

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on September 23, 2014, at 6:07 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Brian Duncan
Mike Gailey
Craig A. Johnson
Karianne Lisonbee
Douglas Peterson

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

City Employees Present:
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
City Attorney Clint Drake
Police Chief Garret Atkin
Community Development Director Sherrie Christensen
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson

The purpose of the Work Session was to swear in Syracuse Youth Court members; receive public comments; hear a proposal to amend the newsletter delivery schedule; discuss energy efficiency options for secondary water system; discuss proposed ordinance 14-23 amending Title 8 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to the subdivision process; and discuss Council business.

6:08:10 PM

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

6:08:55 PM

Proposal to amend newsletter delivery schedule

A staff memo from the Community Development Department explained currently the City sends a bi monthly, 12-page, one color newsletter to each household and business in the City. Costs for the newsletter include \$11,389 dollars a year for printing from Thrive Press in Kaysville and \$6,660 per year on postage costs; the City has a bulk mailing permit with the USPS. Approximately 30 hours of staff time is used to produce each issue of the newsletter. The City sells advertising in the newsletter and on average there is about \$400 worth of advertising in each issue. The total cost to produce the newsletter, minus advertising revenue, is \$19,248 dollars per year. Staff's proposal is to convert the newsletter to a monthly, 4 page one color newsletter. The 4 pages would be printed front and back on one 11x17 piece of paper. The 11x17 paper is then folded in half. Cost to print a 4 page monthly newsletter is \$7,560 a year. The city utility bill, for which the City already pays postage, has a maximum weight of 2 oz. The 11x17 sheet of paper would be added to the same envelope as the utility bill without additional postage cost. In fact, in addition to the newsletter and utility bill, there would still be excess capacity in the same envelope to include local advertising or the yearly water quality report. For those citizens that do not receive a monthly utility billed mailed to them and instead receive the bill electronically, they would be delivered an electronic pdf copy with their utility bill email. The memo further explained many other local cities follow this strategy for their respective newsletters. In addition to printing and postage cost savings, the 4 page newsletter would use less staff time for design and mailing. Changing the newsletter to this new format would save the city approximately \$11,688 per year. A sample design for the shorter newsletter is included for review. The text in the sample design is filler text for demonstration only. Also included below is a cost estimate comparison table.

Newsletter Cost/Year				
	Now	Proposed	Difference	
Printing (one color)	\$ 11,388.66	\$ 7,560.00	-3,828.66	
Postage	\$ 6,659.64	\$ -	-6,659.64	
Staff Time	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 2,400.00	-1,200.00	
Subtotal	\$ 21,648.30	\$ 9,960.00	-11,688.30	
Advertising	-2,400.00	-2,400.00		
Total	\$ 19,248.30	\$ 7,560.00	-11,688.30	

(Sources: June/July newsletter printing and postage receipts. Price quote from Freedom Mailing for 4 page newsletter.)

The memo provided a list of benefits associated with the proposed four-page format:

- More concise
- Monthly edition more current
- Less cost
- Higher visibility because residents have to open their utility bill
- Design allows a larger font size (easier to read for seniors)
- Less paper waste
- Efficient use of postage
- Less staff time used

Staff is requesting support from the Council to convert the newsletter to the proposed format.

[6:09:13 PM](#)

Community and Economic Development Director Christensen and City Planner Steele summarized the staff memo and addressed general questions regarding the proposal asked by the Council and Mayor. The Council and Mayor ultimately offered their support for the proposal and Mr. Steele concluded he will begin working to convert to the new format for use in the next newsletter mailing cycle.

[6:16:42 PM](#)

Swear in Syracuse Youth Court Members

City Recorder Brown administered the oath of office for newly selected Syracuse City Youth Court members.

Youth Court Advisor Lori Smith stated this is her second year as Advisor and she is very excited to work with such a great group of kids.

[6:22:13 PM](#)

Discussion regarding energy efficiency options for secondary water system.

A staff memo from City Manager Bovero explained on average, the City spends approximately \$130,000 per year on electricity for the secondary water system. This charge is largely due to the cost to run the City’s pumps, which pressurize the secondary water system. As we have discussed with the Council in previous meetings, the City’s Secondary Water Fund is in a level of distress that needs to be addressed in order to ensure the Fund’s solvency going into the future. In an effort to realize savings, and therefore provide relief to the Secondary Water Fund, we reached out to Mark Cram with Siemens for advice on ways the City could save energy. Mr. Cram has worked with the City before, including the recent switchover to energy efficient street lighting, which is saving the City approximately \$65,000 per year in electrical charges; he will present, in general terms, the various avenues the City can use to save energy on our secondary water system. The memo concluded the staff proposal is for the Council to evaluate potential avenues for the City to reduce energy usage and thereby realize a savings in the annual operations of the secondary water system and instruct the Administration on which avenues the Council would like to explore.

[6:22:31 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and introduced Mr. Cram. Mr. Cram used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to review potential secondary water system enhancement opportunities that could aid the City in realizing a savings on the

operation of the system. He and Public Works Director Whiteley addressed general questions from the Council throughout the presentation.

The Council discussed the opportunity to meter secondary water and Mayor Palmer indicated the City has promised the City's residents that such metering would never be implemented. He stated he is not interested in considering the option. Councilmembers Duncan, Johnson, and Lisonbee agreed.

Mr. Cram continued his review of his PowerPoint presentation, highlighting different secondary water energy efficiency options. There was a focus on watering restrictions and requesting that residents only water at night to reduce the energy costs associated with pumping water during the day. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she feels ongoing education of the City's residents relative to the function of the City's secondary water system coupled with a recommended watering schedule would be very valuable in lowering the usage of secondary water by the City's population. Mr. Whiteley stated that would be ideal, but with no recourse for violating the water schedule there will always be residents that do not follow it. Councilmember Duncan wondered if it would be beneficial to invest in additional water storage capacity to balance water throughout the City and equalize pressure; this would reduce the wear and tear on the secondary water pumps. This led to discussion about opportunities for securing property that would accommodate an additional secondary water pond.

Mr. Cram then concluded his presentation and Mr. Bovero noted that going forward staff will evaluate the efficiency of secondary water pumps and determine whether there are alternative fuel sources that could be used to operate the pumps. He stated staff will also look for ways to pressurize the various zones of the City as well as encouraging night time watering to shut off the pumps during the day.

[7:04:38 PM](#)

Discuss Proposed Ordinance 14-23 amending Title 8 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to the subdivision process.

A memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained the Planning Commission has been reviewing Title VII for the past few months regarding subdivision processes. The proposed amendments ensure that subdivision applications are not vested until they are seen by the Council at Preliminary Plat Approval. The process is also designed to be more efficient in the use of staff and Planning Commission time. The following reviews will take place:

Concept (sketch)	Development Review Committee
Preliminary	Planning Commission Recommendation (Public Hearing)
Preliminary	City Council Approval
Final	Planning Commission
Final	City Council

The memo further explained the proposed ordinance reflects the recommended changes from the Planning Commission with regard the process and other minor amendments for clarity. The Planning Commission held public hearings on the proposed amendments on June 17, 2014 and again on August 5, 2014. At a public meeting on August 19, 2014 the Planning Commission recommended to the City Council the adoption of the proposed amendments.

The memo offered the following summary of proposed amendments:

Various Sections	Change the term Subdivider to Developer
Section 8.10.020	Clarify that the plats should be prepared by a civil engineer and not a surveyor.
Section 8.10.030	Bring the code into compliance with the State statute that does not allow bonding to 110%, only that a city may retain the last 10% of the bond for warranty.
Section 8.10.50	Amends the section on park impacts to be in conformance with the new single park impact fee.
Section 8.10.070	Provides a requirement for the number and spacing of stub roads required to adjacent undeveloped property
Section 8.10.190	Amends the process for subdivision approval as follows: Concept (sketch) Development Review Committee

	Preliminary Preliminary Final Final	PC Recommendation (Public Hearing) City Council Approval Planning Commission City Council
Section 8.15.010	Clarifies when a temporary turn-around is required on a stub street, length greater than 150 feet. Removes exceptions for dead-end street length over 500 feet	
Section 8.15.030	Requires developer to work with not only ditch companies but individuals who have private service connection ditches	
Section 8.20	Outlines procedures for Concept (sketch) review by the Development Review Committee (DRC)	
Section 8.25	Outlines procedures for Preliminary Plat Review & recommendation to Council	

The memo concluded by noting the Syracuse City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council approve the adoption of Ordinance 14-23, Amending Title X.

[7:04:52 PM](#)

Ms. Christensen reviewed her staff memo and noted the Council provided her with some feedback regarding this proposal at the last Council meeting and she has made some amendments to the recommendation from the Planning Commission to recognize that feedback.

[7:11:30 PM](#)

Councilmember Peterson stated his concerns have been addressed by the changes that have been made by staff since the last meeting. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she is not comfortable with the creation of a development review committee and she would prefer that the first body reviewing a development application be an elected or appointed body. She then asked if there is an opportunity to add language to Title Eight specifying when vesting of a project takes place. City Attorney Drake stated vesting is established by law. Councilmember Lisonbee then wondered if the sketch approval process is necessary; she stated the development review committee step could be skipped and an application could be forwarded directly to the Planning Commission for preliminary and final approval. Ms. Christensen stated she feels a pre-application meeting is needed and staff would work with the developer to ensure he has met all requirements before submitting his application because the last thing staff wants to do is take an incomplete application to the Planning Commission as doing so would be a waste of the staff, Planning Commission, and the developer's time. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she is concerned about staff review taking place in a committee form because it implies that there is some authority of the body to make a decision about an application and that an application could potentially be vested at that point in time. Ms. Christensen stated the language in the proposal could be changed from development review committee to pre-development review meeting with staff. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she would be more comfortable with that. Councilmember Gailey inquired as to which staff members would participate in the pre-development review meeting. Ms. Christensen stated it would be herself, the City Planner, Public Works Director, City Engineer, Fire Marshall, and representatives from other pertinent entities. Mayor Palmer indicated his only concern regarding the development review committee is that it could be considered a public body that would be required to adhere to the Open and Public Meetings Act; he would prefer to amend the name of the group as well. He added that in his reading of the proposal, however, he does not believe the staff group has been given the authority to make any decisions. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she feels it is implied. Ms. Christensen reiterated she is comfortable with changing the proposal to indicate that a developer will meet with staff in a pre-application meeting prior to their application being forwarded to the Planning Commission. Mr. Bovero added that most developers want to meet with staff to understand the requirements that would be imposed upon them and their development. Councilmember Lisonbee stated she is comfortable with that change and concluded she wants to the ordinance to clearly specify that preliminary and final approval of any project must be granted by the City Council and no other body. Councilmember Johnson agreed.

[7:20:46 PM](#)

Councilmember Duncan referred to 8.15.030 of the proposal and stated that he is not comfortable with forcing developers to plant trees in their developments. Councilmember Lisonbee stated the City already requires plantings. Ms.

Christensen clarified that the section referred to by Councilmember Duncan simply requires developers to incorporate existing trees into their development whenever possible. Councilmember Duncan then indicated he is comfortable with the proposed changes.

[7:22:10 PM](#)

Councilmember Gailey stated his concerns have been addressed and he is comfortable proceeding with considering final adoption of the ordinance.

[7:23:22 PM](#)

Councilmember Johnson asked if it would be possible for the findings of the staff group to forward their findings from the pre-application meeting to the Planning Commission and City Council for review during a work session meeting. The Council had a discussion regarding this idea and concluded they feel a staff report regarding the pre-application meeting would be beneficial.

[7:26:20 PM](#)

Mayor Palmer referred to section 8.20.020 and stated the Council has recommended that cluster subdivisions be prohibited in the R1, R2, and R3 zones. He asked if that request has been reflected. Ms. Christensen stated the PRD cluster subdivision is referenced for the purpose of identifying density of a proposed development. Councilmember Lisonbee recommended an independent PRD ordinance be adopted in order to avoid confusion regarding whether cluster subdivisions are permitted in residential zones. Ms. Christensen stated she could work on such a recommendation.

[7:28:09 PM](#)

Council business

At each meeting the Councilmembers and Mayor provide reports regarding the meetings and events they have participated in since the last City Council meeting. Councilmember Gailey's report began at [7:28:09 PM](#). He was followed by Councilmembers Lisonbee, Peterson, and Johnson. Councilmember Duncan indicated he had nothing to report.

Mayor Palmer's report began at [7:38:00 PM](#).

The meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: October 14, 2014