

Minutes of the Regular meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on September 13, 2016 at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

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

City Manager Brody Bovero
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

Excused: Mayor Terry Palmer

City Employees Present:

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

[6:03:43 PM](#)

1. Meeting Called to Order/Adopt Agenda

Mayor Pro Tem Gailey called the meeting to order at [6:04:09 PM](#) p.m. as a regularly scheduled meeting, with notice of time, place, and agenda provided 24 hours in advance to the newspaper and each Councilmember. Councilmember Lisonbee provided an invocation. Councilmember Bolduc led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

[6:06:00 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO REMOVE ITEM FIVE FROM THE AGENDA AND ADOPT THE AGENDA WITH THAT CHANGE. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[6:06:26 PM](#)

2. Presentation of the Syracuse City and Wendy's "Award for Excellence" to Mary Thorpe and Tanner Kofoed for the month of September 2016.

The City wishes to recognize citizens who strive for excellence in athletics, academics, arts and/or community service. To that end, in an effort to recognize students and individuals residing in the City, the Community and Economic Development, in conjunction with Jeff Gibson, present the recipients for the "Syracuse City & Wendy's Award for Excellence". This monthly award recognizes the outstanding performance of a male and female who excel in athletics, academics, arts, and/or community service. The monthly award recipients will each receive a certificate and be recognized at a City Council meeting; have their photograph placed at City Hall and the Community Center; be written about in the City Newsletter, City's Facebook and Twitter Feed, and City's website; be featured on the Wendy's product television; and receive a \$10 gift certificate to Wendy's.

Mayor Pro Tem Gailey noted both teens receiving the award for September 2016 were nominated by the staff of Legacy Junior High School.

Mary Thorpe:

It is an honor to recommend Mary Thorpe for the Syracuse City and Wendy's Award for Excellence. Mary is a delight to be around. She excels in the classroom and in the arts at Legacy Junior High School. Mary has been an influential member of the Musical Theater program during 7th and 8th grade, with roles in both Xanadu and Beauty and the Beast and will be involved in Shrek Junior as a 9th grader during the 2016/2017 school year. Along with her academic excellence and musical and theatrical talents, Mary stands out among her peers because of her optimistic, pleasant demeanor. Mary is positive, friendly, organized, and dependable. She is committed to her school work, dedicated to her values, hard-working and a positive role model. She is compassionate and friendly to her teachers and peers. Mary has many friends and is inclusive of all. She is quiet, kind, a natural leader who simply radiates kindness, enthusiasm, and professionalism. For these reasons, I highly recommend Mary for this recognition.

Tanner Kofoed:

I am pleased to nominate Tanner Kofoed for the Syracuse City and Wendy's Award for Excellence athlete and scholar of the Month because of his leadership, academics, and contribution to the Legacy Boys

basketball team. Tanner showed great leadership while playing on the varsity basketball team when on several occasions we lost closed games. Instead of complaining and sulking, he sought to lift other up and instill a spirit of resilience to finish the games strong and to prepare for the next opponent. He is an excellent example of a student athlete because of his strong academics and his high level of basketball play. His strong basketball skills and decision making ability on the court contributed heavily in winning games that placed Legacy Jr. High into the playoffs last year, for the fifth year in a row since I have been there. For these and other reasons, I am pleased to nominate Tanner for this Award for Excellence.

[6:15:01 PM](#)

3. Proclamation declaring September 15, 2016 as Hunter Woodhall Day in Syracuse City

Mayor Pro Tem Gailey asked City Recorder Brown to read the Proclamation declaring September 15, 2016 as Hunter Woodhall Day in Syracuse City for the record. Ms. Brown read the proclamation as follows:

WHEREAS, Syracuse resident and Syracuse High School Student, Hunter Woodhall, will be participating in Track and Field sporting events in the Rio 2016 Paralympic Games; and

WHEREAS, Hunter captured the bronze medal during the 2016 United States Paralympic Team Trials in the 200 meter and 400 meter events; and

WHEREAS, During the 2015 Paralympics Track & Field National Championships, Hunter took second place in the 400-meter event and fifth place in the 200-meter event; and

WHEREAS, Hunter won his first State title in the 400-meter event as a junior during the Utah High School State Championship in 2016; and

WHEREAS, Hunter served as an ambassador for Shriner’s Hospital from 2012-2013, representing thousands of children who receive care at the facility and his motto is “they told me I would never walk, so I learned to run instead”.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Mayor Palmer, Mayor of the City of Syracuse, Utah, do hereby proclaim **SEPTEMBER 15, 2016** as

HUNTER WOODHALL DAY

in the City of Syracuse, Utah, and I urge all citizens to celebrate Hunter’s efforts and successes as an athlete and valuable resident of our community.

[6:16:28 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE MOVED TO ADOPT THE PROCLAMATION. COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

[6:17:25 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan noted that Mr. Woodhall has improved upon his accomplishments since the proclamation was drafted; this week he medaled in the Rio Paralympic games; he is so proud of what Mr. Woodhall has done and the manner in which he has represented the City.

[6:17:51 PM](#)

Mayor Pro Tem Gailey stated there has been a motion and second to adopt the proclamation and he called for a vote;
ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[6:17:55 PM](#)

4. Request to be on the agenda: Utah Municipal Clerks Association to recognize City Recorder Cassie Brown for receiving her Master Municipal Clerk (MMC) designation.

An administrative staff memo explained the leadership of the Utah Municipal Clerks Association (UMCA) has requested time on the agenda to recognize City Recorder Brown for receipt of her MMC designation.

[6:18:19 PM](#)

UMCA President and Layton City Recorder Theida Wellman approached and also introduced UMCA Membership Director, Teresa Harris. Ms. Wellman stated the UMCA Board would like to recognize City Recorder Brown for achieving the Master Municipal Clerk (MMC) designation; it took Ms. Brown several years to receive the designation, which is equivalent to a bachelor's degree. There are 247 cities in the State of Utah and the UMCA has 250 members; of those 250 members, 74 have received the Certified Municipal Clerk (CMC) designation – which Ms. Brown accomplished previous to receiving her MMC – and there are just 39 MMC's in the State of Utah. She noted Ms. Brown is part of an elite group of City Recorders and the education she has received not only helps her, but it helps the community. The job of City Recorder is an intensive job and she could not do it without the support of the Mayor and City Council. She concluded by recognizing other City Recorders in attendance this evening: Cindi Mansell, Salt Lake City Recorder; Tracy Hansen, Ogden City Recorder, and Lisa Tittensor, Clinton City Recorders. She presented Ms. Brown with a plaque memorializing her MMC designation and a gift from the UMCA Board.

[6:22:35 PM](#)

Ms. Brown thanked the City Council for their support. She also thanked the other City Recorder's in attendance this evening; one great thing about the position of City Recorder is the network of relationships she has had the opportunity to build and many City Recorders have been mentors and great friends to her. She also recognized her family in attendance and thanked them for their patience and support as she has served as a City Recorder for the past 15 years. She thanked the UMCA Board for their recognition.

[6:23:18 PM](#)

Mayor Pro Tem Gailey stated that the Council recognizes the value Ms. Brown brings to the City and he thanked the UMCA Boar for recognizing her efforts.

[6:23:33 PM](#)

5. Request to be on the agenda: Mark Spalding re: Goliath Race.

This item was removed from the agenda.

[6:23:44 PM](#)

6. Approval of Minutes:

The following minutes were reviewed by the City Council: Work Session of July 26, 2016; Special Meeting of July 26, 2016; Regular Meeting of August 9, 2016; and Special RDA Meeting of August 9, 2016.

[6:24:01 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES LISTED ON THE AGENDA.
COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[6:24:18 PM](#)

7. Public comments

Gary Pratt stated that over the past eight years he has been very active in the City and over that time he has heard residents speak about two main issues: preventing the development of high density housing and industrial land uses in the City. The General Plan of the City has been centered around these desires; it is a very important document and is essentially an agreement between the City Council and their constituents. The City Council is responsible for the doctrine in the General Plan and when they are executing their responsibilities they must know what the Plan says. He asked each Councilmember to ask themselves if they have read and understand the General Plan; the Planning Commission and Planning staff should be asked the same. In his recent attendance at meetings he has felt that many have not read and do not understand the General Plan. Recent actions relating to Planned Residential Development (PRD) developments are not in line with the PRD requirements of

the City. The PRD ordinance was written specifically for the Stoker Garden’s development and other developments should not be approved if they do not conform with the ordinance. He concluded that he submitted a document to the City Council regarding actions that were being taken by the former Community and Economic Development (CED) Director; that person was doing the same thing the current CED Director is doing, which his misrepresenting the PRD zone; they leave things out and miscommunicate things to the Planning Commission and City Council that lead to improper actions. The only person that has the document in her hands is Councilmember Lisonbee.

[6:29:03 PM](#)

Kevin Homer referenced the Hunter Woodhall proclamation and stated it is an awesome recognition. He noted that Mr. Woodhall won a silver medal in the Paralympic games, but he is very concerned about an IRS levy – or victory tax – that will be levied against anyone winning a medal. The tax is thousands of dollars and he suggested the City monitor the issue and possibly create a “Go Fund Me” account where members of the community can make a contribution to aid Mr. Woodhall in paying the atrocious tax.

[6:30:49 PM](#)

8. Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval, Jackson Court, located at approximately 1958 S. 2000 W.

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

In the August 23rd Work Session the City Council requested the following:

- Widen the trail connection from 2000 W to 8 feet
- Place a trail through the common space to the south of the development for public access.
- Clearly mark amenities on the plat
- Place language in the Development Agreement that specifically states that the developer must construct the private drive to at city standard that will be verified through core sample tests reviewed by the Syracuse PW department.
- One side of the private drive shall be clearly marked no parking and called out on the plat.

The amended Development Agreement and Preliminary Plat include these changes required by the council and are attached to this document.

[6:31:03 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

[6:32:39 PM](#)

Council discussion centered on the classification of the street that will be used to access the development, with Mr. Mellor noting that the plat included a typographical error that will be corrected to read “private drive”. He stated that the road will be maintained privately, but will be open to public access. Councilmember Anderson stated there is no definition for “private drive” in the City Code and she is concerned about assigning a title that is not clearly defined. Mr. Mellor stated that the Code does include the term “private driveway” and the Council could assign that title to the road. City Attorney Roberts added that Title Eight of the City Code includes the term “residential driveway” and this term could be assigned to the road; a residential driveway allows for shared driveways. He added the Planning Commission is considering a Code amendment that would limit the number of homes that can be accessed with a residential driveway, but since there is currently no restriction in the City Code, the Council can approve the plat with the road being called a residential driveway with no fear of setting a precedent.

[6:42:16 PM](#)

Discussion briefly centered on the Planning Commission’s recommendation; Mr. Mellor noted that the body recommended approval when they took action on the application. Councilmember Maughan stated he is concerned about the process that was followed to arrive at that recommendation and noted that several Planning Commissioners have expressed concerns about the project though they supported a positive recommendation. Councilmember Lisonbee agreed the process that was followed to consider this project has not been a smooth one; she has had concerns about the project, but she understands the property is unique and design of a project that will fit on the property has been difficult. She pointed out the Craig Estates Homeowners Association (HOA) is supportive of the project, the developer has worked to address the Council’s concerns, and Mr. Roberts is of the opinion that the project conforms with City Code. She suggested the Council proceed with approval so long as the reference to the street on the plat

can be changed to “residential driveway”. Mr. Mellor agreed and noted that the feedback offered by the Planning Commission following their favorable recommendation is highly irregular and should not be occurring; this is an issue the Council should address through appointments to and training of the body. Councilmember Maughan addressed the Planning Commission Chairman and asked that he charge the Planning Commission with simply deciding whether an application conforms to City Code; some members indicated that they did not feel the project conforms with City Code, yet they voted in support of the favorable recommendation and that can lead some to believe their decision was political in nature.

[6:46:33 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC MOVED TO GRANT PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT APPROVAL FOR JACKSON COURT SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1958 S. 2000 W., SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT AND WITH THE DIRECTION THAT THE ACCESS ROAD BE CLASSIFIED AS A ‘RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAY’. COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

[6:47:43 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts suggested that the Council invite feedback from the developer regarding whether he can comply with the conditions listed in the staff report.

[6:47:51 PM](#)

Developer Mike Waite stated that he is willing to comply with the conditions and to title the access road a “residential driveway”.

[6:48:10 PM](#)

Mayor Pro-Tem Gailey stated there has been a motion and second to grant preliminary approval and he called for a vote; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN, WHO VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

[6:48:43 PM](#)

Councilmember Maughan stated his no vote is not based upon the project, but on the flaws in the process. Councilmember Lisonbee stated there has been much debate about the project, but she feels it is a good use of the property and it complies with City Code.

[6:49:48 PM](#)

9. Final Subdivision Approval, Hamblin Haven Phase 2, located at approximately 3230 W. 2700 S.

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

Location:	3230 W. 2700 S.
Current Zoning:	R-1
General Plan:	R-1
Total Subdivision Area:	1.18 acres
Preliminary Approval:	August 8, 2016. Recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on September 6, 2016.

The applicant has requested approval of a 2 lot subdivision phase known as Hamblin Haven Subdivision Phase 2 in the R-1 Zone. The dimensions of these lots are as follows:

Lot	Zone	Lot Size (R-1 12,000 Sq. Ft. Min.)	Lot Width (R-1 100 Ft. Min.)	Existing Structures to Remain
201	R-1	26,068	201.26	None
202	R-1	26,068	201.26	None

As is shown, all proposed lots meet the requirements of the R-1 Zone. The City Code restricts block length to 1,320 feet. The current length of 3230 West is approximately 635 feet. Adding the width of these properties will make the street approximately 835 feet. If future phases are added with lots of the same dimensions, the maximum block length would be reached before 2 additional phases could be added. This is included for the record as part of this report to anticipate the provision of a cross-street in the future as a cul-de-sac would not be permitted because 3230 West is longer than 500 feet. This is the maximum road length permitted by the City Code to terminate into a cul-de-sac. The block length and need for a cross-street does not affect the current proposed plat. This analysis was included for future reference. Because the proposed plat meets the intent of the General Plan, the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, is part of a previously approved preliminary plat, and is consistent with the existing development in the area, planning staff recommends approval of this final plat.

[6:49:56 PM](#)

CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

[6:51:57 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE MOVED TO GRANT FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT APPROVAL FOR HAMBLIN HAVEN PHASE 2, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 3230 W. 2700 S. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[6:52:19 PM](#)

10. Public Hearing: Authorize Administration to dispose of surplus property.

An administrative staff memo explained several City Departments have indicated they have surplus property to dispose of. Below is a list of items for which Departments are seeking approval to dispose.

FIRE DEPARTMENT:

Sharp MX-3501 Multifunction Fax/Copy/Scan machine

JUSTICE COURT

Pd6500 Walk Through Metal Detector.

ADMINISTRATION

HP Designjet 800 Plotter

PARKS & RECREATION

102 Football helmets

73 Baseball helmets

2 Baseball bats

[6:52:27 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed the staff memo.

[6:53:14 PM](#)

Mayor Pro Tem Gailey opened the public hearing. There were no persons appearing to be heard and the public hearing was closed.

[6:53:17 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO AUTHORIZE CITY ADMINISTRATION TO DISPOSE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY. COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

[6:55:06 PM](#)

COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE MOVED TO ADD A THIRD PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD TO THE AGENDA FOLLOWING THE FINAL ITEM TO DISCUSS THE EMPLOYEE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION POLICY AND FISCAL YEAR 2017 EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION PLAN. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN WHO VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

[6:53:54 PM](#)

11. Public comments

TJ Jensen stated he wanted to follow up on earlier comments made by Mr. Pratt. He indicated that when the Stillwater Estates project was approved there were a number of recommendations by staff that made things difficult for the Planning Commission and City Council and the City Council ultimately felt they were backed into a corner and had to approve the project to avoid a lawsuit. Many issues were created by staff working with the developer and the developer felt they were vested by that work; once a developer is vested, it is difficult for the City to deny their application. The Jackson Court PRD is another example of this type of issue; it does not meet the City Code and does not have direct access to an arterial road. He stated this is not the sort of business the City should be in and Councilmember Maughan's comments about the process were accurate; the Planning Commission dropped the ball and they should not have vote in favor of something that does not meet the ordinance. He feels staff is falling into lazy habits; they should be very careful when handling applications and all they should do is determine whether an application meets submission requirements. Any work the staff does beyond that point is pushing the City into vesting territory and that is a dangerous place to be. He suggested the staff, Planning Commission, and City Council receive training regarding this issue very soon.

[6:58:49 PM](#)

Gary Pratt stated the City has been pinned down legally relative to project vesting; years back the Stillwater Estates development was declared non-conforming. The State was asked to weigh in on the project and they did not disagree that the project did not meet City Code; however, they indicated that the fact the CED Director got some key votes through the Planning Commission and City Council led the project to be vested and the City could not make a change at that point. He stated the discussion tonight regarding the classification of the road in the Jackson Court development is troubling; the bottom line is that the project does not meet City Code and should not have been approved. He reiterated his earlier comments regarding the PRD ordinance and emphasized it was written for Stoker Gardens; the Jackson Court development does not meet the requirements of the ordinance. He stated the last two Mayors have 'dumbed down' the Planning Commission to the point that they come to meetings and 'fly by the seat of their pants' with no historical reference upon which to base a decision. They rely upon the CED Director and City Attorney and most of the City Attorneys the City has employed over the past eight years have had no land use experience. The City Attorney employed prior to the current City Attorney could not defend the City against the Stillwater Estates developer.

[7:02:07 PM](#)

12. Councilmember reports.

At each meeting the Councilmembers provide reports regarding the meetings and events they have participated in since the last City Council meeting. Councilmember Bolduc's report began at [7:02:19 PM](#). She was followed by Councilmembers Anderson, Gailey, Maughan, and Lisonbee.

13. Mayor's Report.

Mayor Palmer was not present to provide a report.

[7:09:19 PM](#)

14. City Manager report

City Manager Bovero's report began at [7:09:27 PM](#).

[7:11:06 PM](#)

The meeting recessed to allow the Council to convene in the large conference room to hold discussion regarding item 15. The meeting reconvened at [7:22:04 PM](#).

[7:22:27 PM](#)

15. Discussion of Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal Year 2017 Employee Compensation Plan (in conference room).

A staff memo from City Manager Bovero explained that pursuant to August 23rd meeting, the Council requested that he summarize the items discussed in the meeting to assist in continued discussion of this issue. The memo referenced an outline of the main components of the policy in a summarized format. The items in **blue** were discussed at the August 23rd meeting. The items in **red** are concepts for the Council's consideration, that are based on comments made during previous discussions. The memo concluded he has attempted to propose something that captures the various issues expressed by the Council over the last four to five months. This draft is for discussion purposes and at this point is not yet refined enough to constitute a recommendation on staff's part.

[7:22:41 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and facilitated a discussion regarding the items listed in the summary document as follows:

Benchmark

- Every 4 years, departments are on a rotating schedule
 - Yr 1: Police, Fire
 - Yr 2: PW, Park & Rec
 - Yr 3: CED, IT
 - Yr 4: Courts, Finance

Wage Scales

- 60th percentile (see comment)

- Wages adjusted every benchmark (4 yrs), along with wage scale adjustment, if Council approves. This comes in the form of an increase in the percentage that the employee is eligible to receive in the annual merit increase evaluation.

Example: The Council adopts a 2% budget for merit increases. The benchmark for Employee 'X's position shows an overall increase of 1.5% in the wage scale since the last benchmark. Therefore, an employee is eligible for his/her regular merit increase, and a maximum of an additional 1.5% depending on his/her evaluation score.

Biennial Review

- Every 2 years, each department conducts in-depth review of operations, issues, direction, and goals with the City Council.
 - Yr 1: Police, Fire, Park & Rec
 - Yr 2: PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance
- Any wage abnormalities, such as wage compression, or other special wage adjustments will be discussed as a part of the departmental review.

Merit Increases

- Average percent increase of benchmark cities/companies from previous year is set aside for merit increases.
 - Administration of merit increases is performed by City Manager under direction of the Mayor, subject to performance scores of employees. No single employee may receive more than 1.5 times more than the budgeted percentage set aside for merit increase without Council approval.
- Example:** Council adopts a 2% budget for merit increases. No single employee may receive more than a 3% (2% x 1.5) merit increase, unless approved by the Council.

Evaluation System

- **Scoring System:**
 - 4.5 – 5 -> Max 1.5x the Avg
 - 4 – 4.49
 - 3.5– 3.99 -> Target group for Avg merit increase
 - 3– 3.49
 - 2– 2.99 -> No merit increase at 2.99 or below
 - 0 – 1.99
 - Scores of 3.5 – 3.99 will be targeted to earn a merit increase equivalent to average percentage budgeted. Higher scores can earn higher merit increases, up to the maximum allowed; lower scores receive lower amounts. The City Manager can adjust merit increases to account for differences in how each evaluator scores his/her employees, as a means to level the scoring system.
- Example:** Council adopts a 2% budget for merit increases. Scores at 3.5 – 3.99 would be targeted to receive a 2% merit increase. An employee above a 4.5 score could receive up to 3% (2% x 1.5), and an employee near a score of 3 could receive about 1%.

Advancements

- Employees that advance to higher position move to the bottom of new scale, but at least 1.5 times the percentage set aside for merit increases (This provides a raise equivalent to the maximum allowed under the merit increases). Nevertheless, the ultimate minimum increase for advancement is 4%. Employees are not eligible for merit increase for year of advancement.
- Example:** Council budgets a 2% budget for merit increases. Employee X reaches advancement, and his/her current wage is already higher than the bottom of the scale for the new position. He/she would receive a 3% increase (2% x 1.5). However, since this is below 4%, the employee would receive 4%. He/She would not receive a merit increase for that year.

Promotions

- Employees that are promoted to a position with more responsibility move to the bottom of new scale, but at least 2.5 times the percentage set aside for merit increase. Nevertheless, the ultimate minimum increase for promotion is 9%. Employees are not eligible for merit increase for year of promotion.
- Example:** Council adopts a 2% budget for merit increases. Employee X is promoted, and his/her current wage is already higher than the minimum of the new higher position. He/She would receive a 5% increase (2% x 2.5). However, since this is below 9%, the employee would receive 9%. He/she would not receive a merit increase for that year.

There was a focus on benchmarking practices and frequency as well as adjustments to be made based upon benchmarking, conditions that will trigger benchmarking, employee evaluations and reviews (scoring system) and departmental reviews, the rate at which an employee can move through their wage scale, funding sources for employee compensation, the percentile at which the City's wage scales should be set when compared to wage scales in benchmark cities, the idea of setting money aside to accommodate for growth in the City, development of a comprehensive staffing plan to accompany the compensation plan, and career advancement pay increases and tuition aid.

10:15:22 PM

16. Public comments

TJ Jensen stated that he understands the different positions explained by Councilmembers regarding their desires for an employee scoring system, but noted that there is nothing more frustrating for employees than hearing from the City Council that they cannot offer pay increases though the City has an excess of money in its surplus fund each year. He stated this can seem disingenuous and the employees feel that the Council is simply refusing to fairly compensate them. He noted that he likes the idea of connecting the compensation plan to the economy rather than using a subjective policy that is up to the Council's discretion each year. Tying the plan to the market offers some predictability and consistency for the employees, especially those that plan to work for the City until they are able to retire. He suggested that a trigger be included in the plan to call the Council to action in the event that the City's surplus fund balance dips below 17 percent. At this point the Council should have the discretion to reduce employee increases.

At 10:18:32 PM p.m. COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: October 11, 2016