



## SYRACUSE CITY

### Syracuse City Council Regular Meeting Agenda **\*\*AMENDED\*\***

October 11, 2016 – 6:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers

Municipal Building, 1979 W. 1900 S.

1. Meeting called to order  
Invocation or thought  
Pledge of Allegiance  
Adopt agenda
2. Presentation of the Syracuse City and Wendy's "Award for Excellence" to Madison Waller and Scott Johnson.
3. Introduction of new Police Officers.
4. Oath of Office administered to Youth Court Members and Advisors.
5. Proposed Resolution R16-44 reappointing Christopher Weaver and Trachelle Hilton-King to the Syracuse City Arts Council.
6. **Recognition of Cassie Brown for being awarded the Utah City Recorder of the Year Award.**
7. Approval of Minutes:
  - a. Work Session of August 23, 2016.
  - b. Special Meeting of September 9, 2016
  - c. Regular Meeting of September 13, 2016.
8. Public Comment: This is an opportunity to address the Council regarding your concerns or ideas. Please limit your comments to three minutes.
9. Discussion and/or action on Proposed Resolution R16-44 adopting the Utility Fee and Internal Service Allocation Policy.
10. Public Comment: This is an opportunity to address the Council regarding your concerns or ideas. Please limit your comments to three minutes.
11. Councilmember Reports.
12. Mayor Report.
13. City Manager Report.
14. **Continued discussion of Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal Year 2017 Employee Compensation Plan. (in conference room)**
15. **Continued discussion of secondary water regulations for HOA developments. (in conference room.0**
16. **Continued discussion of recall statute. (in conference room)**
17. Adjourn.

-----  
In compliance with the Americans Disabilities Act, persons needing auxiliary communicative aids and services for this meeting should contact the City Offices at 801-825-1477 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

#### CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted within the Syracuse City limits on this 10<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2016 at Syracuse City Hall on the City Hall Notice Board and at <http://www.syracuseut.com/>. A copy was also provided to the Standard-Examine on October 10, 2016.

CASSIE Z. BROWN, MMC  
SYRACUSE CITY RECORDER



# COUNCIL AGENDA

October 11, 2016

## Agenda Item #2

Presentation of the Syracuse City and Wendy's "Award for Excellence" to Madison Waller and Scott Johnson for the month of October 2016.

### *Factual Summation*

- Any questions regarding this item can be directed at CED staff. Please see the attached memos regarding the Award recipients for October 2016.

### *Recommendation*

The Community & Economic Development Department hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council present the "Syracuse City & Wendy's Award for Excellence" to Madison Waller and Scott Johnson for the month of October 2016.



**Mayor**  
Terry Palmer

**City Council**  
Andrea Anderson  
Corinne Bolduc  
Mike Gailey  
Karianne Lisonbee  
Dave Maughan

**City Manager**  
Brody Bovero

**SYRACUSE**  
EST. CITY 1935

### ***Factual Summation***

- Any questions regarding this items may be directed at Brigham Mellor, City Economic Development Director

## **MEMORANDUM**

**To:** Mayor and City Council

**From:** Community & Economic Development Department

**Date:** October 11, 2016

**Subject:** Presentation of the Syracuse City & Wendy's Award for Excellence Madison Waller and Scott Johnson

---

### **Background**

The City wishes to work towards recognizing citizens who strive for excellence in either athletics, academics, arts or community service. To that end, in an effort to recognize students at Syracuse High, Clearfield High, as well as other schools in our City and individuals residing in the City, Mayor Terry Palmer and City Manager Brody Bovero has asked staff to develop a recognition program to promote pride and unity within our community. In conjunction with Jeff Gibson, staff would like to present the "Syracuse City & Wendy's Award for Excellence."

### **"Syracuse City & Wendy's Award for Excellence"**

In order to recognize outstanding students and athletes in Syracuse, the Community and Economic Development Department have developed the "Syracuse City and Wendy's Award for Excellence" award process. This monthly award, given in alternating months (e.g. January athlete, February scholar/community/art, March athlete, etc.), recognizes the outstanding performance of a male and female who excel in athletics, arts and/or academics. The individuals selected for this award will be identified by Syracuse City in partnership with representatives from the city recreation department, local elementary, junior high, and high schools. Once selected, an individual will:

- Receive a certificate and be recognized at the first City Council meeting of each month
- Have their picture put up in City Hall
- Have a write up in the City Newsletter, Facebook, Twitter, and website
- Be featured on the Wendy's product TV

- Receive \$10 gift certificate to Wendy's

#### Scott Johnson

It is West Point Jr, High's pleasure to nominate Scott Johnson for the Syracuse City and Wendy's Award for Excellence. Scott is, without question one of the most outstanding students at West Point Jr. High School. He consistently demonstrated excellence in his classwork. Scott has a 4.0 grade point average while taking honor level classes.

Scott completed 2 years of math in one year in an accelerated math class. He is currently one of a few 8<sup>th</sup> grade students enrolled in a 9<sup>th</sup> grade math class. His contributions to the school are well noted. Teachers have said many great things about his abilities. He has shown the ability to accomplish anything he wishes to accomplish. Scott has an outstanding future ahead of him. Congratulations to Scott Johnson!

#### Madison Waller

It is also a privilege to nominate Madison Waller for the Syracuse and Wendy's Award for Excellence. Madison has been an outstanding student at West Point Jr. High. She also serves as a member of the student government. She is willing to help and is an incredible, model student in every way.

Madison has a 3.9 grade point average while taking three honor level classes. She has taken may honor classes at West Point Jr. High, including Honors Biology. Her contributions to the classroom are second to none. Teachers have said many great things about her abilities. She has shown the ability to take difficult classes and master them. Madison has an outstanding future ahead of her. Congratulations to Madison Waller!

#### **Recommendation**

The Community & Economic Development Department hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council provide feedback regarding the items presented during the Work Session. Further, the CED Department hereby requests Mayor and City Council support of the proposed "Syracuse City & Wendy's Award for Excellence."



# COUNCIL AGENDA

October 11, 2016

Agenda Item #3

Introduction of new Police Officers Garret Whattcott, Wes Hutchings, and Mark Reid.

***Factual Summation***

- Chief Atkin has requested time on the agenda to introduce his newest Police Officers, Garret Whattcott, Wes Hutchings, and Mark Reid.
- City Recorder Brown will also administer the Oath of Office for Officer Reid during the meeting.



# COUNCIL AGENDA

October 11, 2016

Agenda Item #4

Oath of Office administered to Youth Court  
Members and Advisors

### *Factual Summation*

- City Recorder Brown will administer the oath of office to newly selected Youth Court Members and Advisors. Following is a list of those to be sworn in:

Advisors:

1. Karrie Nyre
2. Anna Elmer

Youth:

1. Heather Anderson
2. Elizabeth Beeli
3. Hannah Bouy
4. Konnor Doxey
5. Parker Hardy
6. Morgan Jaques
7. Karlee Jaques
8. Tristan Martin
9. Jared Nyre
10. Jessa Nyre
11. Isabella Pahrman
12. Hunter Peart
13. Taelyn Petersen
14. Case Sorenson
15. Erin Zaugg
16. Ryan Zaugg



# COUNCIL AGENDA

## October 11, 2016

### Agenda Item #5

### Arts Council Reappointments

#### *Factual Summation*

Arts Council leadership has requested that Christopher Weaver and Trachelle Hilton-King be reappointed to the Arts Council Board. Syracuse City Code Title Three provides a process for appointing members of the Arts Council as follows:

- 3.09.020(B) Terms of Office. The terms of office for the five (5) Board members, who are not a member of the Recreation Department, shall be for five (5) years. These members' terms shall be staggered so that no more than one (1) member's term expires at the same time. The terms of office for at-large and ex-officio members shall be five (5) years from the date of appointment. The term of office for the Recreation Department staff designated as a member of the Board shall be as determined by the Department Director. Appointments to the Board shall be made no later than the first City Council meeting in July of each year. In circumstances where appointments are not made prior to the first City Council meeting in July of each year, said appointments shall be made as soon as reasonably possible thereafter.

#### *Proposal*

***Adopt Proposed Resolution R15-44 reappointing Christopher Weaver and Trachelle Hilton-King to the Syracuse Arts Council with their terms ending June 30, 2021.***

**RESOLUTION R16-44**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE SYRACUSE CITY COUNCIL  
REAPPOINTING CHRISTOPHER WEAVER AND TRACHELLE  
HILTON-KING TO THE SYRACUSE CITY ARTS COUNCIL.**

**WHEREAS** Title III of the Syracuse City Code provides for the establishment of a Syracuse City Arts Council; and

**WHEREAS** Section 3.09.020 of the Syracuse City Code dictates that no less than six (6) members of the community shall be appointed and serve on the Syracuse City Arts Council; and

**WHEREAS** Arts Council leadership has requested that Christopher Weaver and Trachelle Hilton-King be reappointed to serve as members of the Syracuse City Arts Council.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF SYRACUSE CITY, UTAH, AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section 1. Appointment.**

- Christopher Weaver is hereby reappointed to serve on the Syracuse City Arts Council with his term expiring June 30, 2021.
- Trachelle Hilton-King is hereby reappointed to serve on the Syracuse City Arts Council with her term expiring June 30, 2021.

**Section 2. Severability.** If any section, part or provision of this Resolution is held invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Resolution, and all sections, parts and provisions of this Resolution shall be severable.

**Section 3. Effective Date.** This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF SYRACUSE CITY, STATE OF UTAH, THIS 11<sup>th</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2016.**

**SYRACUSE CITY**

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cassie Z. Brown, City Recorder

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Palmer, Mayor



# COUNCIL AGENDA

October 11, 2016

Agenda Item #6

Approval of Minutes.

***Factual Summation***

- Please see the draft minutes of the following meeting(s):
  - a. Work Session of August 23, 2016.
  - b. Special Meeting of September 9, 2016
  - c. Regular Meeting of September 13, 2016.
  
- Any question regarding this agenda item may be directed at Cassie Brown, City Recorder.

Minutes of the Syracuse City Council Work Session Meeting, August 23, 2016

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**

1 TJ Jensen stated that the Planning Commission has submitted a recommendation regarding proposed amendments to  
2 the Planned Residential Development (PRD) zone, but he feels there are a couple of loose ends that need to be addressed;  
3 first is related to street connectivity in PRD developments and second is the number of units that can use a shared private  
4 driveway. He noted that when the Planning Commission indicated that they wanted road cross-sections to meet the City's  
5 cross-section, it may be easy to be confused about pavement width; developers may reduce their pavement width, but it is  
6 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  
7 the future.

8 [6:08:41 PM](#)

9 Gary Pratt stated the underpinnings and history of the City are found in the General Plan. Last year a committee  
10 spent a considerable amount of time updating the Plan, but it is concerning to him that it appears there are some members of  
11 the City Council or staff who have not read the General Plan document. He addressed a recent ordinance change relating to  
12 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  
13 City entertained a request from a developer to change the cul-de-sac lengths without any presentation from staff or an  
14 explanation of the basis for the cul-de-sac regulations in the General Plan. He then stated the recent vote to appoint a new  
15 Planning Commission flies in the face of reason; one applicant had loads of experience and met the Mayor's criteria for  
16 selecting the appointee and the Council chose select another person who admitted he had never been to a Planning  
17 Commission or City Council meeting and that he had never read the General Plan. He stated the Council has the right and  
18 power to give or withhold their consent for the Mayor's appointment and the fact that they chose the less experienced person  
19 is troubling and he wondered if the same decision would have been made for other important positions in the City.

20

21 [6:13:33 PM](#)

22 **Request to be on the agenda: Request to create Disc**

23 **Golf Course at Rock Creek Park.**

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

26 [6:14:13 PM](#)

1 Mr. Cagle used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide the Council with additional information about the  
2 creation of a Disc Golf Course, with a focus on the benefits such an amenity could provide to the community and its  
3 residents. He discussed the manner in which disc golf is played and noted it is one of the fastest growing sports in the United  
4 States; however, there is not a single disc golf course between Riverdale and Centerville. He also discussed the infrastructure  
5 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  
6 course that he would propose at Rock Creek Park. The total cost of creating a course would be roughly \$3,300 and he is  
7 hopeful that the City would be willing to partner with him to create the course.

8 [6:24:42 PM](#)

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

13 [6:25:21 PM](#)

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

17  
18 [6:31:35 PM](#)

19 **Continued discussion and review of Preliminary**  
20 **Subdivision Plat, Jackson Court, located at**  
21 **approximately 1958 S. 2000 W. (continued from August**  
22 **9, 2016).**

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

25	Location:	1958 South 2000 West
26	Current Zoning:	PRD



Total	227,249	100	5.22	None.
-------	---------	-----	------	-------

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

- 21 • *The development lacks a direct connection to an arterial.*

22 SCC 10.75.040(A)(7) “Minimum lot standards” states that “The development design shall include a direct  
 23 connection to a major arterial, minor arterial, or major collector roadway.”

24 The only road that abuts the property and falls within the bounds of the Code is 2000 West which is a major arterial.  
 25 There is sufficient space to provide a direct connection to 2000 West. This connection may be a private or public  
 26 road as permitted in the PRD Zone.

1 SCC 8.10.070 "Relation to adjoining street systems" states the following: "Street access for new subdivisions shall  
2 be established by using the AASHTO Traffic Design Manual calculation of seven and one-half seconds of travel  
3 time between street accesses onto existing roadways (which calculated would be 385 feet at 35 mph) unless  
4 otherwise recommended by the Planning Commission. The street arrangement must be such as to cause no  
5 unnecessary hardship to owners of adjoining property when they plat their land and seek to provide for convenient  
6 access to it. Where, in the opinion of the Planning Commission, it is desirable to provide for street access to  
7 adjoining property, proposed streets shall be extended by dedication to the boundary of such property. Half streets  
8 along the boundary of land proposed for subdivision will not be permitted."

9 The speed limit on 2000 West where it abuts the proposed development is 35 miles per hour. Using the AASHTO  
10 standard, the City Code establishes a minimum separation of 385 feet for new intersections. When measuring south  
11 from 1900 South (shown in red below) and north from 2025 South (shown in blue below), there is no point where  
12 the proposed subdivision fronts 2000 West where an intersection may occur that would meet the AASHTO standard.  
13 As such, a public street access may not occur from the proposed development to 2000 West without a  
14 recommendation from the Planning Commission.

15 The speed limit on Craig Lane is 25 miles per hour which requires a minimum separation of 275 feet between  
16 intersections (shown in yellow below). The intersection created by 2060 South has a separation distance which  
17 approximately overlaps the frontage of the property. Again, a street access may be provided here with a  
18 recommendation by the Planning Commission.

19 The applicant has expressed that they would be willing to provide access to 2000 West if necessary. However, staff  
20 has also included text in the draft development agreement that would require a traffic study for Craig Lane between  
21 the proposed development access and 2000 West, requiring road widening or other mitigation requirements along  
22 Craig Lane if a significant traffic impact were predicted.

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

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

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

- 14 • *The proposed development is intended to be a phase of the Craig Estates development.*

15 Some mention was made in the meeting that a rezone of Craig Estates to PRD would be required to include the  
16 proposed development as a phase of Craig Estates. There is no current precedent for this or is there a City or State  
17 Code that requires it. An example of multi-zoned phasing that has been approved by the City recently is Keller  
18 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-  
19 2 Zone are both residential zones, just as the R-2 and R-3 Zones which underlie the Keller Crossing subdivision,  
20 requiring Craig Estates to be rezoned to include the proposed subdivision as a phase or add-on would be  
21 inconsistent.

- 22 • *The Planning Commission alleged that private roads are not permitted.*

23 As stated above in SCC 8.15.010, private roads are permitted in the PRD Zone.

- 24 • *The development needs to show additional amenities.*

25 The applicant has included an additional pavilion with 4 tables across the sidewalk that bisects the central open  
26 space of the development. All other amenities remain the same. As there are no explicit requirements for the type,

1 size, or number of amenities within the City Code, the determination of whether what the applicant has provided on  
2 the updated plan remains to be determined by the Planning Commission and City Council.

- 3 • *The road layout within the development raised concerns about emergency service access.*

4 The applicant has provided a map showing the design track for a fire truck. The tracks are contained within the  
5 paved area of the private road.

- 6 • *Specific snow removal agreements with the HOA had not been reached.*

7 The applicant has provided documentation indicating the specifics of snow removal agreements with the HOA of  
8 Craig Estates. Fire hydrants have also been moved to accommodate for snow storage at the end of each projecting  
9 leg of the private drive.

10 The memo concluded all other requirements of the PRD Zone are met by this development.

11 [6:32:02 PM](#)

12 CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

13 [6:32:46 PM](#)

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

20 [6:48:09 PM](#)

21 Councilmember Lisonbee stated she is not satisfied by calling the access road to the development a driveway because  
22 she is concerned that at some point in the future the Homeowner's Association (HOA) for the development could dissolve and  
23 there will be insufficient funding to improve or maintenance the driveway properly. She stated that the road should be called a  
24 road – even if it is a private road – and it must meet certain standards and accommodate public safety and emergency response  
25 access. Mr. Mellor stated that the road is currently classified as a private driveway. Developers Mike Waite and Troy Barber noted  
26 that mechanisms will be put in place to provide for proper maintenance of the road. Mr. Waite added that he will ensure that the

1 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  
2 development comply with City Code. Councilmember Lisonbee stated that the design meets City Code, but it does not meet the  
3 Code with certain contingencies that are inherent in the design and that is her concern.

4 [6:55:31 PM](#)

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

9 [7:10:11 PM](#)

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

13 [7:22:22 PM](#)

14 Mr. Jensen interjected that if the Council desires to create an emergency access onto 2000 West from the development,  
15 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  
16 foot drive width for an emergency response vehicle.

17 [7:23:30 PM](#)

18 Mr. Mellor summarized the remedies proposed by the Council as follows: widen the trail to eight feet to accommodate  
19 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  
20 City standard; require one-way traffic only with the other side of the road reserved as a fire zone; reconfiguring fencing between  
21 the subject property and existing development; and mark amenities that will be included in the development.

22

23 [7:27:01 PM](#)

24 **Discuss the proposed creation of a Residential Planned**

25 **Community Zone.**

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

15 Commissioner Rackham made a motion to recommend for approval to the City Council Title 10 the Residential  
16 Planned Community (RPC) zone with the following changes: that the total units add a minimum of 15% on the other  
17 lots standards, the dimensions of all shared driveways shall be determined in accordance with current IFC Code, the  
18 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  
19 side yard for 5,100 be 7 feet, the plan must be developed by an accredited master planner with the concepts and the  
20 design for the development, minimum land requirement is 100 contiguous acres, the entire master plan must be  
21 presented and approved at the same time and cannot have additional phases added after approval by the city council,  
22 major amenities of substantial benefit to the city and approved by the City Council must be provided to the city,  
23 property maintenance HOA section will become its own section, requirement added for an architectural review  
24 committee to review all exterior structural changes and making these changes to conform with the requirements of  
25 what the planning commission believes is the general plan and to keep the character of the city the way the residents  
26 would like to see it. The motion was seconded by commissioner Day. Commissioner Thorson and Moultrie voted  
27 nay, all other commissioners voted in favor, motion carried with a majority vote, 5/2.

1 [7:27:26 PM](#)

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

20  
21 [8:39:40 PM](#)

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

25 A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained it has been requested  
26 that the language for common and open spaces in the PRD zone be examined to ensure that it meets the spirit and intent of

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

16 [8:39:59 PM](#)

17 CED Director Mellor reviewed his staff memo and indicated he will take direction offered by the Council earlier in  
18 the evening that the Planning Commission consider the number of units that can be served by a private drive (the Council's  
19 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,  
20 and the number of access points needed for a development of a given size.

21  
22 [8:47:09 PM](#)

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

24  
25 [8:56:24 PM](#)

1 **Continued discussion of Employee Recruitment and**  
2 **Retention Policy and Fiscal Year 2017 Employee**  
3 **Compensation Plan.**

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

- 7 • August 17, 2016 email from Councilmember Bolduc that outlines her research on benchmarking from other  
8 cities.
- 9 • A second draft policy that includes three edits from the August 9<sup>th</sup> Draft. These edits were not discussed in  
10 a work session but are submitted for the Council’s consideration.
  - 11 ▪ The first edit provides additional detail on a methodology to provide “like to like comparisons” as  
12 stated in the draft policy.
  - 13 ▪ The second edit proposes a lifetime maximum career development reimbursement benefit of  
14 \$5,000.
  - 15 ▪ The third edit proposes an annual maximum budget amount of \$25,000 for the career development  
16 reimbursement program.

17 [8:56:43 PM](#)

18 City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo. He then facilitated a discussion among the Council, with input from  
19 staff, regarding the edits that have been made to the draft Policy and Plan. There was a focus on issues such as benchmarking  
20 practices, the rate at which employees can move through their wage scale, avoidance of “stacking” pay increases for  
21 individual employees, the Council’s involvement in the evaluation of employees, development of annual employee increase  
22 packages, employee turnover, the City’s employee evaluation system, wage compression, and the manner in which  
23 employees will be placed in their wage scale. The Council ultimately directed Mr. Bovero to attempt to prepare a document  
24 including the suggested amendments to the Policy and Plan documents for further review and discussion at the September 13  
25 Council meeting.  
26

1 [10:40:30 PM](#)

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

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

12 Major decision points include:

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

21 Staff does not anticipate a lengthy discussion during this work meeting, considering the other items on this full  
22 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  
23 thoughts and discussion among constituents, and that the Council and staff can have a robust discussion on the topic during  
24 the September Work Session.

25 [10:41:32 PM](#)

1 Mr. Roberts reviewed the staff memo and aided the Council in discussion and debate regarding the concept of  
2 imposing watering restrictions and associated penalties for violation of an ordinance enacting such restrictions. Public Works  
3 Director Whiteley also provided the Council with information regarding the current status of the City's water supply. The  
4 Council concluded to have an in-depth discussion regarding the entire secondary water system and any potential watering  
5 restrictions during the extended work session meeting scheduled to be held in October.

6  
7 Councilmember Bolduc left the meeting at 10:52 p.m.

8  
9 [10:56:07 PM](#)

10 **Discussion regarding Utility Fee and Cost Allocation**

11 **Policy.**

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

20 [10:56:45 PM](#)

21 City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo. The Council discussed the draft policy with a focus on whether  
22 adoption of the policy would trigger an increase in utility rates. Mr. Bovero noted that rates are dictated by operating and  
23 capital costs and the Council would need to decide whether capital costs necessitate a rate increase. The Council indicated  
24 they would like time to review the policy and directed staff to include an item on the next work session agenda to allow for  
25 continued discussion.

1 [11:02:11 PM](#)

2 **Public comments**

3 Gary Pratt again discussed the General Plan of the City as well as the items included on the meeting agenda  
4 regarding the creation of a new zone and amendments to the City's PRD zone. He stated that when the Planning Commission  
5 conducted a thorough review of the zoning designations available in the City they eliminated or drastically amended any zone  
6 with a reference to high density housing. The PRD ordinance was written for the Stoker Garden's development with the  
7 understanding that it should be the last PRD in the City. If the Council has any questions about what a PRD should look like,  
8 they should visit that development to see the road layout, density, and inclusion of amenities. PRD should be a zone that  
9 buffers between residential and commercial uses; it should be of a certain size and density and include open space and  
10 amenities. Additionally, the road should be connected to a primary road and this is because PRD developments should not be  
11 stuck as an island within another subdivision. He stated the Planning Commission spent nearly a year working on the PRD  
12 zone in order to facilitate the Stoker Gardens development. He concluded by addressing connectivity and stated that the  
13 ordinance does not reference the use of a path, sidewalk, or driveway connecting to a primary road and he feels the developer  
14 of Jackson Court is skirting the restrictions of the ordinance by calling their road a private driveway.

15  
16 [11:06:58 PM](#)

17 **Council business**

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

20  
21  
22 The meeting adjourned at [11:18:40 PM](#) p.m.

23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 Terry Palmer  
26 Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC  
City Recorder

27  
28 Date approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Minutes of the Syracuse City Council Special Meeting, September 9, 2016

Minutes of the Special meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on September 9, 2016 at 9:00 a.m., in the Council Chambers, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Andrea Anderson (participated via Skype)  
Corinne N. Bolduc  
Mike Gailey  
Karianne Lisonbee  
Dave Maughan (participated via Skype)

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

City Employees Present:  
City Attorney Paul Roberts  
Finance Director Steve Marshall  
Information Technologies (IT) Director TJ Peace

9:16:13 AM

1. Meeting Called to Order/Adopt Agenda

Mayor Palmer called the meeting to order at 9:16:38 AM 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.

9:16:52 AM

COUNCILMEMBER GAILEY MOVED TO ADD PUBLIC COMMENTS TO THE AGENDA AND ADOPT THE AGENDA WITH THAT CHANGE. COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

9:17:13 AM

2. Public comments

Kevin Homer asked if the proposed amendments include expanding the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to allow for low income housing or will the status quo be maintained. City Manager Bovero noted that Davis County already uses the funds to offer low income housing loans and the City and other cities in Davis County participated in the program through the County. He noted the amended agreement does not put any requirement on the City to offer anything different than what has been offered in the past and if the City were not a participant, the County would still participate in the program. Mr. Homer indicated he has 19 trillion reasons why the City, County, and State of Utah should not be participating

1 in the program; he would prefer the City not participate because there is a deficit at the federal level that is \$19 trillion and the  
2 City and County participates in that debt. At some point the City needs to “put our foot down” and refuse to participate in the  
3 program. He understands the funds are available, but the City needs to stop that kind of spending that will be harmful to future  
4 generations. The City should not participate in deficit spending and government is a bad way to provide funding for low income  
5 people; the free market options are much better options. He noted that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in conjunction with the  
6 Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) – all government agencies – do not know how to manage home loan  
7 programs for the poor. Such programs should be offered by the private sector. Mr. Homer concluded he will remember how  
8 the Council votes on this issue as it will be a good indicator of their principles.

9  
10 [9:21:30 AM](#)

11 3. Resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an amendment to an  
12 Interlocal Agreement with Davis County regarding the conduct of the  
13 Community Development Block Grant program.

14 A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the attached amendment to a previous agreement with the County  
15 is required for the County to continue administering the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, as  
16 well as the HOME and ESG program. The amendment makes the following changes:

- 17 • Changes to effective date to match the federal fiscal year, with some correlated text amendments
- 18 • Adds HOME Investment Partnership and Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program to the list of  
19 programs which the County will exclusively administer, should the City seek access to those funds for  
20 projects within the City:
  - 21 ○ HOME makes federal grants available for strategies to increase home ownership and affordable  
22 housing for low-income and very low-income families
  - 23 ○ The Emergency Solutions Grant Program provides services for those struggling with homelessness
  - 24 ○ The City may apply to the County for these funds as sub-recipients due to the County's designation  
25 as an "Urban County." The City would not be eligible to apply for these funds by itself, because it

1 does not meet the definition of a "Metropolitan City."

- 2 • Prohibits the City from trading or transferring any CDBG, HOME, or ESG funds to another city or unit of
- 3 local government. Any funds provided must be spent on eligible activities.
- 4 • Both City and County will comply with the provisions of the United States Housing and Community
- 5 Development Act, Civil Rights Act, Fair Housing Act (including the Rehabilitation Act and Age
- 6 Discrimination Act).
- 7 • Other technical amendments

8 City Administration has been informed that any delays in providing written amendments to the Agreement will  
9 stall the County's distribution of nearly \$1 Million of funding for these programs. The County has therefore requested  
10 that the City hold a Special Session to approve the amendment and take immediate action.

11 [9:21:46 AM](#)

12 Mr. Bovero reviewed the staff memo.

13 [9:23:04 AM](#)

14 The Council engaged in discussion regarding the grant reporting requirements the City would be required to adhere  
15 to if the City continues to participate in the CDBG program, after which Councilmember Lisonbee indicated she feels CDBG  
16 money could be best used in other areas of the County. Syracuse is a fairly unique City and residents have said they want it to  
17 stay that way; she has voted for every other grant that does not have egregious strings attached to it, but she is unsure whether  
18 this grant is worthwhile for the City.

19 [9:26:25 AM](#)

20 Discussion centered on the projects the City has completed with CDBG funding in the past, with Mr. Bovero noting  
21 the most the City has ever received in a program year is \$200,000. Councilmember Maughan stated there are several projects  
22 – such as the Ranchette's utility infrastructure project – that need to be completed in the City, but there is a lack of funding for  
23 those projects. He wondered how accepting money to fund those programs could be a bad thing for the City. Councilmember  
24 Lisonbee stated that Public Works Director Whiteley has indicated that the City does have sufficient funding this year or next  
25 year to complete the Ranchette's project. Councilmember Maughan stated that the information provided to the Council

1 regarding capital projects indicated that there would not be funding for the Ranchette's project for several years.  
2 Councilmember Lisonbee stated she personally spoke to Mr. Whiteley and he felt that the project should have a higher priority  
3 and that funding will be available for it. Mr. Bovero stated that if Ranchette's is deemed to be of greater priority there will be  
4 funding available for it, but other projects will be delayed.

5 [9:30:53 AM](#)

6 Discussion refocused on the purpose of CDBG funding and whether the City would be required to increase the amount  
7 of low income housing in the City in order to gain access to the funds. Councilmember Lisonbee indicated that CDBG grants  
8 are meant to equalize wealth and assist the underprivileged members of society; those funds can be used elsewhere in the  
9 County as the City is the least needful of all cities in the County. Mayor Palmer stated the City would not be using CDBG funds  
10 for low income housing; rather, the funds would be used to complete utility projects. Councilmember Lisonbee agreed, but  
11 noted she is thinking of how the funding could be more helpful elsewhere in Davis County. Mayor Palmer echoed  
12 Councilmember Maughan's comments that there are utility projects the City needs to complete, but there is a lack of funding.  
13 Councilmember Lisonbee stated the Council can prioritize funding of such projects; she is not willing to tie CDBG funds to  
14 the Ranchette's project as she has spoken with Mr. Whiteley and indicated to him that the project should be funded in the next  
15 year or two. Mayor Palmer stated he is concerned about the projects that will not be funded over the next couple of years if the  
16 Ranchette's project is ranked higher than others. This led Finance Director Marshall to provide an overview of the City's five-  
17 year capital plan to identify the projects that will not be funded if the Ranchette's project is ranked higher than others; currently  
18 the City has the ability to fund \$1.2 million of a \$7.4 million five-year plan. If the Ranchette's project is moved to the top of  
19 the priority list, four other projects will be delayed until future years.

20 [9:36:46 AM](#)

21 The Council then participated in high level philosophical discussion and debate regarding the appropriateness of the  
22 City accepting CDBG funding; there was also a focus on other grant programs that may provide funding for utility or street  
23 projects without 'attached strings' relating to low income housing.

24 [9:42:54 AM](#)

1 COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN MOVED TO TABLE CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION R16-40  
2 AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH DAVIS  
3 COUNTY REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM,  
4 RESERVING THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS THE ENTIRITY OF THE CDBG PROGRAM DURING A FUTURE  
5 COUNCIL MEETING.

6 [9:43:31 AM](#)

7 Mr. Bovero noted Davis County representatives have indicated they need the City to vote on the agreement prior to  
8 September 13 due to a HUD deadline. Councilmember Lisonbee asked if the City would still be engaged in the original CDBG  
9 agreement if the decision were made to not approve the amendment. City Attorney Roberts answered yes; however, Mr. Bovero  
10 indicated that HUD may not accept the City's participation in the original agreement if the Council refuses to agree to the  
11 amendments. Mr. Roberts stated that the County's designation as a recipient of grant funds may be jeopardized if certain  
12 jurisdictions are not compliant with the new contract terms. Councilmember Lisonbee stated the Council needs to understand  
13 the exact implications of not approving the amendments to the interlocal agreement. Mr. Bovero contacted CDBG Program  
14 Coordinator Tony Zambrana, who provided input by phone regarding the implications of failure to execute the agreement. He  
15 noted that federal funding provided to the County would be reduced because the funding is based upon population size for all  
16 participating entities. If Syracuse City pulls out of the contract, the total population of participating entities will be reduced.  
17 This will impact other recipients of grant funding as well; these include shelters and food pantries that provide services to  
18 residents throughout the entire County, including Syracuse residents. If Syracuse is not able to meet the September 13 deadline  
19 the funding calculation for the next program year will reflect a reduction in total population.

20

21 Councilmember Gailey left the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

22

23 [9:54:17 AM](#)

1 Councilmember Lisonbee inquired as to the percentage of the grant funds that is dedicated to services like food  
2 pantries and shelters. Mr. Zambrana stated 30 to 40 percent of the funding allocation is dedicated to those service entities each  
3 year.

4 [9:55:29 AM](#)

5 Mr. Bovero inquired as to the percentage of the total County population that Syracuse represents. Mr. Zambrana stated  
6 he cannot answer that question at this time. He noted South Weber, Layton, and Clearfield are the three cities in the County  
7 that do not participate in the program, but all other cities participate. Mr. Bovero stated that he would estimate that Syracuse  
8 City represents 10 to 15 percent of the total population considered for the purpose of funding allocation.

9 [9:58:27 AM](#)

10 Council discussion of the CDBG program continued, with Councilmember Lisonbee stating she feels the Council has  
11 two choices; they can decide to continue to be engaged in the CDBG program through the County or withdraw altogether.  
12 Councilmember Anderson stated she would like to remain involved in the program and have future discussions regarding any  
13 application the City may make to receive any portion of CDBG funds. Mr. Bovero stated the Council can have oversight  
14 regarding any such grant application.

15 [10:07:47 AM](#)

16 Councilmember Lisonbee addressed Mr. Homer and stated she feels that denying the resolution before the Council  
17 would not address his larger concerns; the Council needs to understand the distribution of funding throughout the entire County  
18 and she would like for the Council to have continued discussion with County representatives at a future meeting to understand  
19 how the program is administered.

20 [10:08:57 AM](#)

21 COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION R16-40 AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR  
22 TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH DAVIS COUNTY REGARDING THE  
23 CONDUCT OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM, RESERVING THE OPPORTUNITY  
24 TO DISCUSS THE ENTIRITY OF THE CDBG PROGRAM DURING A FUTURE COUNCIL MEETING.

1 COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. Councilmember Gailey was  
2 not present when this vote was taken.

3

4 [10:10:28 AM](#)

5 Mayor Palmer provided brief reports regarding various items of City business.

6

7 [10:12:05 AM](#)

8 At 10:12 a.m. COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER  
9 BOLDUC SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. Councilmember Gailey was not present when this vote  
10 was taken.

11

12 -----

13 Terry Palmer  
14 Mayor

15

16 Date approved: \_\_\_\_\_

-----

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC  
City Recorder

Minutes of the Syracuse City Council Regular Meeting, September 13, 2016

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,

1 in conjunction with Jeff Gibson, present the recipients for the “Syracuse City & Wendy’s Award for Excellence”. This monthly  
2 award recognizes the outstanding performance of a male and female who excel in athletics, academics, arts, and/or community  
3 service. The monthly award recipients will each receive a certificate and be recognized at a City Council meeting; have their  
4 photograph placed at City Hall and the Community Center; be written about in the City Newsletter, City’s Facebook and Twitter  
5 Feed, and City’s website; be featured on the Wendy’s product television; and receive a \$10 gift certificate to Wendy’s.

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

8 Mary Thorpe:

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

19  
20 Tanner Kofoed:

21 I am pleased to nominate Tanner Kofoed for the Syracuse City and Wendy’s Award for Excellence athlete  
22 and scholar of the Month because of his leadership, academics, and contribution to the Legacy Boys  
23 basketball team. Tanner showed great leadership while playing on the varsity basketball team when on  
24 several occasions we lost close games. Instead of complaining and sulking, he sought to lift other up and  
25 instill a spirit of resilience to finish the games strong and to prepare for the next opponent. He is an excellent

1 example of a student athlete because of his strong academics and his high level of basketball play. His strong  
2 basketball skills and decision making ability on the court contributed heavily in winning games that placed  
3 Legacy Jr. High into the playoffs last year, for the fifth year in a row since I have been there. For these and  
4 other reasons, I am pleased to nominate Tanner for this Award for Excellence.

5  
6 [6:15:01 PM](#)

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

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

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

14  
15 **WHEREAS,** Hunter captured the bronze medal during the 2016 United States Paralympic  
16 Team Trials in the 200 meter and 400 meter events; and

17  
18 **WHEREAS,** During the 2015 Paralympics Track & Field National Championships, Hunter  
19 took second place in the 400-meter event and fifth place in the 200-meter event;  
20 and

21  
22 **WHEREAS,** Hunter won his first State title in the 400-meter event as a junior during the Utah  
23 High School State Championship in 2016; and

24  
25 **WHEREAS,** Hunter served as an ambassador for Shriner’s Hospital from 2012-2013,  
26 representing thousands of children who receive care at the facility and his motto is  
27 “they told me I would never walk, so I learned to run instead”.

28  
29 **NOW, THEREFORE,** I, Mayor Palmer, Mayor of the City of Syracuse, Utah, do hereby  
30 proclaim **SEPTEMBER 15, 2016** as

31  
32 ***HUNTER WOODHALL DAY***

33  
34 in the City of Syracuse, Utah, and I urge all citizens to celebrate Hunter’s efforts  
35 and successes as an athlete and valuable resident of our community.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

[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

1 the education she has received not only helps her, but it helps the community. The job of City Recorder is an intensive job and  
2 she could not do it without the support of the Mayor and City Council. She concluded by recognizing other City Recorders in  
3 attendance this evening: Cindi Mansell, Salt Lake City Recorder; Tracy Hansen, Ogden City Recorder, and Lisa Tittensor,  
4 Clinton City Recorders. She presented Ms. Brown with a plaque memorializing her MMC designation and a gift from the  
5 UMCA Board.

6 [6:22:35 PM](#)

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

12 [6:23:18 PM](#)

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

15

16 [6:23:33 PM](#)

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

18 This item was removed from the agenda.

19

20 [6:23:44 PM](#)

21 6. Approval of Minutes:

22 The following minutes were reviewed by the City Council: Work Session of July 26, 2016; Special Meeting of July  
23 26, 2016; Regular Meeting of August 9, 2016; and Special RDA Meeting of August 9, 2016.

24 [6:24:01 PM](#)

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

3

4 [6:24:18 PM](#)

5 7. Public comments

6 Gary Pratt stated that over the past eight years he has been very active in the City and over that time he has heard  
7 residents speak about two main issues: preventing the development of high density housing and industrial land uses in the City.  
8 The General Plan of the City has been centered around these desires; it is a very important document and is essentially an  
9 agreement between the City Council and their constituents. The City Council is responsible for the doctrine in the General Plan  
10 and when they are executing their responsibilities they must know what the Plan says. He asked each Councilmember to ask  
11 themselves if they have read and understand the General Plan; the Planning Commission and Planning staff should be asked  
12 the same. In his recent attendance at meetings he has felt that many have not read and do not understand the General Plan.  
13 Recent actions relating to Planned Residential Development (PRD) developments are not in line with the PRD requirements of  
14 the City. The PRD ordinance was written specifically for the Stoker Garden’s development and other developments should not  
15 be approved if they do not conform with the ordinance. He concluded that he submitted a document to the City Council  
16 regarding actions that were being taken by the former Community and Economic Development (CED) Director; that person  
17 was doing the same thing the current CED Director is doing, which his misrepresenting the PRD zone; they leave things out  
18 and miscommunicate things to the Planning Commission and City Council that lead to improper actions. The only person that  
19 has the document in their hands is Councilmember Lisonbee.

20 [6:29:03 PM](#)

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

1  
2 [6:30:49 PM](#)  
3 8. Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval, Jackson Court, located at  
4 approximately 1958 S. 2000 W.

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

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

11 In the August 23<sup>rd</sup> Work Session the City Council requested the following:

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

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

21 [6:31:03 PM](#)

22 CED Director Mellor reviewed the staff memo.

23 [6:32:39 PM](#)

24 Council discussion centered on the classification of the street that will be used to access the development, with Mr. Mellor  
25 noting that the plat included a typographical error that will be corrected to read “private drive”. He stated that the road will be

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

8 [6:42:16 PM](#)

9 Discussion briefly centered on the Planning Commission’s recommendation; Mr. Mellor noted that the body recommended  
10 approval when they took action on the application. Councilmember Maughan stated he is concerned about the process that was  
11 followed to arrive at that recommendation and noted that several Planning Commissioners have expressed concerns about the project  
12 though they supported a positive recommendation. Councilmember Lisonbee agreed the process that was followed to consider this  
13 project has not been a smooth one; she has had concerns about the project, but she understands the property is unique and design of  
14 a project that will fit on the property has been difficult. She pointed out the Craig Estates Homeowners Association (HOA) is  
15 supportive of the project, the developer has worked to address the Council’s concerns, and Mr. Roberts is of the opinion that the  
16 project conforms with City Code. She suggested the Council proceed with approval so long as the reference to the street on the plat  
17 can be changed to “residential driveway”. Mr. Mellor agreed and noted that the feedback offered by the Planning Commission  
18 following their favorable recommendation is highly irregular and should not be occurring; this is an issue the Council should address  
19 through appointments to and training of the body. Councilmember Maughan addressed the Planning Commission Chairman and  
20 asked that he charge the Planning Commission with simply deciding whether an application conforms to City Code; some members  
21 indicated that they did not feel the project conforms with City Code, yet they voted in support of the favorable recommendation and  
22 that can lead some to believe their decision was political in nature.

23 [6:46:33 PM](#)

24 COUNCILMEMBER BOLDUC MOVED TO GRANT PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT APPROVAL FOR  
25 JACKSON COURT SUBDIVISION, LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1958 S. 2000 W., SUBJECT TO THE

1 CONDITIONS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT AND WITH THE DIRECTION THAT THE ACCESS ROAD BE  
2 CLASSIFIED AS A ‘RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAY’. COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

3 [6:47:43 PM](#)

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

6 [6:47:51 PM](#)

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

9 [6:48:10 PM](#)

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

13 [6:48:43 PM](#)

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

17

18 [6:49:48 PM](#)

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

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

23 Location: 3230 W. 2700 S.

24 Current Zoning: R-1



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

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

5 **FIRE DEPARTMENT:**

6 Sharp MX-3501 Multifunction Fax/Copy/Scan machine

7 **JUSTICE COURT**

8 Pd6500 Walk Through Metal Detector.

9 **ADMINISTRATION**

10 HP Designjet 800 Plotter

11 **PARKS & RECREATION**

12 102 Football helmets

13 73 Baseball helmets

14 2 Baseball bats

15 [6:52:27 PM](#)

16 Mr. Bovero reviewed the staff memo.

17 [6:53:14 PM](#)

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

20 [6:53:17 PM](#)

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

23

24 [6:55:06 PM](#)

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

6

7 [6:53:54 PM](#)

8 11. Public comments

9 TJ Jensen stated he wanted to follow up on earlier comments made by Mr. Pratt. He indicated that when the Stillwater  
10 Estates project was approved there were a number of recommendations by staff that made things difficult for the Planning  
11 Commission and City Council and the City Council ultimately felt they were backed into a corner and had to approve the  
12 project to avoid a lawsuit. Many issues were created by staff working with the developer and the developer felt they were  
13 vested by that work; once a developer is vested, it is difficult for the City to deny their application. The Jackson Court PRD is  
14 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  
15 stated this is not the sort of business the City should be in and Councilmember Maughan's comments about the process were  
16 accurate; the Planning Commission dropped the ball and they should not have vote in favor of something that does not meet  
17 the ordinance. He feels staff is falling into lazy habits; they should be very careful when handling applications and all they  
18 should do is determine whether an application meets submission requirements. Any work the staff does beyond that point is  
19 pushing the City into vesting territory and that is a dangerous place to be. He suggested the staff, Planning Commission, and  
20 City Council receive training regarding this issue very soon.

21 [6:58:49 PM](#)

22 Gary Pratt stated the City has been pinned down legally relative to project vesting; years back the Stillwater Estates  
23 development was declared non-conforming. The State was asked to weigh in on the project and they did not disagree that the  
24 project did not meet City Code; however, they indicated that the fact the CED Director got some key votes through the Planning  
25 Commission and City Council led the project to be vested and the City could not make a change at that point. He stated the

1 discussion tonight regarding the classification of the road in the Jackson Court development is troubling; the bottom line is that  
2 the project does not meet City Code and should not have been approved. He reiterated his earlier comments regarding the PRD  
3 ordinance and emphasized it was written for Stoker Gardens; the Jackson Court development does not meet the requirements  
4 of the ordinance. He stated the last two Mayors have ‘dumbed down’ the Planning Commission to the point that they come to  
5 meetings and ‘fly by the seat of their pants’ with no historical reference upon which to base a decision. They rely upon the  
6 CED Director and City Attorney and most of the City Attorneys the City has employed over the past eight years have had no  
7 land use experience. The City Attorney employed prior to the current City Attorney could not defend the City against the  
8 Stillwater Estates developer.

9  
10 [7:02:07 PM](#)

11 12. Councilmember reports.

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

15  
16 13. Mayor’s Report.

17 Mayor Palmer was not present to provide a report.

18  
19 [7:09:19 PM](#)

20 14. City Manager report

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

22  
23 [7:11:06 PM](#)

1 The meeting recessed to allow the Council to convene in the large conference room to hold discussion regarding item

2 15. The meeting reconvened at [7:22:04 PM](#).

3

4 [7:22:27 PM](#)

5 15. Discussion of Employee Recruitment and Retention Policy and Fiscal

6 Year 2017 Employee Compensation Plan (in conference room).

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

14

15 [7:22:41 PM](#)

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

18 **Benchmark**

- 19
- 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

24 **Wage Scales**

- 1 • 60th percentile (see comment)
- 2 • Wages adjusted every benchmark (4 yrs), along with wage scale adjustment, if Council approves. This comes
- 3 in the form of an increase in the percentage that the employee is eligible to receive in the annual merit increase
- 4 evaluation.

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

9 **Biennial Review**

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

16 **Merit Increases**

- 17 • Average percent increase of benchmark cities/companies from previous year is set aside for merit increases.
- 18 • Administration of merit increases is performed by City Manager under direction of the Mayor, subject to
- 19 performance scores of employees. No single employee may receive more than 1.5 times more than the
- 20 budgeted percentage set aside for merit increase without Council approval.

21 **Example:** Council adopts a 2% budget for merit increases. No single employee may receive more than a 3%  
22 (2% x 1.5) merit increase, unless approved by the Council.

23 **Evaluation System**

- 24 • **Scoring System:**  
25 4.5 – 5 -> Max 1.5x the Avg

- 1                                    4 – 4.49
- 2                                    3.5– 3.99 -> Target group for Avg merit increase
- 3                                    3– 3.49
- 4                                    2– 2.99 -> No merit increase at 2.99 or below
- 5                                    0 – 1.99

- 6                    • 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.

7  
8  
9  
10                    **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%.

11  
12  
13                    **Advancements**

- 14                    • 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.

15  
16  
17  
18                    **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.

19  
20  
21  
22                    **Promotions**

- 23                    • 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.

1                   **Example:** Council adopts a 2% budget for merit increases. Employee X is promoted, and his/her current  
2                   wage is already higher than the minimum of the new higher position. He/She would receive a 5% increase  
3                   (2% x 2.5). However, since this is below 9%, the employee would receive 9%. He/she would not receive a  
4                   merit increase for that year.

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

11

12                  [10:15:22 PM](#)

13                  16. Public comments

14                  TJ Jensen stated that he understands the different positions explained by Councilmembers regarding their desires for  
15                  an employee scoring system, but noted that there is nothing more frustrating for employees than hearing from the City Council  
16                  that they cannot offer pay increases though the City has an excess of money in its surplus fund each year. He stated this can  
17                  seem disingenuous and the employees feel that the Council is simply refusing to fairly compensate them. He noted that he likes  
18                  the idea of connecting the compensation plan to the economy rather than using a subjective policy that is up to the Council’s  
19                  discretion each year. Tying the plan to the market offers some predictability and consistency for the employees, especially  
20                  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  
21                  Council to action in the event that the City’s surplus fund balance dips below 17 percent. At this point the Council should have  
22                  the discretion to reduce employee increases.

23

24

1 At [10:18:32 PM](#) p.m. COUNCILMEMBER LISONBEE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN.

2 COUNCILMEMBER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

3

4

5

6

7 -----  
Terry Palmer

8 Mayor

9

-----

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC

City Recorder

10 Date approved: \_\_\_\_\_



# COUNCIL AGENDA

October 11, 2016

## Agenda Item #8

### Utility Fee and Internal Service Allocation Policy

- Any question regarding this agenda item may be directed at Brody Bovero, City Manager.
- Please see attached draft policy provided by Brody Bovero.

#### *Factual Summation*

- Pursuant to previous Council discussions, the attached policy will be on the agenda for the Council's approval.
- The policy dictates how much of the City's utility service costs will be covered by customer utility fees. It also explains 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% 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, up to an estimated \$311,000 would not be reimbursed to the General Fund from the utilities. That money would stay in the utility funds.
- Once the policy is adopted, the Council will have the flexibility to decide how much of the General Fund will absorb utility service costs, up to 50% of the administrative cost.

## **RESOLUTION R16-44**

### **A RESOLUTION OF THE SYRACUSE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE SYRACUSE CITY UTILITY FEES AND INTERNAL SERVICE ALLOCATION POLICY.**

**WHEREAS**, the City provides utility services to its residents, which services are funded through separately maintained enterprise funds largely funded by user fees imposed upon users of those services; and

**WHEREAS**, the City provides administrative and overhead support for the utility services and general government functions; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 10-6-135(3)(f) and the Uniform Accounting Manual for Utah Cities, the City is permitted to reasonably allocate these costs between the enterprise funds and general fund of the City, to ensure a fair accounting for the costs that the City's general fund will supply in order to provide these services to the utilities; and

**WHEREAS**, the Council previously adopted a policy governing the allocation of these costs between the enterprise funds and the general fund; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council, in planning for capital projects which will be completed using utility enterprise funds, finds that an adjustment to the policy is necessary in order to accomplish more of those projects and to keep the enterprise funds solvent; and

**WHEREAS**, the Council intends to refer to this policy as it performs its role in allocating funds in upcoming budget seasons,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF SYRACUSE CITY, STATE OF UTAH, AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section 1. Approval.** The City Council hereby adopts the Utility Fee and Internal Service Allocation Policy, attached to this Resolution as "Exhibit A."

**Section 2. Severability.** If any section, part or provision of this Resolution is held invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect any other portion of this Resolution, and all sections, parts and provisions of this Resolution shall be severable.

**Section 3. Effective Date.** This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its publication.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF SYRACUSE CITY, STATE OF UTAH, THIS 11<sup>th</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2016.**

**SYRACUSE CITY**

**(Signatures appear on next page)**

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cassie Z. Brown, CMC  
City Recorder

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Palmer  
Mayor

Voting by the City Council:

	“AYE”	“NAY”
Councilmember Anderson	_____	_____
Councilmember Bolduc	_____	_____
Councilmember Gailey	_____	_____
Councilmember Lisonbee	_____	_____
Councilmember Maughan	_____	_____

**EXHIBIT “A”**



## SYRACUSE CITY

### Utility Fees & ~~Cost~~ Internal Service Allocation Policy

## (DRAFT)

#### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this policy is to outline the City's policy on the establishment of customer rates and the allocation of costs for enterprise funds related to public utilities, including water, secondary water, sewer, storm sewer, and solid waste collection.

#### **AUTHORITY**

Under subsection 10-6-135(3)(f) of Utah Code and the provisions of the Uniform Accounting Manual for Utah Cities, the City Council has the authority to establish, through its budgetary process, a reasonable allocation of costs between the enterprise fund and other funds that provide staff or other support to the enterprise fund.

#### **GENERAL POLICY FOR UTILITY USER CHARGES**

User charges for utility services, including water, secondary water, storm sewer, sewer, and solid waste collection, shall be set at rates sufficient to cover all direct operating and maintenance costs, all capital improvement and debt service costs, and at least 50 % of indirect operating costs. General administrative services from the General Fund provided to the enterprise activities (aka internal services) shall be included as indirect costs. Rates will be set so the enterprise fund balance is never below zero during the year.

#### **PERIODIC REVIEW OF RATES**

At least once every three years, the Finance Director will conduct a review of utility rates for each utility provided by the City. The review will include an analysis of the following for each fund:

- Planned capital improvements to be made within the next 5 years.
- Projected direct operational and maintenance costs for the next 5 years.

- Projected indirect costs for the next 5 years.
- Maintenance of minimum working capital.
- Projected debt service costs.
- Analysis of the extent that projected revenues at current utility rates will cover the projected costs over the next 5 years.
- Competitive analysis of utility rates of similar cities.

Upon completion of the analysis, the Finance Director will provide a report to the City Council for consideration. The City Council may use this information in determining user rate levels.

### **PRICING INTERNAL SERVICES**

Internal services include all services provided by the city government in support of the utility service operations. For example, the City government may provide accounting, payroll, and human resources services to the utility. These services come at a cost, which is counted as part of the indirect operational costs of the utility.

At least every 3 years, the basis for pricing of internal services will be reviewed. In determining the methodology for establishing the pricing for these services, the City will weigh the cost and time needed to accurately determine the [basis for](#) pricing versus the accuracy of the pricing itself. Extraordinary costs should not be incurred if reasonable pricing structures can otherwise be determined.

The following is an outline on the methodology that will be used to determine the pricing of internal services:

- The Finance Director will conduct an evaluation of the percentage of time each employee has spent, or reasonably will spend, on each of the utility services being provided by the City.
- Based on the allocation of time, the Finance Director will take a percentage of the budgeted wages, benefits, and operating costs associated with each of those employees, and multiply the total budgeted amount by that percentage.
- In addition, the Finance Director will conduct an evaluation of non-personnel expenses that are incurred internally, and are related to the provision of the utility services. An allocated or pro-rated share of those expenses will be applied based on the percentage of such expenses that are related to utility services.

Both the personnel-related and non-personnel costs are then added together and applied to each utility fund based on the allocation of time that has been calculated.