

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on October 25, 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 (via telephone)
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, discuss the City's secondary water ordinance and enforcement, discuss secondary water provisions for HOA developments, discuss a potential recall statute, discuss a potential ordinance amendment requiring a development agreement upon zone change, discuss a proposed text amendment to the Planned Residential Development (PRD) zone, Syracuse City Code 10-75-040, discuss creation of a new Residential Planned Community Zone, receive an update from the Development Review Committee (DRC), discuss the Board of Adjustment, continue discussion of Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal Year 2017 Employee Compensation Plan, and discuss Council business.

[11:18:07 AM](#)

A Boy Scout from Troop 331 led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. Councilmember Anderson provided an invocation.

[11:20:07 AM](#)

Public comments

There were no public comments.

[11:20:30 AM](#)

Discussion regarding secondary water ordinance/enforcement.

An administrative staff memo explained this item is returning for discussion on potential enforcement of mandatory watering restrictions and penalties associated with violating those restrictions. The draft ordinance, which has not been modified from the one presented at a recent work meeting, is included in the packet. It is somewhat connected to item D on the agenda, related to conservation plans and large-area properties. The memo concluded establishing a violation in code is, of course, only the first step and that it is important to discuss the costs and benefits of various policing methods.

[11:22:00 AM](#)

City Manager Bovero and Public Works Director Whiteley facilitated a review of the option of adopting an ordinance that would provide mandatory watering schedules and penalties associated with violating the ordinance. The Council engaged in philosophical discussion of the proposed ordinance, with a focus on allowing exceptions for watering gardens and agricultural properties, the notification process that will be used to inform residents of imposition of a mandatory watering schedule, the amount of water the City has access to in order to provide pressurized water to the City, the amount of water needed to maintain landscaping in the average yard, establishing a trigger for implementing mandatory watering schedules, potential costs of enforcing a mandatory watering schedule, options for improving the secondary water system to provide adequate delivery of water, and effective education of residents regarding any mandatory watering schedule that may

be enacted. As the discussion concluded, City Attorney Roberts indicated that he will attempt to craft an ordinance that addresses the main points raised by the Council.

[12:06:20 PM](#)

Continued discussion of secondary water regulations for HOA developments.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained discussion about wasteful watering practices on HOA-owned properties at our last work meeting led to a potential for additionally regulating the use of secondary water by large users, such as HOA's. Accompanying this memo is a draft section that could be considered alongside the other secondary water regulations that have been proposed. The draft includes parameters for whether the regulation applies, the requirement of an Annual Conservation Plan, requirements for current contact information in the event the city needs to get in touch with property owners, and penalties for non-compliance. For reference, a map showing the developed parcels exceeding 3 acres is included in the packet.

The draft ordinance also addresses possible provisions that allows someone to avoid service fees if they establish xeriscaping and disconnect from the City's secondary system.

[12:06:35 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo and facilitated a review of the draft ordinance language that he included in the meeting packet. Mr. Bovero reviewed a map to identify the large parcels in the City that would be subject to the ordinance and continued discussion focused on the manner in which each property owner would be notified of the ordinance if it is enacted and the process the City would follow to ensure that an Annual Conservation Plan is on file for each property. The Council concluded it would be appropriate to require a property owner to renew their Plan annually in conjunction with the business license renewal process.

[12:15:57 PM](#)

Continued discussion of potential recall statute.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained at the last Council meeting there was a discussion of the possibility of enacting a recall ordinance in the City. Staff received direction to prepare an outline of the decisions that should be made prior to enacting such legislation. The complexity of the ordinance will depend upon the Council's decisions. However, specific direction regarding deadlines, eligible elections, formatting, and so forth, will be beneficial for the City. Otherwise, staff will be required to invent such processes (and subsequently accused of wrongdoing by one side or the other).

[12:16:17 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo and a document that he prepared including decision points the Council would need to make in order to create an ordinance allowing for a recall election.

[12:17:47 PM](#)

Councilmember Anderson stated that after seeing additional documentation from Mr. Roberts and carefully considering the issue, she does not feel the Council has the authority to enact a recall statute; she feels that any such statute should be initiated by the voters and that is the direction she would prefer that the issue follow. There was a brief discussion regarding the legality of a recall statute, after which Councilmember Lisonbee stated that the residents who have expressed concerns regarding the lack of a recall statute could be encouraged to petition for the City to add a ballot question to the ballot in an upcoming election. Discussion concluded with a brief review of the petition process outlined by the State Election Code.

[12:30:17 PM](#)

Discussion of potential ordinance amendment requiring a development agreement upon zone change.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained during discussion in your September 27, 2016 work session, there arose the concept of requiring development agreements with all zone changes to certain zones. This memo identifies some of the strengths and liabilities of this proposition.

1. **Legality.** State law allows land use controls such as development agreements, so long as their contents are not expressly prohibited by law. Utah Code Ann. § 10-9a-102(2). The City could impose the requirement for development agreements with respect to specific zones, and not others.

It is recommended that if the City does take this route, that it do so on a consistent basis so that developers are aware that this will be an expectation, prior to making the zone change request. Applicants will be caught unawares if the requirement is imposed on an ad hoc basis. We should also ensure that the terms of the development agreements do not amount to an exaction against the property owners (for instance, requiring dedication of property to the city outside of normal parameters for public infrastructure).

2. Strengths.

- a. **Bait-and-Switch Prevention.** The main strength of this approach, and the principal reason why it would be adopted, would be to provide some security against bait-and-switch tactics in which the developer brings in a conceptual plan when applying for zoning change, and then presents a fundamentally different plan – but one which complies with codes governing that zone – when it comes time to build. Specifically, if there are certain components of their proposed development that are important to the City, or something that the Council would like to see excluded as a potential use, then the development agreement could ensure the presence or absence of those items.
- b. **Flexibility.** The existence of a development agreement would not necessarily forever lock a property into a specific land use or layout. A developer could always approach the Council and ask for an amendment to the agreement for any substantial changes that were necessary, in light of discoveries during engineering or changed circumstances.

3. Liabilities. There would be negative effects of such a policy, however:

- a. **Uncertainty.** Developers would be uncertain as to the specific concerns of the council sitting at the time their development is proposed. Although separate meetings a few councilmembers may assuage that concern somewhat, those councilmembers cannot speak on behalf of the full council. Staff would also be uncertain as to whether they have correctly identified the concerns that would be raised by the sitting council. Such uncertainty could dissuade developers from the initial investment of time, negotiation over land, and document preparation necessary to even get to the point of council consideration.
- b. **Resources.** The requirement of a development agreement will require additional resource allocation (staff time) toward identifying the critical aspects of the proposal, and drafting/negotiating the appropriate agreement.
- c. **Delay.** The addition of a development agreement after consideration by the Council would effectively add an additional step in the process for certain zone changes. This would delay progress by at least two weeks, but potentially four. While this generally does negatively impact the city government, it would be another consideration of developers, and could provide additional deterrent from them bringing projects to the city.
- d. **Appearance of arbitrariness.** The City is required to apply the law equally to everyone, rather than picking favorites. If a case-by-case negotiation of development terms is pursued by the City, then a developer who is unsatisfied with the conditions we impose could challenge the decision to reject their zoning application as a violation of the uniform operation of laws or equal protection clause. Although such challenges are still tremendously difficult to successfully mount, the back and forth of development agreement negotiation could open up the city to slightly greater liability. A straight up or down vote on zoning, without negotiation, is much simpler to defend.
- e. **Additional tracking.** If a developer enters into the development agreement, achieves the requested zoning designation, and then sells the property to another developer, it will require staff to track specific parcels with development agreements attached to them, in order to ensure that the subsequent buyer abides by the terms of the agreement. While one or two of these could be tracked without difficulty, the administrative burden would increase with each agreement. We currently do not have a system that would note the existence of an agreement, and would need to explore whether such an option is possible with our current GIS system. There are likely solutions to the technical concerns.
- f. **No guarantee.** Unless the developer is required to submit detailed plans, there is no guarantee that the existence of a development agreement will avoid problems. Indeed, many code deficiencies would not be on our radar at the time of development agreement any more than they are when crafting zoning laws.

There are other alternatives that the Council could consider in order to address these concerns. They would be effective to varying degrees.

1. Rigorous review of zoning code.
A comprehensive review of the zoning code, along with the policy discussions that accompany it, could address many of these problems (along with many others). This process would likely take well over 2 years.
2. Strategic use of traditional zoning tools.
 - A Council/Commission review of the permitted and conditional uses listed in our zones might identify uses that are particularly problematic. Those that do not appear to fit should be removed from the list of permitted or conditional uses.
 - Proximity requirements could also be imposed for specific uses. For instance, if the Council is concerned about the placement of animal clinics in the General Commercial Zone abutting residential properties, it could impose a 300-foot buffer requirement for that particular use. Transitional zoning districts between residential and business/industrial/high-density uses also provide opportunities to insulate against abutting uses becoming nuisances.
 - Additionally, if there are particular items that are potentially problematic, then the development standards associated with that and other zones may be tightened up in order to address those problems. The weakness of traditional zoning is that it is normally reactive – a problem is only detected once a project that has vested rights has submitted an application. Changes to the code can prevent similar issues from arising in the future, but will not stop that specific development from moving forward on the unsatisfactory aspect.
3. Zoning conditions.
Somewhat similar to a development agreement, but with less administrative burden, specific zoning conditions could be placed on the specific parcel when the property is re-zoned. For instance, if specific uses in the zone were problematic, then the restriction could exclude those uses. The restriction would run with the land. In order for this to be effective, we would need to establish that our GIS system could facilitate tracking these conditions, and that the conditions appears on the title of the property to protect future purchasers.

Any of these options will require recommendations from the Planning Commission.

[12:30:25 PM](#)

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo and facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the types of development for which a development agreement would be appropriate in conjunction with a zone change. Discussion also centered on the aspects of a project that a development agreement can legally regulate. The Council directed Mr. Roberts to work with Planning staff and the Planning Commission to craft an ordinance that would address the issue.

[12:46:21 PM](#)

Discussion re: proposed text amendment to the Planned Residential Development (PRD) zone, Syracuse City Code 10-75.040.

A staff memo from Community and Economic Development (CED) Director Mellor explained that as requested by the Council, the Planning Commission has forwarded a proposed text amendment to the Planned Residential Development (PRD) Zone for consideration. The proposed changes include:

- 10.75.040(A)(2) - This added language is intended to add detail to the requirements for common space in a PRD development. 20% of a PRD project would be required to be designated as common space.
- 10.75.040(A)(5) - Language clarifying that a 'direct connection' consists of a full width dedicated road.
- 10.75.070 - This limits shared driveways to 6 dwelling units total and a maximum length of 160 feet. Also, shared driveways must be built to accommodate fire apparatus.

[12:47:22 PM](#)

Mr. Mellor reviewed his staff report and reviewed the ordinance amendments that have been proposed by the Planning Commission. Council discussion of the Planning Commission's recommendation ensued, with a focus on the amenities to be included in a PRD zone; Councilmember Lisonbee stated that she would like to require more open space and that the percentage of open space be tied directly to the density of the development; the higher the density, the greater the

amount of open space that should be provided. She specified that she does not feel that side and rear yards of homes should be included in the open space calculation.

[1:02:24 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero suggested that the item be referred back to Planning staff in order for them to adjust the ordinance language to take into consideration the feedback offered by the Council. He added that the City Planner can also be charged with developing examples of bad designs to illustrate the worst-case scenario that could occur according to the ordinance as written. The Council supported Mr. Bovero's recommendation.

[1:03:34 PM](#)

Discussion of creation of a new Residential Planned Community Zone.

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.

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.

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%. 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.

August 2nd, 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 ft., 8,000 be 75 ft., 6,400 be 65 ft. And 5,100 be 55 ft., the minimum side yard for 5,100 be 7 ft., 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.

August 23rd, 2016 - The city council had a discussion on the new zone and the lot sizes and densities. It was determined that there would need to be a significant park amenity needed in this new RPC zone to offset the densities proposed and that more density was a sufficient exchange for more park.

[1:04:11 PM](#)

Mr. Mellor reviewed his staff report and identified the changes that have been made to the ordinance document since the last time it was discussed by the Council. The Council discussed the implications of the proposed zone, with a focus on the minimum size of contiguous property for which the zone would be an option. Continued discussion of the zone centered on issues such as minimum lot size, open space requirements, and amenity requirements. Mr. Mellor stated that he will email to the Council a revised document incorporating the changes suggested by the Council; the item will also be included on the next business meeting agenda for action in order to meet the timelines in the annexation agreement approved for the project.

[1:23:52 PM](#)

Update from Development Review Committee (DRC)

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department in accordance with SMC 8.20.30, staff is to update the Council on development review committee's proposals before the staff review of concept subdivision design. The following projects are to be reviewed at this time.

Project Name	# of lots	Acres	Location	Zone	Developer
Seaside	60(ish)	27	4500 W. 1200 S.	R-1	Ivory
Hampton Acres	4	1.73	Bluff & Antelope	R-1	Dwayne Johnson
Hunter's Glen	55(ish)	24	920 S. 4000 W.	R-2	Cole Shlack
Grayson Ridge	97(ish)	45	South of Buffalo Point Elementary	R-1	Duncan Barlow

[1:24:06 PM](#)

Mr. Mellor reviewed his staff memo and provided the Council with an update on each of the projects listed.

[1:29:42 PM](#)

Discussion regarding Board of Adjustment

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the City ordinance states that the Board of Adjustment will hear the following applications:

- Appeals of Hearing Officer's decision (Title 6) involving the zoning ordinance.
- The granting of variances from the zoning ordinance.
- Appeal of land use (Title 10) decisions made by the Land Use Administrator.

The City has operated without a functioning Board of Adjustment for almost two years. The City has advertised for applicants to apply for open seats on the Board of Adjustment for over a year, and has consistently advertised in the City-wide newsletter for the previous 6 months. The City has only received one letter of interest. State law allows an alternative approach to hearing applications items such as variances and land use appeals. Specifically, a Hearing Officer/Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) may be appointed by the City to hear such cases. This appointment can be made in a similar fashion to the Board of Adjustment (Mayor appoints, with advice/consent of Council). While there are no specific requirements for an appointee, City Attorney Paul Roberts and I would both recommend, for overall risk/liability issues, that the appointee be law-trained. This means that they are either a licensed attorney, or hold a law degree. The appointee could be citizen volunteer, a paid volunteer (similar to planning commission), or a contractor. The City runs certain risks by not having a Board of Adjustment or Hearing Officer/ALJ in place. The purpose of this discussion is to consider options in appointing a Board of Adjustment or Hearing Officer/ALJ for variance applications and certain land use appeals.

[1:29:59 PM](#)

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and asked the Council how they would like to proceed with handling land use appeals and variance applications in the City. After philosophical discussion of the matter, the Council determined to solicit applications of interest from residents in order to refresh the Board of Adjustment. Mayor Palmer stated an item will be included on the next meeting agenda to allow the Council to report back regarding any interest they have generated in being appointed to the Board of Adjustment.

[1:45:35 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 pursuant to October 11 meeting, the Council requested that I summarize the items discussed in the meeting to assist in the discussion, and add information related to advancements, promotions, and benchmarking. Attached to the memo was an outline version 1.4 showing the main components of the policy in a summarized format. The items in **black** text were discussed in previous meetings and appeared to have tentative consensus amongst the Councilmembers. The items in **red** are concepts for the Council's consideration, that are based on comments made during previous discussions. This outline is for discussion purposes and at this point is not yet refined enough to constitute a recommendation from City Administration.

Summarized Draft Recruitment, Retention, and Compensation Policy v1.4 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 would be discussed as a part of the departmental review.

Benchmark

- Every other Biennial Review, departments are on a rotating benchmark schedule:
 - Group 1: Police, Fire, Park & Rec
 - Group 2: PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance

Example Schedule:

Year 1: In-depth review and benchmark of Police, Fire, Park & Rec
Year 2: In-depth review and benchmark of PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance
Year 3: In-depth review of Police, Fire, Park & Rec
Year 4: In-depth review of PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance
Year 5: In-depth review and benchmark of Police, Fire, Park & Rec
Year 6: In-depth review and benchmark of PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance

Wage Scales

- Wage scales will not be set lower than the 50th percentile of the market. Based on inability to attract an acceptable applicant pool, or due to a change in the labor market for any given position, the Council may adjust the wage scale to a higher percentile.
- Individual wages can be adjusted with every benchmark study, 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.
- The policy advises the Council to adjust wages scales only when there is a net change of 2.5% or greater in the benchmark for any given position.
- An employee's wages will not be adjusted due to a benchmark study if the employee has been hired within the previous 24 months.

Example 1: The Council budgets 2% of payroll 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. Since this is less than 2.5%, there would be no wage adjustment or wage scale adjustment.

Example 2: The Council budgets 2% of payroll for merit increases. The benchmark for Employee 'X's position shows an overall increase of 3.5% in the wage scale since the last benchmark. Since this is more than 2.5%, the employee is eligible (subject to Council approval) for his/her regular merit increase, plus a maximum of an additional 3.5% depending on his/her evaluation score.

Merit Increases

- In order to determine the budgeted amount for merit increases, the Council will:
 - Calculate the moving average of wage increases for the last 3 years of benchmark cities/companies.
 - Set aside a minimum of 25% of the net increase in combined sales tax, property tax, and franchise tax from the previous fiscal year.
 - Decide to either increase, decrease, or maintain the set-aside amount in order to stay competitive with the market.
- An evaluation system with scores ranging from 0 to 5 will be utilized for employee performance evaluations. Administration of merit increases is performed by the City Manager under direction of the Mayor, subject to performance scores of employees.
- Each department will be allotted a proportional share of the budgeted merit increase dollars based on the following formula:
 - Department Share of Budgeted Merit Increase Dollars= (Total budgeted dollars approved by Council for merit increases/Total city-wide payroll dollars) X Total payroll of the department
Note: Department heads will be considered a separate department for these purposes.
- For each department, the Average Merit Increase will be calculated using the following formula:

- $AVG \text{ Merit Increase} = \text{Department Share of Budgeted Merit Increase Dollars} / \text{Total payroll of the department.}$
- For each department, the average evaluation score will be calculated. The average score will be targeted for the Average Merit Increase. Scores above the average evaluation will be provided a higher merit increase, and scores below the average will be provided a lower merit increase. Nevertheless, in no case shall the highest merit increase be higher than 50% above the average, unless approved by the City Council.
- Any score below a 3 will not be eligible for a merit increase.
Example: Average merit increase is 2%. No single employee may receive more than a 3% ($2\% \times 1.5$) merit increase, unless approved by the Council.

Advancements

Option #1

- 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 ($2\% \times 1.5$). However, since this is below 4%, the employee would receive 4%. He/She would not receive a merit increase for that year.

Option #2

- Employees that advance to higher position move to the bottom of the new scale, but at least a 3.5% increase. Employees are still eligible for merit increase for year of advancement.
Example: Council budgets 2% for merit increases. Employee 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 3.5% increase. Employee would also be eligible to receive the budgeted merit increase, depending on performance.

Option #3

- Employees that advance to a higher position move to the bottom of new scale. However, if the bottom of the new scale is less than 3.5% higher than his/her current wage, the employee is instead eligible to receive, at the next merit increase, an additional increase of up to 3.5% for the advancement. The total amount will depend on the previous 2 year's performance scores.
Example: Employee 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 merit increase with an eligibility to earn up to an extra 3.5% depending on the previous two year's performance scores.

Promotions

Option #1

- 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 ($2\% \times 2.5$). However, since this is below 9%, the employee would receive 9%. He/She would not receive a merit increase for that year.

Option #2

- Employees that are promoted to a position with more responsibility move to the bottom of new scale. However, if the bottom of the new scale is less than 7.5% higher than his/her current wage, the employee will receive a 7.5% increase.

Example: Council budgets 2% for merit increases. Employee is promoted, and his/her current wage is already higher than the bottom of the scale for the new position. He/she would receive a 7.5% increase. Employee would also be eligible to receive the budgeted merit increase, depending on performance.

Option #3

- Employees that are promoted to a position with more responsibility move to the bottom of new scale. However, if the bottom of the new scale is not 7.5% higher than his/her current wage, the employee is instead eligible to receive, at the next merit increase, an additional increase of up to 7.5% for the advancement. The total amount will depend on the previous 2 year's performance scores.
Example: Employee is promoted, and his/her current wage is already higher than the bottom of the scale for the new position. He/she would receive a merit increase with an eligibility to earn up to an extra 7.5% depending on the previous two year's performance scores.

Benchmark Cities

- **Philosophy:** The purpose of benchmarking in this policy is to establish an estimate of the local and regional market for municipal employees. When deciding which cities to compare with, there needs to be balance of similar city structure (size, land use, revenue, etc) and logistical competition (geographic proximity, type of community, etc). Benchmarks serve as a market indicator, and checkpoint, but by no means are to be used as the sole determining wage scale indicator. The City Council reserves the right to unilaterally adjust the wage scales to a level where it feels appropriately represents the market.
- **Resources:** In addition to cities within the same regional location, data resources provided by the Utah Benchmarking Project can be used. The UBP has categorized cities into different clusters based on their characteristics. While all cities are unique, some characteristics are similar enough to enable the categorization process. The UBP has placed Syracuse City in the High-Income Residential Cluster, along with 17 other cities in the state. Previously, Syracuse was in the High-Growth Cluster, but was moved since it now fits more closely with the new category. For purposes of benchmarking, the City will use all the cities in the High-Income Residential and High Growth Clusters.
- **Location:** Based on location, it is reasonable to expect that all of Davis County and all, or at least the southern part of Weber County would be in competition for Syracuse employees. It could also be argued that northern Salt Lake County would also be in the primary location market for Syracuse employees. In addition to the cities in the High-Income Residential and High Growth Clusters, the City will use all the cities in Weber and Davis County for benchmark purposes.
- **Benchmark Exclusions:** Within the primary market location (Davis/Weber County), there are certain cities that are drastically different that Syracuse. While the identification of these cities is ultimately the Council's decision, examples would be cities such as Ogden City, or the Town of Uintah. These types of cities would be excluded from the benchmark, which in essence is saying, "we won't compete with these cities".
- **(Optional) Cities of Strong Similarity:** Using the UBP data, there are certain variables that demonstrate a stronger similarity with Syracuse City. These variables can be used if the Council wants to create a shorter list of benchmark cities that demonstrate a closer similarity to Syracuse City. Certain variables to examine include:
 - Population size
 - Sales Tax per Capita
 - Primary Residential Land Value
 - Commercial & Industrial Land Value
- Based on all the factors listed above, 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 wage scales.

Setting Wage Scales

- The minimum wage and maximum wage for any given position will be determined by calculating the XXth percentile of each position's wage scales in the list of benchmark cities. The Council may adjust the wage scale of a position to within the percentile limits outlined in this policy.

- Due to the uniqueness of each city, some cities may be added or deleted from the wage scale benchmark of a position in order to ensure a more accurate comparison of duties and responsibilities.

Setting Wages

Option 1:

- In determining the wage for employees, the City Manager shall consider relevant factors such as experience, education, skills, and training obtained by the employee.
- For new hires, the City Manager may use these factors to set the new employee's wage up to the mid-point of the wage scale, assuming budgetary allowance. If the City Manager determines that the new hire should start above the mid-point of the wage scale, he/she must first get approval from a majority of the City Council.
- For existing employees, if the City Manager determines that an employee should receive an increase in wage level above that allowed in the policy, then he/she shall present those reasons and obtain approval from a majority of the City Council prior to adjusting the wage.

Option 2:

- In determining the wage for employees, the City Manager shall conduct an analysis on each position which includes the following steps:
 - The City will contact benchmark cities to obtain actual wages of employees in each position.
 - In addition, the City will ask the benchmark cities to provide relevant information about each employee, such as total years of related experience (not just with current city), years of experience with the current city, years of experience in current position, number of people the employee supervises, job duties, etc.
 - All of the information obtained will be listed and analyzed in order to determine the appropriate wage level of the City employee in question. The analysis will take into account the percentile at which the City Council desires to pay for that position.
 - The City Manager will present the analysis on each employee of the City for approval by the City Council.
- Based on the analysis and approval, each employee's wage will be set at the level decided by the Council. This process also applies to new hires.

1:45:51 PM

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the edits that have been made to the draft Policy and Plan. There was a focus on issues such as benchmarking, the amount of money to be set aside annually for merit increases, the minimum merit increase that each employee should be eligible to receive each year, promotions and advancements, and stacking of multiple increases in a given year. Mr. Bovero indicated that he will use the feedback provided by the Council to prepare an actual draft policy document that can be considered for adoption by the Council at a future meeting.

2:55:38 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 11:00 p.m.

Terry Palmer
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

City Council Work Session
October 25, 2016

Date approved: December 13, 2016