

Minutes of the City Council Work Session of the Syracuse City Council, held on January 27, 2026 at 6:00 p.m., in a hybrid in-person/electronic format via Zoom, meeting ID 889 2514 0071, in-person in the City Council Conference Room at 1979 W. 1900 S., and streamed on the Syracuse City YouTube Channel in accordance with House Bill 5002, Open and Public Meetings Act Amendments, signed into law on June 25, 2020.

Present: Councilmembers: Andrea Brown
Brett Cragun
Paul Watson
Julie Robertson

Mayor Dave Maughan
City Manager Brody Bovero
Deputy City Recorder Marisa Graham

Excused: Councilmember Abraham Pollard

City Employees Present:

Assistant City Manager Stephen Marshall
City Attorney Colin Winchester
Fire Chief Aaron Byington
Police Chief Alex Davis
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Communications Specialist Kara Finley

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; review recommendation from Planning Commission, application for zone change for property located at approximately 2300 W. 1700 S., Residential (R-2) and Agricultural (A-1) to Light Commercial (LC), applicant Leisure Villas; review recommendation from Planning Commission, application for General Plan Map amendment, Civic to Low Density Residential, for property located at approximately 963 S. 2000 W.; review recommendation from Planning Commission, application for zone change for property located at approximately 963 S. 2000 W., Agricultural (A-1) to Residential (R-3), Applicant CW Land; discuss proposal to consider Amendment No. 1 to Interlocal Cooperation Transportation Project Reimbursement Agreement for a signalized intersection at 2500 W. and State Road (SR) 193; discuss proposed amendments to Syracuse Municipal Code Section 4.15 and 4.25 pertaining to water meters; proposed Engineering Standards updates related to water meters; and proposed policy related to existing meters; discuss updates on potential changes to 911 Dispatch Services; discussion regarding provision of ambulance services responsive to Senate Bill (SB) 215, 2025; discuss Municipal budgeting; discuss proposed City-wide branding guidelines; review Council assignments/appointments; discuss and review Section 2.45.060 of Syracuse Municipal Code pertaining to the appointment process for special service district positions; and receive biennial review for Community and Economic Development (CED) Department.

Public comments

There were no public comments.

Planning item C1: Recommendation from Planning Commission: application for zone change for property located at approximately 2300 W. 1700 S., Residential (R-2) and Agricultural (A-1) to Light Commercial (LC), applicant Leisure Villas

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director Steele explained that the City has received a rezone application from Leisure Villas for approximately 4.27 acres located approximately 2300 W. 1700 S. The request includes seven parcels. The applicant provided the following reasons for the requested change: "Rezoning from residential to light commercial to meet the general plan." The property is located south of Walmart. The north edge of the property has frontage and access on Antelope Drive which is State Route 127. In 2021, UDOT demolished six homes that were present on the property to make room for the widening of Antelope Drive. The applicant purchased the property at surplus auction from the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) after completion of the highway widening. The south, east, and west edges of the property are bordered by single family homes. The current zoning on the parcel is Agricultural (A-1) and Residential (R-2). Zoning to the east, south, and west is R-2. Zoning to the north is General Commercial (GC). The requested zoning is Light Commercial (LC). The property is also within the Town Center Overlay zone. The LC zone permits a variety of commercial uses including banks, fast food, restaurants, medical office, and retail sales. The maximum building height

City Council Work Session

January 27, 2025

allowed in the LC zone is 25 feet. The Town Center Overlay Zone prohibits auto repair, auto body, auto maintenance, auto detailing, car washes, and car dealerships. The LC zone does not list gas stations as permitted. The property is general planned for 'Commercial'. The LC zone is a permitted zone within the Commercial general plan designation and is therefore consistent with the General Plan. General Plan to the north of the property is Commercial and to the south is Low Density Residential. As explained in 10.20.070 (D)(3-4), Planning Commission is the advisory body to the City Council for zoning and general plan map amendments. The Planning Commission is required to hold a public hearing and forward a recommendation to approve, approve with modifications, or deny the request. The City Council will then review the recommendation and make a decision. During the public meeting, the City Council can approve, approve with modifications, or deny the proposal. 10.20.070 (E) explains that amendments to the zoning map are matters of legislative discretion by the City Council after considering if the application would be harmonious with the overall character of the existing development, the extent to which it may adversely affect adjacent property, and the adequacy of facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including but not limited to roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, storm water drainage systems, water supplies, and waste water and refuse collection. The Planning Commission held a public hearing and discussed the item on 12/02/25. They are forwarding a recommendation for approval.

The Mayor reviewed the staff memo and explained that this is a project the Council reviewed a few years ago and at that time the City did not have a Light Commercial (LC) zone. The City now has a Light Commercial (LC) zone established and the proposed project would fit within the Light Commercial zone guidelines. The Mayor and Council briefly discussed the proposed application for a zone change and the Council showed support for this item. The Mayor concluded that this item would move forward to the consent agenda at the February 10 business meeting.

Planning item C2(i): Recommendation from Planning Commission: application for General Plan Map amendment, Civic to Low Density Residential, for property located at approximately 963 S. 2000 W. and, Planning item C2(ii): Recommendation from Planning Commission: application for zone change for property located at approximately 963 S. 2000 W., Agricultural (A-1) to Residential (R-3), applicant CW Land

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development Director (CED) explained that the City has received an application to amend the General Plan Map and an application for a rezone of the property. The application was received from Chase Freebairn of Cole West North, LLC for approximately 12.83 acres located approximately 963 S. 2000 W. The request includes two parcels. The applicant provided the following reasons for the requested change:

"Cole West is planning to purchase approximately 12.83 acres of property owned by the Davis School District (DSD), located in Syracuse City. Following acquisition, Cole West intends to rezone approximately 12 acres of the property to the R-3 Residential Zone, consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods. A General Plan Map Amendment is required to facilitate the rezone and ultimately the development of a 36-lot single-family residential subdivision that complements existing land uses in the area. Pursuant to our agreement with DSD, within 30 days following the property closing, Cole West will deed approximately 0.83–0.85 acres located at the west end of the site to Syracuse City, at no cost, to support the City's potential plans for a future fire station adjacent to the residential development. As part of our design commitment, Cole West will preserve the large existing tree onsite, integrating it into the subdivision's open space and incorporating it alongside stormwater detention and possible community amenities. In addition, Cole West intends to coordinate with the adjacent property owner to the west (Parcel ID# 120500126) to determine their interest in participating jointly in this rezone request. Should that property owner wish to participate, the application will be amended to include their parcel, promoting orderly and coordinated development and preventing the parcel from becoming landlocked without access to 1925 West."

The property is located east of Sorensen Construction and Utah Onions along 2000 W. 2000 W, is also known as State Route 108. The north, south, and east edges of the property are bordered by single family homes. The current zoning on the parcel is Agricultural (A-1). Zoning to the north and east is Residential (R-2). Zoning to the south is Residential (R-3). Zoning to the west is Industrial. Immediate west is planned for a future fire station which will most likely remain A-1 zoning. The requested zoning is R-3, the R-3 zone permits single family lots with a minimum lot size of 8,000 sf. The property is general planned for 'Civic'. This is left over from when the school district owned the property and was planning on building an elementary school. The school district decided against building a school at this location and is now under contract to sell the property to a developer. R-3 would be allowed in the low, medium, and high residential designations. The applicant has requested an amendment to the general plan map from 'Civic' to 'Low Density Residential' designation. As explained in 10.20.070 (D)(3-4), Planning Commission is the advisory body to the City Council for zoning and general plan map amendments. The Planning Commission is required to hold a public hearing and forward a recommendation to approve, approve with modifications, or deny the request. The City Council will then review the recommendation and make a decision. During

City Council Work Session

January 27, 2025

the public meeting, the City Council can approve, approve with modifications, or deny the proposal. 10.20.070 (E) explains that amendments to the zoning map are matters of legislative discretion by the City Council after considering if the application would be harmonious with the overall character of the existing development, the extent to which it may adversely affect adjacent property, and the adequacy of facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including but not limited to roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, storm water drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection. The Planning Commission held a public hearing and discussed the item on 12/02/25. They are forwarding a recommendation for approval.

The Mayor facilitated discussion among the Council and Mr. Steele for both agenda items C2(i) and C2(ii), application for zone change and General Plan Map amendment at this property. He explained that there was a brief discussion during Planning Commission about Residential (R-2) zoning vs Residential (R-3) zoning for this property and it was determined (R-3) zoning would be adequate. Ultimately the Council felt comfortable with the proposed General Plan map amendments and zoning changes for the property, and the Mayor stated both items would move forward to the consent agenda at the February 10 business meeting.

Planning item C3: Proposal to consider Amendment No. 1 to Interlocal Cooperation Transportation Project Reimbursement Agreement for a signalized intersection at 2500 W. and State Road (SR) 193

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Director explained that the City applied for and was awarded a transportation grant from Davis County for \$2,817,918 on January 23, 2024. The money is for a new signalized intersection at 2500 West and State Road (SR) 193. The original grant timeline expired on January 23, 2026. The City has requested to extend the timeline to June 30, 2028. The proposed agreement extending the grant timeline needs to be approved by resolution by the Council and forwarded to the County Commission for approval.

Mayor Maughan reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the proposed Interlocal Transportation Project Reimbursement Agreement. Councilmember Robertson asked if this project is for a signalized intersection only. The Mayor stated that the project is for the infrastructure for a signalized intersection and 500 feet of road as a requirement of the grant for the project. The Council felt comfortable with the proposed amendment and the Mayor indicated that this item would be on the consent agenda at the next business meeting for the Council to take action on.

Public Works item D1: Proposed amendments to Syracuse Municipal Code Section 4.15 and 4.25 pertaining to water meters; proposed Engineering Standards updates related to water meters; and proposed policy related to existing meters

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained Water meters are intentionally not located in concrete for safety and serviceability. If a leak at the meter were to develop at the meter or at pipes near the meter, the leak may go undetected for long periods of time because concrete prevents water from coming to the surface and can erode the soil underneath the concrete creating a void that may collapse. Leaks at meters are frequently excavated around the outside edges of the meter box to make repairs. Staff are recommending proposed amendments to clarify the City Code, and a recommended Policy has been drafted for the Council to review. Staff have also included updated Engineering Standards for the Council to review.

Public Works Director Whiteley reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the safety and serviceability issues for water meters located in concrete and the possibility of leaks. Mr. Whiteley explained the updates to the engineering standards and the proposed water meter policy would support the amendments to the City Code. The Council showed support for the proposed amendments and policy, and the Mayor concluded these items would move to the next business meeting for the Council to take action on.

Public Safety item E1: Updates and Discussion on potential changes to 911 Dispatch Services

A staff memo from Administration explained the purpose of this agenda item is to brief the City Council on the impending termination of the City's current 911 dispatch arrangement with Davis County, outline the City's available options for continued dispatch services, review the major terms of a proposed interlocal cooperation agreement with Layton City, and receive direction from the City Council on how to proceed. Syracuse City currently receives 911 dispatch services through Davis County. Davis County has notified participating cities that it is closing its dispatch center and transitioning dispatch operations to Layton City. As a result, the City's existing contract with Davis County will terminate later this year, requiring Syracuse City to secure a replacement dispatch service provider to ensure uninterrupted public safety communications. Under current Utah law, once Davis County discontinues its dispatch operations, only two dispatch centers may remain operational within the county (currently Layton City and Bountiful City). Because Syracuse City does not share a contiguous service area with Bountiful City, state law does not allow the City to contract with Bountiful for dispatch services. Additionally, once Davis

City Council Work Session

January 27, 2025

County's dispatch center closes, a third dispatch center cannot be created. These statutory limitations significantly narrow the City's available options. Layton City has proposed an interlocal cooperation agreement under which it would provide consolidated regional dispatch services to Syracuse City and other participating agencies.

Alternative Option

One alternative that has been suggested by another Davis County city is the potential formation of a special service district to provide dispatch services. A special service district could offer direct representation on a governing board, rather than governance through Layton City Council. However, based on preliminary discussions, formation of a special service district is not expected to produce significant cost savings compared to contracting directly with Layton City. The Layton proposal includes an advisory body with participating cities represented, but final decisions are made by Layton City. A feasibility study could be conducted to further analyze the special service district option; however, such a study would require time and resources and would not guarantee a materially different outcome. The staff memo summarizes the terms of an interlocal agreement, and the final draft will be updated by Administration at a later date.

City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo and explained that Davis County currently provides 911 dispatch services for Syracuse City, and they will be transferring their operations to Layton City. He facilitated a high-level discussion among the Council regarding the possibility of contracting with Layton City for dispatch services and the possibility of creating a Special Service District for dispatch services, noting he does not foresee there being a significant cost difference between the two options, however there will be a price increase to the City because Davis County has been subsidizing the cost for the dispatch services. There was a discussion regarding whether the formula Layton City used to charge for their dispatch services was accurate and Fire Chief Byington explained it is the same formula Davis County used.

The Mayor stated he has spoken to some of the Mayors in surrounding cities, and it does not seem like there was support for the creation of a Special Service District for dispatch services; once Davis County discontinues their dispatch services, a Special Service District could no longer be created.

The Council showed support for the possibility of an interlocal cooperation agreement with Layton City. The Mayor concluded that this is not an action item, and he appreciates the feedback from the Council. He explained that once the City receives a draft agreement from Layton City it will be available for the Council to review at a future Work Session.

Public Safety item E2: Discuss regarding provision of ambulance services responsive to Senate Bill (SB) 215, 2025

A staff memo from Fire Chief Byington explained the purpose of this discussion item is to inform the City Council of the rationale for issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for emergency medical services (EMS) and to outline the proposed next steps, including Council consideration of a resolution at the next Council meeting in February. Recent changes to state law require municipalities to formally select and support providers of 911 emergency medical services and interfacility transport services through a public process. In response to these requirements, the City initiated an RFP to ensure compliance with Utah Code and state EMS licensure standards and to provide transparency and due diligence in evaluating available service options. The RFP was issued to identify any qualified EMS providers interested in serving Syracuse City. No formal proposals were received in response. As part of this process, staff reviewed service needs, regulatory requirements, and the historical performance of the Syracuse Fire Department in providing EMS services. For Council's reference, the following documents are included with this agenda item:

- A draft resolution formally selecting and supporting the Syracuse Fire Department as the City's EMS provider.
- A draft Letter of Support to be submitted to the Utah Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Emergency Medical Services, as part of the Syracuse Fire Department's re-licensure process.

City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo and explained that there is a new law that requires the City to advertise a Request for Proposal (RFP) for emergency medical services (EMS). Mr. Bovero explained the City has complied and advertised a Request for Proposal (RFP) for emergency medical services but did not receive any bids. He explained that a draft resolution would need to be adopted and a letter of support would need to be submitted to the State of Utah. The Council showered support for the Syracuse City Fire Department continuing to provide emergency medical services to the City.

The Mayor concluded that this item would move forward to the consent agenda at the February 10 business meeting.

Municipal budgeting overview

The Council received a PowerPoint presentation from the Mayor regarding the Municipal budgeting; the presentation focused on the sources of income the City receives, the Vision and Mission Statements for the City, how the City budgets, and the long-range plans. The Mayor explained how the Municipal Building Authority (MBA) functions and reviewed impact fees and enterprise funds. For a copy of the presentation in its entirety, see the information packet for the meeting.

The Mayor concluded by asking for feedback from the Council on setting a date for the budget retreat; the group concluded the meeting could be scheduled for March 27, 2026.

Discussion of City-wide branding guidelines

A staff memo from Administration explained a style guide has been created to enhance consistency in public-facing materials produced by Syracuse City employees. The style guide outlines color combinations, font options, and template usage to support a cohesive and recognizable visual identity across official City communications.

Public Information Specialist Finley reviewed her staff memo and explained that she is recommending the City to be more consistent with its branding, which will help the community identify a City representative and City materials. She explained there are also branding templates for employees to utilize.

The Council showed support for the proposed branding guidelines and the Mayor concluded that this item will be on the next business meeting agenda for Council to take action on.

Review Council assignments/appointments

A staff memo from Administration explained that the Mayor and Council agreed to divide all assignments into groups so that no one Council member has all the workload in any one category. The Mayor suggests that Council members accept assignments from the following groupings. Last year's resolution solidifying the 2025 appointments and assignments is attached to this memo for review.

Group A- School Point of contacts (2 each council member)

1. Community Council, Bluff Ridge Elementary
2. Community Council, Buffalo Point
3. Community Council, Clearfield High School
4. Community Council, Cook Elementary
5. Community Council, Legacy Junior High
6. Community Council, Syracuse Elementary
7. Community Council, Syracuse High School
8. Community Council, New School Syracuse opens in fall
9. Community Council, Island View Elementary (West Point)
10. Community Council, Horizon Jr. High School
11. Community Council, Syracuse Junior High School
12. Liaison to Syracuse Arts Academy (2 covering all 4 campuses) Mayor

Group B- 1 employee board and 1 ULCT if available

1. Employee Appeals Board alternate member (2)
2. Employee Appeals Board member (2)
3. Voting member of the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) Legislative Policy Committee (3)
4. Non-voting member of the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) Legislative Policy Committee (traditionally a City employee) (2)

***Authorize key city staff as alternate voting members if no council members are able to**

attend. Suggestion: City Manager, City Attorney, or Mayor

Group C- Citizen Committee assignments (2 each Councilmember and Mayor)

1. Architectural Review Board
2. Arts Council Liaison -mayor to continue
3. Davis Chamber of Commerce Liaison -mayor is appointed by COG to serve on board. (add council member?)
4. Disaster Preparedness Committee Liaison
5. Museum Board Advisor
6. North Davis Communities that Care (CTC) Coalition City representative
7. Planning Commission Liaison (counts as 2, meets twice a month)
8. Youth Court Liaison
9. Miss Syracuse Pageant Liaison
10. America 250 Fundraising Special Project (2 council members)
11. New Business Ribbon Cutting Coordinator?
12. Youth Council

Group D- Major Special Events (1 each)

1. Pumpkin Walk Liaison
2. Heritage Days Liaison
3. Safety Jamboree (Combined National Night Out/Fire Open House Night)
4. Syracuse America 250 special events committee – Julie and Andrea

Group E- Mayor Pro-Tem (1 each) Assigned by Mayor

1. Mayor Pro-Tem
2. Mayor Pro-Tem, Second

3. Mayor Pro-Tem, Third

Canal Board- representation has traditionally been covered by PW and individual stakeholders.

1. Davis and Weber Canal Board. (PW Director has been elected to this position)
2. Layton Canal Board – City Representative (traditionally the PW Director)

Mayor Maughan reviewed his memo and facilitated discussion among the Council to determine the assignments they are interested in. Staff will utilize the feedback provided during that discussion to develop a resolution for adoption during the February 10 meeting.

Review Section 2.45.060 of Syracuse Municipal Code pertaining to the appointment process for special service district positions

A staff memo from Administration explained that the Mayor has indicated a desire to review the City's current process and regulations for appointment members to special service district positions. The process can be found in Section 2.45.060 of the Syracuse Municipal Code and reads as follows:

"2.45.060 Appointment to local districts.

(A) Prior to appointing individuals to any local district, the Council shall discuss the appointment in a work meeting, and schedule a public hearing to consider the issue at its next regular Council meeting or a special meeting.

(B) After conducting a public hearing, the Mayor shall open the issue to discussion among Council Members. At the conclusion of discussion, the appointment shall be made by motion, which must be supported by a majority vote. The Mayor may participate in the appointment action as a voting member.

(C) In the case of a vacancy in both an elected position and an appointed position which was previously filled by that elected official, the Council shall fill the vacancy in the elected seat, as provided in SMC 2.45.040, prior to appointing an individual to fill the appointed position. [Ord. 16-19.]

The Mayor reviewed his staff memo and stated he is proposing to have one policy to govern all the appointments for special service district positions. The Mayor and Council briefly discussed this matter and agreed to hear a formal recommendation to amend the current process and policy; the item will come before the Council during their February 24 work session meeting, after which it can move to a business meeting for a vote upon direction from the Council.

Biennial review – Community and Economic Development (CED) Department.

A staff memo from Administration the purpose of this memo is to introduce the biennial “deep dive” review of the Community & Economic Development (CED) Department. This review is part of the City Council’s ongoing commitment to effective governance, accountability, and continuous improvement across City operations. The biennial review provides an opportunity for the Council and Administration to engage in a focused, in-depth discussion of departmental performance, resource alignment, and emerging challenges. The biennial review process is intended to go beyond routine budget and operational updates. Instead, it provides a structured forum to examine whether a department’s goals, staffing, and performance measures align with City Council priorities and adopted policies. This review will focus on the Community & Economic Development Department, consistent with the City’s established review cycle.

Scope of Review:

The 2026 biennial review of the CED Department will focus on the following areas:

1. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

Council will review the department’s adopted Key Results and Performance Indicators to evaluate progress toward strategic goals related to community development, business growth, permitting, inspections, and customer service. These measures are intended to provide clear, objective insight into departmental performance.

2. Staffing Levels and Capacity

The review will examine current staffing levels, workload, and organizational capacity within the CED Department, with consideration given to service demands, development activity, and alignment with the City’s adopted recruitment and retention policies.

3. Concerns and Emerging Issues

Council and staff will discuss any operational challenges, risks, or emerging issues affecting the department, including growth pressures, regulatory changes, customer service expectations, and long-term sustainability.

The goal of the biennial review is to inform future policy direction, budget planning, and potential organizational adjustments, while ensuring alignment with City Council priorities and adopted policies. Staff will be prepared to present information and respond to Council questions during the scheduled review.

City Council Work Session

January 27, 2025

CED Director Steele presented a report of the biennial review of his Department; the presentation covered: Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) related to his Department and reported on the City-wide vision statements that apply to his Department. He reported on the increase in sales tax revenue, the increase in population growth in Syracuse City, as well as new businesses and total businesses in the City. Mr. Steele reported on the number of inspections and building permits being completed 100 percent on time during 2025. He also reported on the staffing levels for his Department and reported on data pertaining to the continuation of training hours for his Department. Mr. Steele concluded that his Department is adequately staffed and he has a great team. The Mayor and Council thanked Mr. Steele for his presentation.

The meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

Dave Maughan

Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC

City Recorder

Date approved: February 10, 2026