of the City's water system, and discover hard to find problems in the system in order to ensure the system is operating appropriately. The memo indicated that during the previous Council discussion of the contract the Council focused on the following issues:

- Confidentiality Assurance: Through discussion with the contractor, safeguards will be put in place to protect the confidentiality of utility customers. Safeguards come in the form of filtering out sensitive information before providing data to the contractor, as well as contractual obligations against use of personal information.
- Require Notice of Overbilling: The contractor has agreed to notify the City of any anomalies that indicate a situation where a customer might be overbilled.
- Fee: The original proposal from the contractor included a 60% fee on all new revenue obtained from the study for 36 months. Prior to consideration of a change in the fee, the contractor requested an opportunity to explain the scope of work, and the work involved.

[6:07:54 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo.

[6:10:08 PM](#)

Steven Hooper, Representative of Water Company of America, used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide the Council with an overview of the service his firm would provide to the City if the Council authorized execution of the proposed agreement.

[6:20:31 PM](#)

The Council engaged in discussion with Mr. Hooper regarding the implications of the proposed agreement and the service to be provided, with a focus on policy decisions the Council would need to make relative to collection of lost revenues found by Water Company of America. Discussion also centered on the frequency of which City staff has found water connection issues that have resulted in lost revenue to the City. The local representative for Water Company of America relayed to the Council the experiences other cities in Utah have had through their relationship with the firm.

[6:27:36 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero revisited his memo and discussed the amendments that have been made to the draft agreement to address the concerns raised by the City Council relative to confidentiality, overbilling, and the fee charged by Water Company of America. Council discussion focused on the fee and Council members engaged in negotiations with Mr. Hooper relative to the lowering of the fee charged by the firm. Council member Maughan proposed a 50-50 split rather than a 60-40 split that favors Water Company of America. Mr. Bovero clarified that Water Company of America receives 60 percent for a 36 month period, but after the expiration of the agreement the City will receive the full amount of new revenue. Mr. Hooper stated that he would be comfortable reducing his share to 50 percent if the length of the agreement were extended. Council member Maughan stated that type of arrangement is more defensible to the residents of the City.

[6:45:16 PM](#)

Review formatting of 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. Below are some of the options staff has considered:

- Option 1: - Breakout NDS and Syracuse City into separate subtotals.
- Option 2: - Breakout NDS and Syracuse City into separate subtotals. Add headers for each entity.
- Option 3&4: - Put an * next to the sewer charge and have a box below that has the NDS logo and have it say something like “North Davis Sewer District charges. For questions please call 801-825-0712.” Different locations are provided.

Staff has provided examples of revised utility bills for Council review; the examples are simply drafts that could be modified at the direction of the Council.

[6:45:32 PM](#)

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo and the four optional utility bills included in the Council packet.

[6:48:23 PM](#)

The Council briefly discussed the optional formats, offering support for a hybrid of options two, three, and four. Mr. Marshall stated he will send the final version of the utility bill to each Councilmember via email. Councilmember Maughan stated that regardless of the reformatting of the utility bill, a public education component regarding the breakdown of utility costs is needed.

[6:50:42 PM](#)

Discussion regarding Utility Rate and Cost Allocation Policy

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that since January, the Council has discussed the issue of pricing internal services, and whether utility rates should be set at a rate that covers all of the direct and indirect costs of the service. As directed by the Council, a draft policy is attached for your consideration. The draft is a working document that will serve as a basis for the discussion of policy on June 28th. The purpose of the discussion is to determine what the Council feels is the best policy for the City, as it relates to this issue. The Council has discussed several options related to whether utility user charges should cover all costs, or whether tax revenue should be used to off-set the utility rates. In previous discussions, the Council favored a policy that allows the City to use tax revenue to pay for a portion of the utility expenses. There has been a policy discussion centered on the City “donating” administrative services at no charge, or at a reduced charge. Another policy discussion centered on the Council’s ability to use tax revenues to fund capital projects for utilities. While either of these approaches, or a combination of both, can be adopted by the Council, the attached working draft focuses on the Council’s ability to use tax revenue to fund capital projects and debt costs.

[6:50:55 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his memo and provided an overview of the draft policy and explained how the policy could be implemented to fund ongoing capital improvement projects.

[6:58:43 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan indicated that it was his understanding that the Council wanted to see a policy that would allow for one time transfers from enterprise funds for project needs rather than a policy that would provide an ongoing allocation or transfer for the same purposes. Mr. Bovero stated that the Council can shape the language of the policy as they see fit; the Council must decide between enacting a policy that calls for transfers as a standard practice or on an as-needed basis.

[6:59:21 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee stated it is her recollection that the Council discussed crafting the policy in a manner that the allocation would be based upon direct costs and that no funding or transfer amount would be allocated for indirect costs, such as Administration overhead associated with management of the utility divisions and oversight of enterprise funds. Discussion centered on options for amending the draft policy to incorporate the desires of the Council relative to ongoing allocation practices, with Councilmember Lisonbee stating she would like for the policy to carry the City through the life of the system to cover infrastructure replacement costs.

[7:04:52 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated he would like to consider options for making the enterprise funds self-sufficient before addressing a long-term policy addressing internal allocations. Councilmember Lisonbee agreed. Councilmember Maughan stated that he understands the root of the draft policy, but he would like to create a lasting policy that will carry the City forward rather than just addressing the City's current position. He noted he would like to take a step back and review the status of each enterprise fund as well as the charges to each fund, such as Administration overhead. He added he would like the policy to include triggers that can be identified by the Council to indicate when it is necessary to increase utility rates as such a policy would be more defensible to the residents. Mayor Palmer pointed out that failure to appropriately compensate the General Fund for overhead costs associated with management of the enterprise funds in the City will create a deficit in the General Fund, which could result in the need to increase property taxes. Councilmember Maughan stated he would be more comfortable evaluating the need for a policy if he truly understood the status of each individual enterprise fund; he does not have a clear understanding of the status of each fund. Councilmember Lisonbee indicated that the status of each fund has been reviewed by the Council as a whole and that data has been provided to the Council. Mr. Bovero stated that he can facilitate a review of each enterprise fund over a series of work session meetings; this would include direct and indirect costs as well as the status of each fund.

[7:14:12 PM](#)

Councilmember Gailey stated Ogden City has developed a policy under which they add 17.5 percent to direct costs of operating each enterprise fund in order to cover administration overhead; the fees in that City are based on that policy. He stated he is not opposed to considering something similar. He would also like for the City's policy to include a trigger that, when met, would indicate it may be necessary to increase utility rates. Mr. Bovero agreed, but acknowledged Councilmember Maughan's desire to gain a more clear understanding of the status of each enterprise fund. He added the current policy does not dictate a tax increase or utility rate increase; it even gives the Council the option to use surplus monies for capital purchases.

[7:17:07 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee stated that the Council should not be considering a policy on the basis of when it is appropriate to raise taxes or fees; rather, the policy should dictate how the City functions and the Council can choose any number they are comfortable with to cover administrative overhead associated with management of the enterprise funds.

[7:21:50 PM](#)

Councilmember Anderson stated that she would like for the language in the policy to be better defined in order for it to be interpreted correctly in the future. She suggested defining direct and indirect costs.

[7:22:56 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero stated he will edit the policy according to the feedback received this evening and provide it for continued review during the next extended work session meeting.

[7:23:05 PM](#)

Discussion regarding Master Planned Community Zone in connection with Woodside Homes annexation petition and subsequent development

A staff memo from Community and Economic Development (CED) Director Mellor explained Woodside Homes is in the process of annexing over 200 acres into the city – the property they will develop is in a unique location on the south side of the WDC alignment (the highway is on track for a 2022 construction). The development that the developer is proposing doesn't fit any zone that we have in ordinance. In exchange for working with the developer to craft a zone that maximizes the development potential of the site – the developer is proposing handing over free-of-charge 50 acres to the city. This is land we would use for a city park (this in addition to the nearly 1.5 million dollars we would collect in park impact fees across the life of the project). There are many different avenues that we can take to accomplish setting up the development criteria, and in reviewing how these opportunities were handled across the state historically - it is staff's recommendation to craft a new zoning ordinance specifically applicable to this real-estate. This new zoning ordinance would go hand in hand with a development agreement and development plan both of which will layout in great detail what the property is entitled to build – and specify the standard to which the developer must build to. The memo concluded staff is asking that the Council instruct the Planning Commission to begin reviewing the new zoning ordinance, and begin the process of bringing the new ordinance to the Council requesting that the Planning Commission follow the schedule outlined therein.

[7:23:19 PM](#)

Mr. Mellor reviewed the staff memo. He emphasized that the Master Planned Community Zone would only be applied to the property that Woodside is pursuing annexation on.

[7:28:42 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee inquired as to the legal implications of creating a zoning designation for one property only. City Attorney Roberts stated that in order for a developer to secure the zoning they must enter into a development agreement and adhere to strict development standards; these details must be addressed before the zoning is assigned to a property. He stated that other property owners could apply for the same zoning and the Council would follow the same process that is laid out in Mr. Mellor's memo. Councilmember Lisonbee indicated she believes the minimum property size for the proposed zone should be 100 acres. She added she feels additional detail is needed to specify design and development standards for the zone. She also indicated she feels density should be addressed in the zone language. Mr. Mellor stated the document included in the Council packet is a very rough draft and additional work must be done by staff and the Planning Commission before a final version will be available for Council review. The Council engaged in high level philosophical discussion regarding the implications of creating the Master Planned Community Zone and ultimately directed staff to refer the item to the Planning Commission for a formal recommendation back to the City Council.

[7:45:24 PM](#)

Councilmember Gailey wondered if the Council will need to take formal action to open the General Plan in order to assign a potential new zoning designation to the subject property. Mr. Mellor stated staff will work to address that issue and ensure that any action taken is procedurally legal according to current ordinances in place.

[7:48:51 PM](#)

Introduction of proposed updates to Code Enforcement regulations

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained that in consultation with two Councilmembers in a working group, he has assembled some changes to the code enforcement regulations. Staff anticipates bringing this item to the July 12 Business Meeting, and would appreciate any proposed edits to that section prior to its inclusion in that packet. The memo drew the Council's attention to the following main points of amendment:

1. Parking vehicles/trailers/boats in side/back yards .

Code currently provides that a person may not park a motor vehicle, trailer or boat in a front yard area, "or on areas not improved for parking." SMC § 10.40.030(C). This requires individuals who wish to park a vehicle or trailer to do so on hard surfaces or gravel.

It is proposed that the following be done:

- Allow parking in side yards – without hard surfaces – in residential zones only, so long as the vehicle is no closer than 20 feet from the road, and does not stick out beyond the plane of the front of the house (side yard is defined as beginning at the plane). Special requirement applies for corner lots – fencing.
- Prohibit parking on unpaved surfaces for non-residential properties (businesses, industrial, etc.)
- Specifically exempt tractors which are in use and parked in A-1 zones
- Allow back yard parking of operable vehicles, trailers, boats, RV's, etc. in residential zones without requiring parking improvements.
- Restoration permits are limited to 2 per address, instead of per resident

If passed, this will be a significant change in code enforcement. Ken Sessions has received multiple complaints vehicles being parked in unimproved back yards, which are visible from neighboring properties.

As this section is included in the Zoning Code, it must be referred to the Planning Commission for their input, and I anticipate adding it to their July 5 meeting.

2. Outdoor storage, construction waste, dumpsters

It is proposed that in addition to "solid waste," which is a term which invites argument by those having codes enforced against them, that the code declare it a nuisance to accumulate household items, indoor appliances, indoor furniture or equipment, construction waste, and demolition waste on property which is visible from the public street. A common response to an allegation that a person is storing solid waste in their yard is that it is not waste, but is valuable property. This removes that argument unless the equipment is designed for outdoor use. Thus, a refrigerator

would be a violation, while a natural gas grill would not. A set of patio furniture would be permissible, while an old couch would not.

It is also recommended that allowing dumpsters or temporary storage containers on residential lots be limited to 30 days, unless the work being performed is pursuant to an active building permit.

3. Additional restrictions for heavy and long vehicles

It is recommended that two categories of heavy vehicles be created: one for vehicles over 50,000 pounds or longer than 24 feet, which can be parked in residential zones for no more than 2 hours (as per current code); and one for vehicles between 10,000 and 50,000 pounds, or between 20 and 24 feet in length, which can be parked in residential zones for no more than 24 hours (proposed code).

4. Impoundment

In case there was any doubt over whether the City could enforce its parking restrictions by impounding vehicles, this section will make it clear. It permits police or code enforcement officers to initiate tows, which will be handled in accordance with Utah law. The owner of the vehicle will be required to pay the costs of towing and storage. Those who do not pick up their vehicles within a certain amount of time will abandon the title to the tow company.

5. Parking regulation evasion

Every once in a while, a person who is contacted by code enforcement or police about a parking concern will start to “play games” and attempt to violate the spirit of the ordinance, while following the letter. This usually breaks down into fighting over technical definitions and arguments. It is hoped that this parking evasion ordinance will put a stop to this type of behavior. The most common example has been a person who moves the trailer or vehicle a short distance – moving it a few feet or parking it across the street. Another example is a person who hitches a trailer and drives it around the block, only to park it back in the same location.

These types of games demonstrate a misunderstanding of the purpose of our residential parking ordinances. These regulations do not exist in order to ensure that there is ample parking available for other visitors, as you would see in a downtown district. Rather, it is out of safety concerns and aesthetic considerations.

The proposed section would prohibit a person from moving an unlawfully parked vehicle or trailer to another public street within ½ mile of the original location of the unlawful vehicle. It would also prohibit taking a vehicle or trailer away for less than 8 hours, and then returning it to the same location (or one within ½ mile).

It is proposed that in addition to this standing in the way of asserting a defense, it also be punishable as an infraction if the person takes these actions with intent to evade. We would be required to prove that they knew of the regulations, and were attempting to skirt them by taking these actions.

It is likely that individuals will find new ways to evade the regulations (but store their vehicles/trailers on the public roads), so we may be touching up this ordinance again in the near future.

[7:49:05 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed the staff memo.

[7:50:44 PM](#)

The Council discussed the amendments that have been recommended by the working group and offered their feedback for amendments that would provide for smaller properties used for agricultural purposes to be compliant with the ordinance. High level discussion also centered on various types of parking activities that could be considered nuisances by adjacent property owners and Mr. Roberts addressed each issue and explained how the proposed ordinance would apply and be enforced throughout the City. Mr. Bovero added that the City’s Code Enforcement Officer will not to use some discretion when determining what types of activities may be classified as a nuisance. Mr. Roberts then concluded his review of his staff memo and the proposed amendments to the public nuisance ordinance.

[8:08:03 PM](#)

Councilmember Gailey then stated that he has received many complaints about nuisances that exist on property at 2700 South and 1000 West. He stated he has been told that the City has done as much as can be done according to the current nuisance ordinance, but there is still broken concrete and other items on the site. He stated there is also a piece of broken fence that could be very dangerous for kids riding their bikes in the area. Mr. Roberts and Mr. Mellor both indicated they will review the case file for the property and see what can be done to address the ongoing nuisances.

[8:10:35 PM](#)

Discussion of Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal year 2016-2017 Compensation Plan.

8:12:19 PM

Mr. Bovero used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide the Council with the current status of Administration's review and potential amendment of the Policy and Plan. The Recruitment and Retention Policy provides direction to leadership of the City and outlines the responsibilities of all parties, includes the Compensation Plan, and provides performance standards. Any Compensation Plan should have the following four components:

1. Method to determine the pecuniary worth of a position.
2. Determine the level of competitive pay.
3. Define terms whereby employees qualify for wage adjustments.
4. Strategy to maintain competitiveness over time.

The Policy addresses the pecuniary worth of a position in the following section: "The City Manager will propose, and the City Council will have final approval of a list of cities that will constitute the benchmark for comparison of employee compensation. The benchmark cities will include those cities that Syracuse City reasonably competes with for employees. The benchmarks will be adjusted at least every 3 years." Mr. Bovero reviewed an example list of primary and secondary benchmark groups that have been identified to evaluate the pecuniary worth of a position. He also reviewed example benchmark comparisons for the Fire Captain and Planner 1 positions in the City. He then read the following statement from the Compensation Plan regarding the level of competitive pay: "As indicated in the Recruitment and Retention Policy, the City desires to recruit and retain the best employees possible. The City has benchmarked comparable salary and wages within the labor market and in FY2015 the scales for the minimum, mid-point, and maximum were set within the 60th to 70th percentile of the benchmark cities. Wage scales will be compared with the benchmark cities at least every 3 years." He used the same Fire Captain and Planner 1 benchmark comparisons to illustrate the difference between pecuniary worth of a position and level of competitive pay. Mr. Bovero reviewed the language from the Compensation Plan regarding terms for wage adjustments as follows: "Syracuse City has adopted a "pay for performance" ethic, and therefore does not use programmed step increases or cost of living increases based on time of service alone. The City will provide Merit and Career Development increases based on the employee's performance of job duties, as well as for approved improvements in knowledge and skill, for the purpose of retaining excellent employees and incentivizing average employees to become better." He then discussed the terms an employee must meet to be eligible for a merit increase. A performance score of 4.5 to 5 is equal to consistently exceeding expectations; a score of 4 to 4.5 exceeds expectations; a score between 3 and 4 meets expectations; a score between 2 and 3 needs improvement; and a score between 0 and 2 is seriously inefficient and at risk of termination. The Compensation Plan reads: "The eligibility of any bonus or raise is contingent upon a "Meets Expectation" or better, with those scoring in the "Exceeds Expectations" and "Consistently Exceeds Expectations" categories receiving greater amounts, respectively." Mr. Bovero then discussed additional terms for wage adjustments, first starting with the career development program; relative to this program, the Compensation Plan reads as follows: "For each position, the City will pre-approve an outline of optional programs, trainings, certifications, or other similar knowledge or skill enhancement measures. Such optional programs shall be above and beyond the normal requirements of the position, and are meant to further develop the employee in a way that he/she can provide a better, more knowledgeable service to the City. Participation in such program will be at the option of the employee, with coordination from the department head." Employees would have two opportunities to receive career development increases; the first opportunity comes if the employee's current wage is below the midpoint of their wage scale. An employee meeting certain career development criteria could receive up to a 3.5 percent wage increase. The second opportunity could come when an employee is paid a wage above the midpoint of their wage scale and the percentage increase would be the same. If an employee is already paid above the midpoint of their wage scale, they are only eligible for one career development increase. Additionally, positions that qualify for advancement are not eligible for the first opportunity. He used the Finance Director position as an example of how the career development program could be implemented; various preferred career development certificates or degrees have been identified and assigned a defined increase in the event the employee receives such certificates or degrees. He then discussed the difference between promotions and advancements as follows:

Promotions:

Promotions include an upward movement in position that significantly increases the employee's responsibilities and/or supervisory duties. An employee who is promoted will receive an increase to the minimum wage of the entering wage scale, or a 7.5% increase, whichever is greater.

Advancements:

Advancement includes movement to a higher position due to improved skill, knowledge, or capability, but does not significantly increase the employee's responsibilities and/or supervisory duties. An employee who advances to a higher position will receive an increase to the minimum wage of the entering pay scale, or a 3.5%, whichever is greater.

The Council asked questions and had brief discussions throughout Mr. Bovero's presentation to gain clarification on issues like how a percentile is calculated, the opportunity for an individual employee to receive multiple pay increases for different reasons, i.e. career development, benchmarking, and compression, in the same year.

[8:34:45 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated he does not believe the existing Policy and Plan are 'on the wrong track', but he feels there are some areas that should be addressed or corrected. He is very concerned, as he has been throughout the budget process, that City Administration was trying to address multiple wage increases for various reasons in the same budget year. That funding commitment could not be supported in the budget and that type of practice should not be allowed or considered in the future. He stated he has expressed other concerns that may not be shared among the Council, but he feels simple adjustments can be made to make the policy effective. One thing that he does not like about the policy is that it treats all Departments equally. He stated he does not think that is necessary because all Departments are not the same due to their staffing structure. That should be acknowledged and worked within. He likes the idea of performing semi-annual Departmental reviews to allow the Council to address certain Departments and like items within those Departments at the same time. It would be less cumbersome to consider needed adjustments in smaller, absorbable chunks and this will contribute to the health of the City. He stated this would lessen the burden on City Administration and the Council throughout the budget review process each year.

[8:39:15 PM](#)

Councilmember Anderson agreed that the Policy and Plan include several good things that do not need to be changed, but she would like more flexibility when considering when pay increases are needed. She also likes Councilmember Maughan's suggestion to evaluate each Department individually rather than trying to apply the same policy to all employee groups. Councilmember Bolduc agreed. Councilmember Gailey added that there are many unique things about different Departments in the City and he agrees that they should be evaluated individually and more frequently in order for the Council to consider each Department on a case-by-case basis.

[8:46:01 PM](#)

The Council engaged in high level discussion regarding language to be included in the policy relative to benchmarking, employee and Department evaluation, and opportunities for pay increases. This led to a discussion regarding the opportunity for employees to receive a career advancement pay increase. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she does not believe employees should be eligible for a pay increase for a certification or training that the City has already paid for. Employees can apply for a greater position in the City for which the education applies and earn more money that way. She added tuition reimbursement should take place after an employee has received a certification or degree, but the reimbursement should take place over a series of years to incentivize employees to stay with the City for a longer period of time. Mr. Bovero indicated that if the City does not compensate an employee for increased knowledge or a desired certification, another City may. He stated that career advancement pay increases are a standard benefit in both the public and private sector. Councilmember Maughan stated that the usefulness of a new degree or certification could be considered in the bi-annual review of a Department. Councilmember Lisonbee stated that the policy should include language regarding career advancement raises if the Council decides to offer that type of increase, otherwise employees will not seek additional education or certification. If an employee does not have a promise of a pay increase for additional education they will not strive to attain additional education. Councilmember Gailey agreed and stated that the Council could set aside a specified amount of money each year that could be dedicated to career advancement increases. He also stated that he agrees with Councilmember Lisonbee's suggestion that the reimbursement for tuition be spread out over a number of years to incentivize an employee to maintain their employment with the City.

[8:59:49 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee then expressed her concerns regarding the benchmarking practices laid out in the policy. She feels the benchmarking system is flawed and if the City is going to proceed with benchmarking in the future there should be at least two other metrics considered; she used the social security cost of living adjustment as an example of an appropriate metric. She added she feels that benchmarking for a given Department every two years is too often. Councilmember Maughan agreed that additional metrics should be considered when benchmarking, but he would like to have additional discussion regarding appropriate metrics or market indicators. He added he would like the Council as a whole to determine the criteria that should be used to evaluate each Department.

[9:05:11 PM](#)

Councilmember Gailey stated that he likes Councilmember Maughan’s idea to review Departments on a bi-annual basis and he likes Councilmember Lisonbee’s idea to use different metrics to consider benchmarking for employment positions in the City. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she is concerned about bi-annual Department reviews as performing employee valuations more regularly would be burdensome for Department Heads.

[9:06:47 PM](#)

Discussion then centered on the way forward and the process the Council and Administration will follow to amend the existing Policy or develop a new one in its place. The Council determined to schedule a special meeting on July 15 at 2:00 p.m. to continue discussion of the issue.

[9:12:08 PM](#)

Council business

The Council and Mayor provided brief reports regarding the activities they have participated in since the last City Council meeting.

The meeting adjourned at [9:18:27 PM](#) p.m.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: August 9, 2016