

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on August 23, 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 regarding the creation of a Disc Golf Course at Rock Creek Park, discuss and review of Preliminary Subdivision Plat, Jackson Court, located at approximately 1958 S. 2000 W. (continued from August 9, 2016), discuss the proposed creation of a Residential Planned Community Zone, discuss proposed amendments to Title Ten of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to Planned Residential Development zoning, discuss the Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal Year 2017 Employee Compensation Plan, receive introduction of potential amendments to Title Four of the Syracuse Code pertaining to secondary water, discuss the Utility Fee and Cost Allocation Policy, and discuss Council business.

[6:03:35 PM](#)

Councilmember Bolduc led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. Mayor Palmer provided a thought and an invocation.

[6:06:53 PM](#)

Public comments

TJ Jensen stated that the Planning Commission has submitted a recommendation regarding proposed amendments to the Planned Residential Development (PRD) zone, but he feels there are a couple of loose ends that need to be addressed; first is related to street connectivity in PRD developments and second is the number of units that can use a shared private driveway. He noted that when the Planning Commission indicated that they wanted road cross-sections to meet the City's cross-section, it may be easy to be confused about pavement width; developers may reduce their pavement width, but it is imperative that the City require a 60-foot right-of-way in the event the City assumes responsibility for the road at any point in the future.

[6:08:41 PM](#)

Gary Pratt stated the underpinnings and history of the City are found in the General Plan. Last year a committee spent a considerable amount of time updating the Plan, but it is concerning to him that it appears there are some members of the City Council or staff who have not read the General Plan document. He addressed a recent ordinance change relating to cul-de-sac lengths; the cul-de-sac lengths in the General Plan were a result of extensive research and he is concerned that the City entertained a request from a developer to change the cul-de-sac lengths without any presentation from staff or an explanation of the basis for the cul-de-sac regulations in the General Plan. He then stated the recent vote to appoint a new Planning Commission flies in the face of reason; one applicant had loads of experience and met the Mayor's criteria for selecting the appointee and the Council chose select another person who admitted he had never been to a Planning Commission or City Council meeting and that he had never read the General Plan. He stated the Council has the right and power to give or withhold their consent for the Mayor's appointment and the fact that they chose the less experienced person is troubling and he wondered if the same decision would have been made for other important positions in the City.

[6:13:33 PM](#)

Request to be on the agenda: Request to create Disc Golf Course at Rock Creek Park.

A staff memo from the Parks and Recreation Department explained Cody Cagle has requested to be on the agenda to bring his proposal to construct a Disc Golf Course to the City Council.

[6:14:13 PM](#)

Mr. Cagle used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide the Council with additional information about the creation of a Disc Golf Course, with a focus on the benefits such an amenity could provide to the community and its residents. He discussed the manner in which disc golf is played and noted it is one of the fastest growing sports in the United States; however, there is not a single disc golf course between Riverdale and Centerville. He also discussed the infrastructure and equipment that would be needed to create a disc golf course in the City and reviewed a map to identify the layout of the course that he would propose at Rock Creek Park. The total cost of creating a course would be roughly \$3,300 and he is hopeful that the City would be willing to partner with him to create the course.

[6:24:42 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan referenced a recent request the City Council entertained to erect a lacross wall in a City park. He noted that the person making that request had secured a corporate sponsor to cover the cost of the infrastructure and materials needed and the City only offered the space for the wall. He stated he believes the City would entertain a similar arrangement for a disc golf course. Mr. Cagle stated he could look into securing a corporate sponsor.

[6:25:21 PM](#)

The Council engaged in brief discussion with staff regarding the proposed use of Rock Creek Park for a disc golf course and how the activity would relate to or conflict with other uses or activities at the Park, with Mayor Palmer concluding that the Council will take the request under advisement and may be in touch with Mr. Cagle for further discussion.

[6:31:35 PM](#)

Continued discussion and review of Preliminary Subdivision Plat, Jackson Court, located at approximately 1958 S. 2000 W. (continued from August 9, 2016).

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

Location:	1958 South 2000 West
Current Zoning:	PRD
General Plan:	PRD
Total Subdivision Area:	5.22 acres

This item was tabled by the Planning Commission on July 19, 2016 for the following reasons:

- The development lacks a direct connection to an arterial.
- The private road within the development does not have curb, gutter, or sidewalk.
- The proposed development is intended to be a phase of the Craig Estates development
- The Planning Commission alleged that private roads are not permitted.
- The development needs to show additional amenities.
- The road layout within the development raised concerns about emergency service access.
- Specific snow removal agreements with the HOA had not been reached.

On August 2, 2016 the Planning Commission voted 6 to 1 to recommend that the City Council approve the revised plans presented during that meeting. Responses to the original reasons for which the item was tabled during the July 19, 2016 meeting are included in this report. These responses are in the format that was presented to the Planning Commission on August 2, 2016. The applicant provided an updated site plan that includes the covered pavilion with seating opposite the grill area in the central common space. There is also a buffer requirement on the northern property line where the project abuts the PO and GC zones. This buffer is not included in the plan but the applicant has indicated that it will be included in final phase iterations of the subdivision. The applicant has requested approval of a 20 lot preliminary subdivision plat known as Jackson Court in the PRD Zone. The dimensions of these lots are as follows:

Land Use	Area (sq. ft.)	Percentage of Total Project Area	Acreage	Comments
Privately Owned Units (20)	48,339 (2.400 each)	28.3	1.11	20' front and 15' rear yard setback compliant. All units separated by 16'.
Private driveways (20)	11,644	5.1	0.27	All are 20' by 20'.

Private road	31,722	14	0.73	Parking areas and turnaround hammerheads provided per IFC requirements.
Public street	15,902	7	0.37	Standard 60' ROW width and 120' cul-de-sac diameter compliant
Open space	71,781	31.6	1.65	Exceeds minimum 30% requirements.
Common space	47,841	21.1	1.09	Exceeds minimum 20% requirements and contains amenities.
Total	227,249	100	5.22	None.

As is shown, all proposed land areas meet the minimum requirements for the PRD Zone. The applicant has also provided a subdivision design document showing the types of housing intended for the development. The home designs are similar to those existing in the Craig Estates neighborhood. The landscape plan provided by the applicant shows various trees which line the public street and generally border the private road. The ordinance requires that landscaping requires that "The aesthetic and landscaping proposals shall provide for trees and shrubs that break up the look of having the same building style duplicated throughout the development and shall be in accordance with the Architectural Review Guide." Trees have been provided between each home along the private road and to the rear of the homes to meet this requirement. Entry landscaping is provided on proposed berms in the central common area to create an inviting space. Trees have also been provided in this space. Existing mature trees are planned to be maintained which will provide shade and aesthetic benefit to the community. A covered gathering area with a grill, counter, and outdoor seating is to be provided in the center of the common space. The applicant has included an example of what this may look like in the subdivision design document. Staff has also been involved in discussions with the applicant and their landscape architect about the types of amenities that will be provided. As landscaping is not considered an amenity, the only amenities are the covered grill area and two benches. During the Planning Commission meeting on July 19, 2016 the Planning Commission expressed concern about the lack of amenities in the subdivision and cited this as a reason for tabling the item. The applicant has since submitted an updated plan that shows the addition of an additional covered pavilion area in the central common area that will house some seating and tables. The applicant has submitted revised plans, additional emergency vehicle access map, and a record of communications with the Craig Estates HOA to address concerns set forth by the Planning Commission in their motion to table the item in the July 19, 2016 meeting. These documents are included in this report. Staff has also researched the various reasons for continuing the item and presents the following responses (concerns listed in italics and responses below each statement):

- The development lacks a direct connection to an arterial.*
 SCC 10.75.040(A)(7) "Minimum lot standards" states that "The development design shall include a direct connection to a major arterial, minor arterial, or major collector roadway."
 The only road that abuts the property and falls within the bounds of the Code is 2000 West which is a major arterial. There is sufficient space to provide a direct connection to 2000 West. This connection may be a private or public road as permitted in the PRD Zone.
 SCC 8.10.070 "Relation to adjoining street systems" states the following: "Street access for new subdivisions shall be established by using the AASHTO Traffic Design Manual calculation of seven and one-half seconds of travel time between street accesses onto existing roadways (which calculated would be 385 feet at 35 mph) unless otherwise recommended by the Planning Commission. The street arrangement must be such as to cause no unnecessary hardship to owners of adjoining property when they plat their land and seek to provide for convenient access to it. Where, in the opinion of the Planning Commission, it is desirable to provide for street access to adjoining property, proposed streets shall be extended by dedication to the boundary of such property. Half streets along the boundary of land proposed for subdivision will not be permitted."
 The speed limit on 2000 West where it abuts the proposed development is 35 miles per hour. Using the AASHTO standard, the City Code establishes a minimum separation of 385 feet for new intersections. When measuring south from 1900 South (shown in red below) and north from 2025 South (shown in blue below), there is no point where the proposed subdivision fronts 2000 West where an intersection may occur that would meet the AASHTO standard. As such, a public street access may not occur from the proposed development to 2000 West without a recommendation from the Planning Commission.
 The speed limit on Craig Lane is 25 miles per hour which requires a minimum separation of 275 feet between intersections (shown in yellow below). The intersection created by 2060 South has a separation distance which approximately overlaps the frontage of the property. Again, a street access may be provided here with a recommendation by the Planning Commission.
 The applicant has expressed that they would be willing to provide access to 2000 West if necessary. However, staff

has also included text in the draft development agreement that would require a traffic study for Craig Lane between the proposed development access and 2000 West, requiring road widening or other mitigation requirements along Craig Lane if a significant traffic impact were predicted.

It is the prerogative of the Planning Commission to recommend that the development access 2000 West. It is also the prerogative of the City Council to approve the development accessing Craig Lane. Due to the AASHTO standard cited in the City Code showing the proximity of 1900 South and 2050 South, and the heavy use of 2000 West, Staff recommends that the property be accessed from Craig Lane.

SCC Section 8.15.010 "Design Standards" Subsection (N) reads: Private streets shall only be permitted in PRD and cluster subdivisions. Private streets shall meet the minimum construction standards established for publicly dedicated streets with the standard right-of-way requirement. Pavement widths less than 35 feet may be permitted, when the private street ties into a minor collector street or greater, and does not terminate in a cul-de-sac. Private streets shall be perpetually maintained by a professionally managed homeowners' association as established within an approved development agreement. The purpose of a private street is not to provide a street which is substandard in construction to public streets, but one that allows for private gated access and maintenance for the exclusive use and benefit of the residents residing on said private street.

The section of this Code stating that "Private streets shall meet the minimum construction standards established for publicly dedicated streets with the standard right-of-way requirement." and "Pavement widths less than 35 feet may be permitted, when the private street ties into a minor collector street or greater, and does not terminate in a cul-de-sac." verify this statement. The private street may not be narrower than 35 feet as Craig Lane is not a minor collector street or greater and a standard cross-section must be utilized.

- *The proposed development is intended to be a phase of the Craig Estates development .*
Some mention was made in the meeting that a rezone of Craig Estates to PRD would be required to include the proposed development as a phase of Craig Estates. There is no current precedent for this or is there a City or State Code that requires it. An example of multi-zoned phasing that has been approved by the City recently is Keller Crossing of which phases 1 and 3 differ in zoning and phase 2 is split into 2 distinct zones. As the PRD Zone and R-2 Zone are both residential zones, just as the R-2 and R-3 Zones which underlie the Keller Crossing subdivision, requiring Craig Estates to be rezoned to include the proposed subdivision as a phase or add-on would be inconsistent.
- *The Planning Commission alleged that private roads are not permitted.*
As stated above in SCC 8.15.010, private roads are permitted in the PRD Zone.
- *The development needs to show additional amenities.*
The applicant has included an additional pavilion with 4 tables across the sidewalk that bisects the central open space of the development. All other amenities remain the same. As there are no explicit requirements for the type, size, or number of amenities within the City Code, the determination of whether what the applicant has provided on the updated plan remains to be determined by the Planning Commission and City Council.
- *The road layout within the development raised concerns about emergency service access.*
The applicant has provided a map showing the design track for a fire truck. The tracks are contained within the paved area of the private road.
- *Specific snow removal agreements with the HOA had not been reached.*
The applicant has provided documentation indicating the specifics of snow removal agreements with the HOA of Craig Estates. Fire hydrants have also been moved to accommodate for snow storage at the end of each projecting leg of the private drive.
The memo concluded all other requirements of the PRD Zone are met by this development.

[6:32:02 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

[6:32:46 PM](#)

Council discussion of the application ensued with a heavy focus on access to the development and the number of homes that can be served by a private driveway. Councilmember Lisonbee emphasized that she is concerned about approving a development that could potentially be dangerous for residents in that the road widths and limited access would make it difficult for public safety officials or first responders to gain access to the development and particularly homes on the far side. This led Mr. Mellor to facilitate a discussion about standard road widths and the number of points of access required based upon the number of homes to be included in any given development.

[6:48:09 PM](#)

Councilmember Lisonbee stated she is not satisfied by calling the access road to the development a driveway because she is concerned that at some point in the future the Homeowners Association (HOA) for the development could dissolve and there will be insufficient funding to improve or maintenance the driveway properly. She stated that the road should be called a road – even if it is a private road – and it must meet certain standards and accommodate public safety and emergency response

access. Mr. Mellor stated that the road is currently classified as a private driveway. Developers Mike Waite and Troy Barber, noted that mechanisms will be put in place to provide for proper maintenance of the road. Mr. Waite added that he will ensure that the road is built to the City's standards. Mr. Barber added that City staff has indicated that the design of the roads in the proposed development comply with City Code. Councilmember Lisonbee stated that the design meets City Code, but it does not meet the Code with certain contingencies that are inherent in the design and that is her concern.

[6:55:31 PM](#)

The Council, staff, and developer engaged in brainstorming regarding changes that would need to be made to the design of the development to address concerns expressed by the City Council. This included options like increasing the width of the private driveway, eliminating park strips or sidewalks, reducing open space in the development, restricting on-street parking in the development, and making the road one-way in direction to provide wider drive widths for emergency vehicles. The Council

[7:10:11 PM](#)

Discussion then refocused on the matter of defining the number of units that can be accessed by a private driveway, with the Council concluding to direct the Planning Commission to consider including a provision in the ordinance to create a standard addressing the issue as well as the type of roads that can be defined as adequate access for a development.

[7:22:22 PM](#)

Mr. Jensen interjected that if the Council desires to create an emergency access onto 2000 West from the development, the entire width of the access road does not need to be asphalted and, rather, a hard surface material could be used to provide a 15 foot drive width for an emergency response vehicle.

[7:23:30 PM](#)

Mr. Mellor summarized the remedies proposed by the Council as follows: widen the trail to eight feet to accommodate traffic in the event of an emergency; install a trail around the grove of trees on the southern end of the property; build the road to a City standard; require one-way traffic only with the other side of the road reserved as a fire zone; reconfiguring fencing between the subject property and existing development; and mark amenities that will be included in the development.

[7:27:01 PM](#)

Discuss the proposed creation of a Residential Planned Community Zone.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City is considering the creation of a new zone which could be used to create a large scale master planned community. The zone would be called "Master Planned Community Zone" or MPC. A master planned community as envisioned, would include smaller lots, but also include ample open spaces and amenities. The zone would allow for flexibility in lot sizes and density to accommodate a variety of housing types that are currently in high demand. On July 5th, 2016 - The Planning Commission discussed the new MPC zone that would allow higher density and smaller lot sizes and expressed discomfort about creating such a zone. On July 19th, 2016 the Planning Commission discussed the new MPC zone and the following is a summary of the proposed changes: Increase minimum lot sizes to 10,000 square feet, 8,000 square feet, 6,400 square feet, and 5,100 square feet so that each category reduces by 20 percent. Increase required common space to 25%. Restrict the private drives to no parking, limit the number of homes on the driveway, and make the widths to be determined by the fire marshal. Reduce minimum acreage to 50 and remove the language about being 'contiguous' and the possibility to 'piggyback' on an existing development. Other changes were discussed related to open spaces, trails, and traffic. On August 2, 2016, after much discussion, the Planning Commission is forwarding a positive recommendation for approval of the attached ordinance. The attached is the motion:

Commissioner Rackham made a motion to recommend for approval to the City Council Title 10 the Residential Planned Community (RPC) zone with the following changes: that the total units add a minimum of 15% on the other lots standards, the dimensions of all shared driveways shall be determined in accordance with current IFC Code, the minimum lot width for the 10,000 be 85 feet, 8,000 be 75 feet, 6,400 be 65 feet. And 5,100 be 55 feet, the minimum side yard for 5,100 be 7 feet, the plan must be developed by an accredited master planner with the concepts and the design for the development, minimum land requirement is 100 contiguous acres, the entire master plan must be presented and approved at the same time and cannot have additional phases added after approval by the city council, major amenities of substantial benefit to the city and approved by the City Council must be provided to the city, property maintenance HOA section will become its own section, requirement added for an architectural review committee to review all exterior structural changes and making these changes to conform with the requirements of what the planning commission believes is the general plan and to keep the character of the city the way the residents would like to see it. The motion was seconded by commissioner Day. Commissioner Thorson and Moultrie voted nay, all other commissioners voted in favor, motion carried with a majority vote, 5/2.

[7:27:26 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council soliciting their feedback

regarding the draft zone document. There was discussion regarding the minimum property size that could receive the zoning designation, minimum lot size within the zone, the impact the zoning designation could have on adjacent developments and property values, amenities to be included in developments with the zoning designation, design standards. The Council debated the minimum lot size for the zone, with Councilmember Lisonbee noting that she will not agree to a minimum lot size less than 3,500 square feet. Mayor Palmer suggested the Council allow staff to work to develop a concept plan for a development with a minimum lot size of 3,500 square feet for review at a future meeting before a decision is made regarding the creation of the zone. Mr. Mellor stated that he can continue to work with Woodside homes regarding their desires for the features of the zone; he will develop a concept plan based on the Council's desire to limit the minimum lot size and the percentage of the lots in the development that can be of minimum size. Councilmember Lisonbee suggested that no more than 25 percent of the development be made up of lots of the minimum lot size, with the majority of the development made up of lots ranging from 5,100 to 5,500 square feet. Councilmember Maughan stated he is opposed to defining those numbers this evening and, instead, he would prefer to take time to research and consider lot sizes and percentages over the next few weeks. Councilmember Gailey agreed. Councilmember Bolduc stated that she believes both desires can be accommodated moving forward. City Manager Bovero stated that he feels the greatest tools the Council has at their disposal is the maximum density to be included in the zone document as well as approval of the design of the development. Councilmember Lisonbee agreed, but it is important for the Council to pay attention to the details of the details of any development that can take place in the zone as well.

[8:39:40 PM](#)

Discuss proposed amendments to Title Ten of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to Planned Residential Development zoning.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained it has been requested that the language for common and open spaces in the PRD zone be examined to ensure that it meets the spirit and intent of the zone. On May 17, 2016, the Planning Commission gave direction to staff during the work session. Multiple ideas were discussed all with the intent to clarify what the common spaces should be like in a PRD development and how to prevent unwanted arrangement of open spaces that favors the developer and not the city or residents. Ideas included removing the open space definition all together to avoid confusion with common space, adding a minimum distance around structures that can be counted towards common space, reducing the required percentage of open space, ensuring that side and rear spaces be excluded from open spaces. On June 7, 2016, a draft ordinance was reviewed in work session. The Planning Commission further discussed the problems that need to be addressed. It was requested that the language further protect the City from 'spaghetti bowl' common spaces, and to ensure an 'open feel' in the development. It was agreed that staff would return with a revised draft. On June 21, 2016, a draft ordinance was reviewed in work session. The Planning Commission further discussed the problems that need to be addressed. It was requested that the language clarify who can access the installed amenities, timing for amenity installation, and the method of calculating the total required open space. It was agreed that staff would return with a revised draft. On July 5, 2016 there was some discussion about bringing back the open space requirement, but the group felt that the revisions as presented were sufficient to remedy the issue at hand. And, finally, on July 19th, 2016, the Planning Commission voted to forward a recommendation for approval to City Council with a small change to increase the common space to 25 percent instead of 20 percent.

[8:39:59 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed his staff memo and indicated he will take direction offered by the Council earlier in the evening that the Planning Commission consider the number of units that can be served by a private drive (the Council's desire is that no more than six (6) units be located on a private drive), the types of access points that can be defined as a road, and the number of access points needed for a development of a given size.

[8:47:09 PM](#)

The meeting recessed briefly and reconvened at [8:56:04 PM](#)

[8:56:24 PM](#)

Continued discussion of Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal Year 2017 Employee Compensation Plan.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that during their August 9, 2016 business meeting, the Council tabled the adoption of the attached draft policy for further discussion. The memo referenced the following materials included in the Council packet for the meeting.

- August 17, 2016 email from Councilmember Bolduc that outlines her research on benchmarking from other cities.
- A second draft policy that includes three edits from the August 9th Draft. These edits were not discussed in a work session but are submitted for the Council's consideration.
 - The first edit provides additional detail on a methodology to provide "like to like comparisons" as stated in the draft policy.
 - The second edit proposes a lifetime maximum career development reimbursement benefit of \$5,000.
 - The third edit proposes an annual maximum budget amount of \$25,000 for the career development reimbursement program.

8:56:43 PM

City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo. He then facilitated a discussion among the Council, with input from staff, regarding the edits that have been made to the draft Policy and Plan. There was a focus on issues such as benchmarking practices, the rate at which employees can move through their wage scale, avoidance of "stacking" pay increases for individual employees, the Council's involvement in the evaluation of employees, development of annual employee increase packages,

9:50:17 PM

and the frequency with which the City's wages should be benchmarked, bi-annual review of City Departments, the value of merit mapping and the rate at which an employee can move through their wage scale based upon performance, employee evaluation practices, budget and policy direction associated with the Compensation Plan, the potential to specify the percentage of tax revenue that would be dedicated to employee wages, the impact the market and the economy can have on employee compensation, the ease of administering one of the two plans that has been proposed, and points relative to given positions to be considered when benchmarking.

Corinne left the meeting at 10:52 p.m.

Introduction of potential amendments to Title Four of the Syracuse Code pertaining to secondary water.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained this summer the City experienced a period of water shortage in which there was insufficient water pressure in the secondary system for many users to irrigate their lawns. Several city officials received reports of wasteful watering practices, even during that difficult time. Although pressures have been restored this year, it is not an unlikely scenario that the City could run into similar problems in future years. It has been requested that staff put together an ordinance which strengthens the City's ability to enforce mandatory watering restrictions and to deter wasteful watering. The accompanying draft presents some ideas for such an ordinance. It is presented to facilitate discussion, and is by no means considered a complete document. It is hoped that over the next few months the draft will be modified until it meets the needs of our community, with an aim of having it in effect by the 2017 watering season.

Major decision points include:

1. The type of conduct considered wasteful
2. The measurement of when acceptable conduct becomes wasteful conduct
3. Appropriate exemptions that do not create inappropriate loopholes
4. Enforcement tools to be employed
5. The severity of enforcement tools
6. Procedure for enforcement and appeals
7. The logistical reality of enforcement – who will do it, how many hours will it take, and what will be its cost?

Staff does not anticipate a lengthy discussion during this work meeting, considering the other items on this full agenda. Further, as it is late in the watering season, any changes would have no effect this year. It is hoped that this will spur thoughts and discussion among constituents, and that the Council and staff can have a robust discussion on the topic during the September Work Session.

Mr. Roberts reviewed the staff memo.

Discussion regarding Utility Fee and Cost Allocation

Policy.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that pursuant to the July 2016 work session, the following policy is presented before the City Council for your consideration. The draft policy creates a policy of the City when determining utility fees and the allocation of costs associated with providing utility services. The draft policy stipulates that utility fees will be set at a rate that covers the direct operational, capital improvement, and debt service costs, and at least 50 percent of the indirect operational costs. Indirect operational costs are the general administrative services provided to the utilities from the General Fund. Under this draft policy, approximately \$311,000 would not be reimbursed to the General Fund from the utilities. That money would stay in the utility funds. To enact this policy as drafted, the budget would need to be amended, and there would need to be a reduction of approximately \$311,000 in the General Fund.

City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo.

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 11:15 p.m.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: October 11, 2016