

Minutes of the Work Session of the Syracuse City Council held on October 27, 2020 at 6:00 p.m., held virtually via Zoom, meeting ID 821 1146 8564, 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. Pursuant to written determination by the Mayor finding that conducting the meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present due to infections and potentially dangerous nature of Infectious Disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus.

Present: Councilmembers: Lisa W. Bingham
Corinne N. Bolduc
Dave Maughan
Jordan Savage
W. Seth Teague

Mayor Mike Gailey
City Manager Brody Bovero
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:

Administrative Services Director Steve Marshall
City Attorney Paul Roberts
Police Chief Garret Atkin
Fire Chief Aaron Byington
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele

The purpose of the Work Session was to hear public comments; review contract with Weber Basin Water Conservancy for District Three secondary water; discuss the following planning items:

1. Final Plat Approval, Shoreline Subdivision Phases 4, 5a, and 5b, located at approximately 1975 S. 3000 W.
2. Final Plat Approval, Village at the Bluff Subdivision, Phases 1 and 2, located at approximately 2750 S. Bluff Road.
3. Final Plat Approval, Grayson Ridge West Phase 1, located at approximately 2050 S. Doral Drive.
4. Proposed amendment to Criddle Farms Development Agreement.
5. Continued discussion of proposed amendment to Zoning Map from residential R-1 to residential R-3, 2.448 acres located at approximately 2889 S. 3000 W. (tabled from October 13, 2020)
6. Proposed amendment to Zoning Map from agricultural A-1 to residential R-3, 60 acres located at approximately 2400 West 3700 South.
7. Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.20.140 of the Syracuse City Code relating to plat amendments.
8. Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.85 of the Syracuse City Code relating to the Professional Office Zone and concerning daycares and dwellings.
9. Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.30.020 of the Syracuse City Code relating to building materials.
10. Continued discussion - review draft Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Discussion of possible publication of Request for Qualifications (RFQ)/Request for Proposals (RFP) for Performing Arts Center Feasibility Study; discussion of policy regarding football season and equipment use; discuss outline for annual Strategic Goals Retreat; and discuss future agenda items/Council announcements.

Councilmember Teague provided an invocation. Councilmember Bingham led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public comment

Mayor Gailey stated that tonight's meeting agenda provided instructions for residents to email their public comments to City Recorder Brown by 5:00 p.m. tonight in order for them to be read into the record of the meeting. He indicated no written public comments were submitted. He then invited Zoom participants to provide public comments; no public comments were made.

**Review contract with Weber Basin Water Conservancy District
Three Secondary Water.**

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained City Code 8.10.090(H) provides an option for a developer to provide a fee in lieu of dedicating water shares for secondary water. The fee is equal to 12 years of assessments for the water acquired by the city from Weber Basin Water. This amount is approximately equal to the current market rate of each water share. The City has received payment for District 3 water prices to serve Stillwater 7 and 8. This is for 33.1-acre feet of secondary water. A contract with Weber Basin is required before a purchase of that water can be made. Contracts must be approved in the December Board meeting before it can be used for the following irrigation season. The memo concluded staff recommends the Council consider adding secondary water to the City's system to accommodate growth. In doing so, a contract with Weber Basin for District Three water is necessary to receive the water. If the Council chooses to approve a contract, then it must go to the Weber Basin Water Board on December 3rd for consideration before the water can be made available during the 2021 irrigation season. Weber Basin has provided a draft contract for the City to review; staff will bring a final version of the contract to the November 10 business meeting for approval before a contract is executed.

Mr. Whitely reviewed his staff memo.

Council discussion centered in the appropriate timing of action on this issue in order for the City to have access to District Three water in 2021. This included a brief focus on the cost of the assessment for District Three water, with the Council ultimately concluding it would be appropriate to act at this time and pay the assessment though the water may not actually be needed until 2022. Mayor Gailey directed staff to include an action item on the November 10 agenda to allow for a Council vote on the agreement.

Council member Maughan asked that Mr. Whitely communicate to the Weber Basin Water Board that the City would like them to carefully consider whether it is truly necessary to increase assessment rates year after year. Mr. Whitely stated he will share that sentiment with the Board.

Council member Savage inquired as to the percentage of the City's water shares that are needed and actually used each year. Mr. Whitely reported the City uses all of its shares each year. Over the past year, given higher temperatures and less precipitation than in a normal year, he was somewhat nervous that the City would get to a point that it would not have enough shares to provide the water needed in the community.

**Planning item: Final Plat Approval, Shoreline Subdivision Phase 4,
5a, and 5b located at approximately 1975 S. 3000 W.**

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

Location:	1975 S. 3000 W.
Current General Plan:	Medium Density Residential
Current Zoning:	Residential Planned Community (RPC)

The applicant is requesting approval of three final plats that as part of the Shoreline development. The phasing is out of order because the development is owned by two property owners and the owner of this side of the development needs to entitle the property for a builder before the eastern half will be ready for approvals. There are still some remaining staff comments on both plats but these should be able to be rectified before they are recorded with Davis County. The largest outstanding items are a provision to the City of the covenants and restrictions for the subdivision. Both of these are required by the Development Agreement. Other than the minor remaining staff comments, the plats meet all the requirements of the City Code. Planning Commission reviewed the item on October 6, and is forwarding a unanimous recommendation for approval. Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the plats with the following condition:

1. All staff comments must be addressed prior to recording either final plat with Davis County.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo. Council discussion of the item centered on the importance of addressing the staff comments prior to recording the final plat. Mr. Steele indicated CW Land is aware of all outstanding staff comments and they are committed to addressing those issues, all of which are minor in nature. Council member Maughan stated he would prefer that all conditions be met before the Council votes to approve a final plat; accepting plats that have outstanding issues is somewhat 'sloppy' in his opinion. Council member Savage agreed. Mr. Steele noted he and his staff are working to tighten processes to avoid recommendations of conditional approval and he thanked the Council for their feedback.

Planning item: Final Plat Approval, Village at the Bluff Subdivision, Phases 1 and 2, located at approximately 2750 S. Bluff Road.

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

Location:	2705 S. Bluff Road
Current General Plan:	Medium Density Residential
Current Zoning:	Planned Residential Development (PRD)
Total Site Area:	18 acres (10.27 acres in Phase 1 and 7.73 in Phase 2)
Number of Lots:	103 total (73 in Phase 1 and 30 in Phase 2)

The applicant has requested approval of 73-lot and 30-lot final plats that are a combination of townhomes and detached housing units. The preliminary plat was approved by the City Council on August 11, 2020. These plats are simply creating the plat to be recorded and do not have any changes from the preliminary plat. The Planning Commission reviewed the item on October 6, 2020 and is forwarding a recommendation for approval.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated Council review of the plat. He noted that the memo does reference outstanding staff comments, but those comments have been addressed since the date the packet for this meeting was published. The Council indicated their support for considering action on the final plat in the special meeting scheduled to follow this meeting.

Planning item: Final Plat Approval, Grayson Ridge West Phase 1, located at approximately 2050 S. Doral Drive.

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

Location:	2050 S. Doral Drive
Current General Plan:	Low Density Residential
Current Zoning:	R-1 (Single-Family Units at 2.3 Units Per Acre)

The applicant is requesting approval of a final subdivision plat that is intended to be the first of additional phases under the same name. The preliminary plat must be approved when this occurs but for now, the final plat contains the entirety of the preliminary plat. The plat meets all requirements of the City Code and all staff comments have been addressed. The Planning Commission reviewed the item on October 20, 2020 and is forwarding on a unanimous recommendation for approval. Because the final plat meets all the requirements of the City Code, staff recommends approval.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated Council review of the plat. The Council offered their support for the final plat, with Council member Maughan indicating that he appreciates that the applicant has addressed all staff comments before applying for final approval.

Planning item: Proposed amendment to Criddle Farms Development Agreement.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the landscape plan for Criddle Farms was forced to be changed because the trees proposed in the plans were in conflict with an underground

canal. The canal company objected to the trees being planted over the facility. An updated landscaping plan has been provided and some minimal verbiage of the document has been adjusted to reflect the change. The goal of this discussion is to determine if this item is ready for a vote during a future City Council business meeting or if more discussion is needed in a future work meeting.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo. The Council expressed their sadness over the loss of the trees in the landscape plan, but concluded the developer has no other option based upon existing circumstances relating to the canal. The offered their support for placing an action item on the next City Council business meeting agenda regarding the proposed amendment.

Planning item: Continued discussion of proposed amendment to Zoning Map from residential R-1 to residential R-3, 2.448 acres located at approximately 2889 S. 3000 W. (tabled from October 13, 2020).

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

Location:	2889 S. 3000 W.
Current General Plan:	Medium Density Residential (Cluster, R-3), RPC, PRD, NS)
Current Zoning:	R-1 (2.3 Units Per Acre) min 12,000 square foot lot
Proposed Zoning:	R-3 (4 Units Per Acre) min 8,000 square foot lot
Total Site Area:	2.448 acres

The applicant has requested approval of a rezone of 2.448 acres from R-1 to R-3 with the intent of building a road and single-family housing. The R-3 zoning would allow up to 10 units (five on each side of a central road). This would provide a connection between 3000 West and the stub road that is planned just east of the property in the Shoreline Subdivision. There are some potential limitations to neighboring properties by the type of development that would be allowed by the rezone to R-3. The properties to the north and south are currently in the R-1 Zone which allows farm animals. According to SCC 10.30.040(C)(2) *all pens, barns, coops, stables, corrals, and other similar enclosing structures to keep animals or fowl shall be not less than 50 feet from dwellings on adjacent lots, not less than 20 feet from a dwelling on the same lot, and not less than 150 feet from a public street, except on corner lots where such structures shall be not less than 50 feet from a public street.* If a road were placed on one side of the property, it may fully restrict the construction on these types of enclosures, depending on the width of the adjacent property. This only applies to structures. The right to maintain farm animals on the property would not be affected by the proposed rezone. The proposed zoning is permitted in the Medium-Density Residential General Plan Designation which was updated by the City Council in 2019 and is the zoning with the lowest density aside from the Cluster Zone. Planning Commission reviewed the item during their meeting on 9-1-20 and is forwarding a recommendation for conditional approval. Commission is recommending approval of the rezone only if ordinance 10.30.040 (C) (2) (a) concerning regulations for farm animal pens and structures are amended. The motion passed unanimously. City Council reviewed the item on October 13, 2020 and tabled the item to be able to review the development agreement. The agreement is included in the packet.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated Council discussion of the terms of the development agreement. The Council communicated their support for imposing R-2 and R-1 design standards within the R-3 zoned project and thanked the applicant for considering a density that is lower than what would be allowed in the R-3 zoning designation. There was also a brief discussion about addressing the requests of neighboring property owners to provide protection for their animal keeping rights. Mr. Steele stated that a note will be included on the final plat for the project once the project has progressed to that point.

Planning item: Proposed amendment to Zoning Map from agricultural A-1 to residential R-3, 60 acres located at approximately 2400 W. 3700 S.

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

Location:	2400 W. 3700 S.
Current General Plan:	Low Density Residential
Current Zoning:	A-1 (Agriculture Residential at 0.5 Units per Acre)
Proposed Zoning:	R-3 (Single-Family Residential at Four Units per Acre)
Acreage:	60 acres

The applicant is requesting approval of a rezone of approximately 60 acres of property from A-1 to R-3 to develop single-family units. Assuming the entirety of the ground is developable, the current zoning would allow for 30 units and the proposed zoning would allow for 240. Currently The Fields and Still Water projects to the east and west have stopped development somewhere around the midpoint of their properties when viewed from north to south due to sewer-fall restrictions. SCC 4.45.020 states that the City will not accept sewer lift stations which leaves the creation and maintenance of such stations to landowners within a special assessment district established for station maintenance. This has limited development to areas served by gravity-fed sewer. As a result, properties in this area have only partly developed with large areas being dedicated to the City. That is the intent in this case if the entire property is not sewer serviceable. The applicant understands this and still wishes to proceed with the application as included in this report. The properties are located in the Low-Density Residential General Plan designation which supports the R-3 Zone. The minimum lot size of 8,000 square feet in the R-3 Zone will be the largest consistent lot size in the area with lots in The Fields in the 7,000 square foot range and lots in Still Water ranging from 3,500 square feet to approximately 10,000 square feet. Development of this property will facilitate the connection of 2400 West from its current termination to 3700 South. This will connect with the Still Water development and provide western access to the City-owned regional park property on the northwest corner of 2000 West and 3700 South. Development will also allow for exaction of a trail segment along 3700 South according to the Syracuse City Trails Master Plan. A map has been included in this report along with the application showing the reasoning for the request. Because this is a legislative decision, no staff recommendation will be included. Planning Commission reviewed the item on October 20, 2020 and is forwarding a unanimous recommendation for approval following a public hearing. During the hearing, no public comment was provided.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo. Council discussion centered on the amount of space that is developable given limited sewer access. The applicant indicated that the land will be raised to provide adequate sewer fall, but only to the extent that is financially feasible. There will be some areas that will be unusable due to the inability to ensure proper sewer fall and those details will be highlighted in future development plans. Preliminary engineering work has indicated that it will be possible to build 160 residences on the property, which means that approximately 15 acres, or a quarter of the property, will be undevelopable. Council members commented on the need that this type of product will fill in the community, expressing support for a portion of the property remaining open/natural space. Council member Savage stated the R-3 zoning is not his preferred zoning designation, but he believes it is harmonious with other development that has occurred in the area.

Council member Maughan asked if the developer will dedicate a portion of the property for recreational or open space preservation. The applicant stated that is his intent at this point.

Planning item: Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.20.140 of the Syracuse City Code relating to plat amendments.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the Council has requested to review the land use approval process for plat amendments. Table one in Section 10.20.140 of the Syracuse City

Code indicates the land use authority for vacations or amendments of subdivision plat is the Planning Commission. A public hearing is required. The appellate body is the City Council. The process to appeal an administrative decision is detailed in 10.20.120.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and he and City Attorney Roberts facilitated a discussion about the plat amendment process and appeal of plat amendments specified in City Code. There was philosophical discussion and debate about a specific plat amendment that has occurred in the City and whether the Council should be the land use authority for these types of issues in the future. Mr. Roberts indicated that if the Council were to act as the land use authority for this type of matter, it may lead residents to believe that the Council has some flexibility in applying the rules governing an administrative issue. That is not the case and if a plat amendment application meets all guidelines set for receiving administrative approval, the land use authority must approve it. When considering an administrative application, the Council is prohibited from ruling based upon public clamor. Council member Teague stated that with the understanding that this matter can not be defined as a legislative matter, he is not inclined to take on the land use authority role for plat amendments. Council member Maughan stated that he feels that it may be possible to provide a differentiation between minor and major plat amendments; if the amendment is considered major, he feels the City Council should have the final say on those issues. Council debate continued, after which the Mayor asked the Council if they would like to refer this issue to the Planning Commission to solicit a recommendation regarding whether the land use ordinance should be changed to make the City Council the land use authority for plat amendments. Council members Bingham, Bolduc, and Teague indicated they do not want to refer this issue to the Planning Commission and they are comfortable with the current policy. Council members Maughan and Savage indicated they feel additional discussion of the issue is needed. Mayor Gailey stated that with two Council members requesting additional discussion, continued discussion is warranted; he advised the City Recorder to place an item on an agenda after the beginning of 2021 to continue discussion of the matter.

Planning item: Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.85 of the Syracuse City Code relating to the Professional Office Zone and concerning daycares and dwellings.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Applicant Vanessa McNeill would like to run a daycare and simultaneously live at the home located at 1384 W. 1700 S. However, the current zoning – professional office (PO) – does not allow dwellings or daycares. The home was somewhat recently changed from residential zoning to PO in order to run a commercial business at the location. The business relocated shortly after, leaving the home vacant and with more limited allowed uses in the newly appointed zoning designation. One potential solution would be to add both dwellings and daycare centers to the list of permitted uses. The applicant is proposing this solution because it is the least costly and quickest option to accomplish her goal. Being located on a busy arterial road, the home most likely will attract another 100 percent commercial tenant, but having some flexibility may assist in leasing the space. Also, as with every text amendment, this will affect all PO zoned areas not just the subject property. See attached for a potential wording for the text amendment. Planning Commission reviewed the item on October 20, 2020 and is forwarding a unanimous recommendation for approval following a public hearing. During the hearing, no public comment was received. The goal of the discussion is to determine if the item is ready to be placed on a business meeting for a vote, or if it needs more time during a future work meeting.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the potential implications of the proposed text amendment; the Council concluded their support for considering the text amendment, so long as provisions can be put in place to protect other businesses from potential unintended consequences of allowing live-work spaces in the professional office zones. Council member Savage stated that if the proposed use is to be allowed, he would like to define it as a major conditional use to give the Planning Commission the authority to determine that a suitable living space is being created and is being created from office spaces. The Council supported that that recommendation and Mr. Steele stated that an action item will be presented to the Council on November 10 regarding the matter.

Planning item: Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.30.020 of the Syracuse City Code relating to building materials.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Council member Bingham requested the opportunity for the Council to review the exterior cladding requirements for multi-family housing. Ordinance 10.30.020 explains that the 'option three' that allows zero percent brick, rock, stone cannot be applied to townhomes, apartments, and nonresidential structures. However, there is a mixed use, multi-family housing project which is requesting to include a 'barn' design that does not have any brick rock or stone by design. The goal of this discussion is to determine if this issue should be referred to the Planning Commission for a recommendation and/or direct staff to begin formulating certain text amendments.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo, after which Council member Bingham explained that current design trends include a strong favor for the farmhouse-style home; this design is typically 100 percent cementitious fiber board with no brick, rock, and/or stone. She stated she would like the Council to consider a text amendment that would make that type of style legal in the City. Councilmember Bolduc stated her only recommendation would be to include language in the ordinance that requires a certain percentage of homes in a development to include brick, rock, and stone, but to also allow some homes to be 100 percent cementitious fiber board. Councilmember Bingham stated she can accept and support that recommendation. The Council deliberated the matter and concluded to refer the issue to the Planning Commission for a recommendation, but communicating the desire for the ordinance to include language to allow one out of every three buildings in a multi-family project to be constructed 100 percent of cementitious fiber board.

Planning item: Continued discussion - review draft Economic Development Strategic Plan.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained that as part of a multi-faceted approach to economic development, the CED department, with the guidance and support of council, has embarked on a three-step approach to ramping up the City's economic development efforts. First step was to work with EDCU in its 'Development Ready Communities Program'. Progress is being made there and initial stages of analysis with them is complete. Second step was to engage with Zion's bank for a fiscal resiliency study in looking at our expenses and sources of revenue and estimate scenarios in which the city will need to plan ahead to remain solvent. From that, we have a financial model that enables us to analyze the financial ramifications of different market conditions and land use decisions. The third step which is to hire Better Cities to guide us in creating an economic development plan that will take into account steps 1 and 2, gather direction from council and stakeholders, analyze economic and demographic data, and provide valuable intel into the strategies to employ for the most efficient use of the city's economic development resources. During the February 25, 2020 work session, Better Cities gave a presentation on the scope of work for our Economic Development Strategic Plan and received initial guidance and instruction from Council. They have now completed a draft plan according to the scope outlined and input received and need additional input and direction by the stakeholders about the specific goals and objectives that will take the analysis and ideas and cement them into our official strategy. It is desired to adopt the final plan by way of ordinance but only after the council is comfortable and confident in the plan. During the August 25 work meeting, the council was introduced to the draft plan. It was decided that further discussion was needed on the item to further digest the plan. Council also provided initial input and observations to Better Cities staff. Corresponding edits to the plan have been made reflecting the council's comments. Next steps include reviewing the document in more detail. The document has been color coded so attention to the goals and objectives may be amplified. A summary of the goals and objectives detailed in the document has also been created. The memo concluded the goal of the discussion is to review and discuss the draft plan; enumerate and prioritize goals and objectives; identify if there are any missing goals or strategies; decide if there is anything in the plan that we do not agree with; and lastly, decide an approximate date to be on business meeting for adoption or if it needs more discussion on another work session.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated review of the amendments that have been made to the document since the Council's last review. He noted that the task force that was created to work on this project has done a great deal of work to clarify the intent and purpose of the Plan, while making it easily understandable for the average reader. He solicited feedback from the Council regarding appropriate amendments to the Plan; discussion points centered on the action items to acquire land along the east shoreline of the Great Salt Lake for passive recreation uses; tying the action items to goals and objectives at the end of the document; opportunities to partner with a local property owner to create a 'village' type of project in the community and acceleration of that action item in advance of the adoption of the Economic Development Strategic Plan; and minor typographical/grammatical error corrections.

The Council concluded that they are not ready to adopt the document at this time and that more discussion – perhaps in a retreat setting – is needed after the first of the year.

Discussion of possible publication of Request for Qualifications (RFQ)/Request for Proposals (RFP) for Performing Arts Center Feasibility Study.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the City has been in discussions with On Pitch Performing Arts, a theater company, who has teamed up with a fundraising and development company to build a performing arts center in the area. In an effort to establish fundraising and viability of the project, we have discussed the need of a feasibility study. The feasibility study would cover, among other things, a market analysis, economic impact analysis, site analysis, finance plan, and operating plan.

Feasibility studies can either have a broad or narrow scope. The main purpose of the study is to gain a sense of viability of a project prior to investing large sums of money. It is part of a due diligence effort, especially when a project needs to stand on its own through revenue generation. The components of the feasibility study that can be performed include the following:

- Market Analysis: studies the demand for this type of facility, along with other existing venues.
- Economic Impact Analysis: studies the economic benefits to the community.
- Site Analysis: studies the location of the facility and analyzes the advantages and disadvantages of the site.
- Development Concept Plan: Preliminary site plan, showing how the facility could be oriented on the site, with parking, and a projected cost estimate.
- Operating Plan: Outlines the ongoing operations of the facility.
- Fundraising Plan: Outlines the strategic plan to raise capital for the project, as well as ongoing sponsorships.
- Strategic Communication Plan: Outlines how the facility would be marketed and perform community outreach.

The feasibility study need not interfere with the exclusivity agreement contemplated by the Council. The exclusivity agreement would have the following terms:

- City Undertakings
 - City will work with OPPA exclusively as it relates to establishing and cooperatively operating a performing arts center within Syracuse
 - Specific property that is either in the City's possession or expected to be in the City's possession will not be sold, developed or otherwise encumbered by the City during scope of this Agreement.
- OPPA Undertakings
 - OPPA will work exclusively with Syracuse City as it relates to establishing and cooperatively operating a performing arts center in Davis/Weber counties, associated with their organization.
- Scope
 - Cooperative efforts will include fundraising, coalition building, developing an operating agreement, and beginning the design and planning process for the center.

- Term
 - Automatic termination, perhaps 6 months or 1 year, unless extended.
- Termination
 - Termination by either party with written notice without cause.

The project with OPPA would be subject to the exclusivity agreement, however the feasibility study could be conducted by a competent firm with experience in this subject matter.

The feasibility study, which in this case is actually a series of studies has a price tag that the Council will need to recognize. The cost estimate for these studies can be somewhere between \$180k and \$280k depending on the scope. A City typically takes the lead on these studies for a project like this one, however it could be funded by the RDA through the creation of a new CRA (Community Reinvestment Area). Under this scenario, the RDA fronts the cost of the study and is later paid back as the CRA develops. Grants are also available; the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) has a planning grant program that could be tapped to help pay for the studies. The maximum amount of this grant is \$100,000. Finally, other stakeholders in the project could be identified and tapped to share in the cost of the study. The following outline the goals of this discussion: in order for the project to move forward, the City will need to decide whether to conduct a feasibility study. Associated with that decision is the identification of funding sources.

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo. Councilmember Savage offered his input from the perspective of attending recent meetings with OPPA and Arts Council representatives regarding this project; he is supportive of proceeding with the feasibility study. Stephen Swisher, GTS Design Team, reported on the public/private partnership that has been created in an effort to help OPPA find a location for a performing arts project.

Council discussion centered on the role that GTS will place in the feasibility study process, with several Councilmembers expressing their concern about the perceived conflict of GTS managing the feasibility study project. There were additional concerns expressed by the Council regarding the fact that other partners of the project are not expected to make a financial contribution to the project; rather, they are relying upon other entities – such as Syracuse City – to provide financial support for the project. Mr. Swisher indicated that the partners that have signed on to the project will aid in raising funding, pursuing other forms of public or private financing, and pursuing grant support. This led to high level discussion of the many different funding options for the project, with Mr. Bovero indicating that this type of project has the potential to heavily influence ongoing economic development in the community. Typically, it is necessary for the City to aggressively invest in certain projects in order to incent private development.

Mayor Gailey invited input from Councilmember Maughan as this is a project he was initially heavily involved in. Councilmember Maughan communicated his feelings that the project scope has changed significantly since it was first conceived and now he has serious concerns about the lack of investment from other partners, while the City is being asked to provide financial support at the onset of the feasibility study. Additionally, he is concerned about the minimal City ownership of the facility after it is constructed, though a great deal of taxpayer dollars would be needed to support the project. He has lost faith this is the correct use of money for the City at this time. Mr. Swisher clarified that he believes the building would be a City asset and would not be owned by OPPA; however, OPPA would like to operate the building and run their arts education business in the facility in partnership with the Syracuse Arts Council.

Mayor Gailey asked that the Council provide Mr. Bovero with direction regarding how to proceed. The Council engaged in philosophical discussion about the matter, focusing on the potential capital outlay the City would be responsible for with no guarantee of a project moving forward. While a feasibility study is not an uncommon thing for a city to undertake, Councilmembers expressed concern that no other options for the land have been explored; if there were a great deal of excitement behind the project, the Council may look upon it more favorably. However, given the location of the property and other development possibilities in the area coupled with the City's position as the only entity that stands to lose anything if the feasibility study does not yield positive results, the Council felt it appropriate to halt the project at this time and further explore the other efforts and funding options for the project.

Councilmember Savage stated that the potential for the City to secure WFRC grant funding for the project is one reason he was supportive of moving forward with the feasibility study. He also wanted to give OPPA the chance to fundraise

for the project once he understands the commitment level of other parties. Councilmember Bingham stated that further exploration of the commitment of the other entities that are interested in the project is the type of work she would like to proceed before the Council makes a decision on proceeding with the feasibility study. Councilmember Savage agreed; he would be supportive of the project if all parties can commit to financial support of the project.

Mr. Bovero indicated another option for the Council to consider would be a feasibility study with a smaller scope; such a study would evaluate the economic impact of this type of project. A market analysis to determine the potential success of this type of project could also be conducted and both of these studies would give the City an idea of the value of this type of project for the community. Additionally, the Council needs to consider that there is likely a market for this type of use in northern Davis County and if the facility is not constructed in Syracuse, it will be constructed in another community. He wanted to be sure that the Council understands and is comfortable with that scenario. Councilmember Maughan stated he does not question whether the project would benefit the community from an economic development standpoint; his greatest concern is that the City will bear the major financial burden of the project and it would take a great deal of time for the City to recoup the money contributed. He stated that if other entities involved in the partnership are willing to contribute financially to the feasibility study, he may reconsider his position. Mayor Gailey asked that Councilmember Savage take the

Discussion of policy regarding football season and equipment use.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the City Parks and Recreation Program has long had a policy that once the final WFFL game for a football team has concluded, the players must return their equipment to the City the following week. This policy ensures that the equipment is timely returned, but also demarcates the end of the season. Having a clear end to the season serves to limit the City's liability to those games and practices that are sanctioned and supervised by the City and WFFL. The City does not authorize overnight trips for its football programs. A football team has requested that they be permitted to keep their equipment longer than the allotted time, in order to attend a game in Southern Utah. They have not asked for City staff to be present or for any additional City resources, except that they wish to retain the equipment. Their comments to staff and online suggest that this is viewed as a simple equipment rental extension request. Staff do not see this as a simple matter of equipment rental, but as an extension of the season with the City-drafted team, which has been coached by City volunteers and has operated under the City's umbrella of coverage. Even with a collection of waivers from participants and their guardians, the staff is concerned that the outing will increase the City's liability without appropriate precautions or policies in place. The City Council has the authority to set all policy for the City, and the matter has been raised by participants and councilmembers to be considered during this meeting. As usual, staff will support whichever policy the Council adopts. The goals of this discussion are to determine whether to adopt a policy governing this issue and, if such a policy is sought, direct staff to prepare a written policy with the main points decided by the Council, and to begin implementation of the policy.

Parks and Recreation Director Robinson reviewed the staff memo. The Council engaged in discussion about the City's current equipment usage policies and opportunities for creating a broader equipment rental program for the City for items other than football equipment. Councilmembers communicated the need for the City to maintain a balance between limiting the liability assumed by the City associated with equipment rental and creating opportunities to give citizens access to equipment needed for certain recreational events. They concluded to maintain the current policy, but continue discussion of the matter in the future if the City Attorney is able to determine a solution that would reduce the liability associated with extending the rental period for football equipment.

Discuss outline for annual Strategic Goals Retreat.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the annual strategic goals retreat is held to address high-level issues facing the city and setting an overall direction of the City by the Council. In 2018, the Council modified and adopted the attached mission and vision statements for the City. The Strategic Operational Plan was designed to accomplish tasks based on the Council's vision. Approximately 80 percent of the action items in the Strategic Operational Plan have been implemented and accomplished. As we move forward with City issues, it is important to periodically revisit the mission

statement and vision of the Council to make sure it is updated. The following items have been identified by the Mayor and Administration as issues to be addressed at the retreat:

- Date: Friday, January 8, 8am-4pm
- Mission and Vision Statements: Discuss and decide on any additions, deletions, or modifications
- Other major issues to possibly review and discuss:
 - Review Long-Term Financial Picture: Updated projections from Zions Bank financial model
 - Review of Park Planning
 - Review of Infrastructure Planning
 - Shift of Paramedic Service to Cities
 - Review of Staffing Plans
 - Review of General Plan goals

The goal of this discussion is to determine the items to address in the upcoming annual strategic goals retreat.

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the major issues they would like to discuss during the retreat. Mr. Bovero stated he will work with the Mayor and City Administrative staff to develop the agenda for the event. He indicated that if other issues arise between now and the January 8 retreat date, Councilmembers can inform him of those issues so he can be prepared to discuss them at the meeting.

Discussion of future agenda items/Council announcements.

The Council discussed and reported on upcoming community events and issues that have been raised in the community via social media outlets or electronic communication methods.

Mayor Gailey offered City Manager Bovero the opportunity to report to the Council. Mr. Bovero reported on adjustments to City operations responsive to the State's adjusted COVID-19 guidelines and regulations.

The meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Mike Gailey
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: November 10, 2020