

Minutes of the Work Session of the Syracuse City Council held on November 17, 2020 at 6:41 p.m., held virtually via Zoom, meeting ID 848 1175 1595, 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 discuss proposed amendments to Parks, Trails, and Recreation Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) and Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP); discuss proposed amendments to Arts Council Bylaws; discuss concept of transitioning paramedic services from the County level to City level; discussion the following Planning items:

1. Potential General Plan Map Amendment pertaining to assignment of the newly created Indoor Storage Unit Zone.
2. Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.30.040 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to regulations for farm animal pens/enclosures.
3. Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.20.070 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to zoning map amendments.
4. Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.92 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to maximum dwelling units per building in the Mixed-Use Development (MXD) Zone.
5. Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.40.030 of the Syracuse Code pertaining to tandem parking.
6. Continued discussion of proposed Zoning Map amendment from Agricultural (A-1) and General Commercial (GC) to Mixed-Use (MXD) for property located at approximately 1850 W. 1700 S.
7. Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.20.140 pertaining to plat amendments.
8. Continued discussion - review draft Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Conduct the Biennial Review for Court and Records, Public Works, and Legal; accept for first reading – proposed revisions of City Mission and Vision Statement.

Discussion regarding proposed amendments to Parks, Trails, and Recreation Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) and Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP).

A staff memo from the Administrative Services Department explained Administration is bringing to the Council a proposed update to the Parks, Trails, and Recreation Impact Fee Analysis (IFA) and Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP). This proposed change updates our costs with current values and adds the park maintenance facility into the plan. It also updates our park acreage and new parks not previously listed on the plan. Because of these changes, the park, trails, and recreation impact fee would increase. The current fee is \$2,393 per household. The proposed fee would increase to \$2,749.70 per

household. If the council approves this change, there would be a 90-day waiting period from the approval date (December 8th) to enact the fee increase (March 8, 2021). Below is a comparison of impact fees with other cities.

Salt Lake City	\$5,173
Lindon	\$5,097
Sandy	\$4,156
South Jordan	\$4,115
Spanish Fork	\$3,959
American Fork	\$3,856
Springville	\$3,715
West Jordan	\$3,201
Provo	\$3,105
Herriman	\$2,904
Orem	\$2,813
Syracuse (Proposed)	\$2,749
Lehi	\$2,600
Syracuse (Current)	\$2,393
Saratoga Springs	\$2,388
Clearfield City	\$2,339
West Valley	\$2,285
St. George	\$2,182
Layton	\$1,873
Taylorsville	\$1,290
Pleasant Grove	\$1,019

The goal of this discussion is to determine whether to proceed with updating the Parks, Trails, and Recreation IFA and IFPP as discussed above.

Mr. Marshall reviewed his memo.

Councilmember Maughan stated that it is important for the public to understand that the Council is limited in the amount the City can charge for various impact fees; the fee must be based upon the study of the City's needs. However, he feels the City does need a great deal more than what can be funded with the revenues to be generated by this impact fee.

Councilmember Savage stated he is somewhat concerned about the comparison cities that have been used for this impact fee analysis; he has been comfortable with the comparison cities in the past, but that list changed for the Parks, Trails, and Recreation Impact Fee and he asked why that is. Mr. Marshall stated he will reach out to the City's financial advisor as they developed the list for this study. He stated he can conduct a comparison with the cities that have been used for other impact fee updates.

Councilmember Teague stated this is an important analysis; it is a science-based approach that provides appropriate limits for the City based on potential future growth. He stated that throughout the process of campaigning for passage of the parks bond in the recent special election, many people asked him why the City simply didn't increase its park impact fees to cover the cost of a regional park; he was able to point to these types of study documents to answer that question. Councilmember Savage agreed and stated it is easy to support a data driven approach. Councilmember Maughan agreed as well, but noted that it is important for the data to be current and accurate.

The Council concluded by communicating their support for moving to a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments to the Parks, Trails, and Recreation Impact Fee. Mayor Gailey asked that staff include information about the impact fees charged in other cities that have been used for comparison purposes in the past.

Discussion regarding proposed amendments to Arts Council Bylaws.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the Arts Council has forwarded the attached proposed amendments to their bylaws for Council consideration. The Council has the ultimate authority to approve or amend the bylaws. Major changes include:

- Clarifying the distinction between board members and other members of the Arts Council.
- Imposing a restriction on the number of consecutive terms that the Board Chairperson may serve, and requiring a “cooling off” period of the same length of time previously served, before being eligible to serve as chair again
- Clarifies that “board decisions” may not be altered except in a public meeting
- Assigns authority to appoint Committee Chairs to the board, by a majority vote
- Permits the instigation of removal from office by majority vote, rather than a unanimous vote
- Requires open positions on the board to be advertised.
- Removes limit on Vice Chair President (Parks & Rec appointee) from voting only in the case of a tie.
- Thirty-day time limit from the date of an event, for requests for reimbursements, and requirement for Activity Chair to approve the expenditure in advance of the purchase.
- Duties of board members establish what constitutes “board decisions” – budgets, program spending, programming decisions like dates/shows, and contractual agreements with guest performers or directors.
- Chair duties outlined – setting agenda and oversee board meetings
- Board Member Administrative Chairs established without an exhaustive list of chairs and descriptions of their duties.
- Board Member Activity Chairs similarly established.
- Removal of description of specific chairs
- Board duties about seasons and activities laid out
- Conflicts of interest of board members, more specific examples and procedures to follow when possible conflict is identified.
- Elimination of section defining standing committees.
- Family member policy related to theatrical productions – board members or their family limited to one significant role every two shows.

In order for all of the bylaws amendments to achieve efficacy, the City code should also be amended:

- Section 3.45.030 will need to adopt the concept of an “executive board” in addition to the board. The bylaws amendments require that both a majority of the executive board and a majority of all board members must be present in order to make board decisions. (Article IV(1)(B)).
- Subsection 3.45.030(A) would need to be amended to permit the Co-Chairperson to vote in all cases
- Recommend adding term limits on leadership, if adopted under bylaws.

The following items outline the goals of this discussion: (1) Direct staff to make any changes the Council wishes to see in the draft; and (2) determine whether to place this item on a business agenda, on a work session, or to refer it back to the Arts Council with direction on changes.

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of the proposed amendments. He also invited the Council to direct questions to Councilmember Maughan as he is the Council’s appointed advisor to the Arts Council. Discussion centered on the proposal to create adjust the organization of the Arts Council by creating an executive board the duties of the executive board. Councilmember Savage asked if the Arts Council supports the amendments. Councilmember Maughan indicated that these amendments are being proposed at the Art Council’s direction; they voted unanimously to support the amendments.

Councilmember Bolduc stated that she is uncomfortable with some of the proposed amendments; she does not want the Council’s liaison or advisor to the Arts Council to be a voting member. The same is true for the staff member assigned to the Arts Council; making them a voting member may politicize their position, which would be negative for any staff member

placed in that situation. Councilmember Maughan stated that he and Parks and Recreation Director Robinson do not care to vote on the Arts Council's decisions; however, there have been instances where their vote has been needed to cast a tie. Also, if a member is not a voting member, they cannot make a motion on any item before the Arts Council. There have been times that the Arts Council has gotten too far off track in regard to what they should be working on and it has been necessary for the liaison to refocus their discussions. Councilmember Bolduc stated that is not necessarily the role of the liaison; additionally, it is not necessary for a Board member to make a motion if the intent is simply to refocus a discussion. She added that she has communicated with a few members of the Arts Council and they feel that they were pressured into supporting these amendments instead of being given the opportunity to discussion and debate them at length before forwarding a recommendation to the City Council. This led to high level discussion and debate among the Council regarding the appropriate role of the Council's liaison to the Arts Council as well as the general role and duties of the rest of the Arts Council Board and the staff member assigned to the Arts Council.

The Council indicated they are not comfortable with dictating that the staff member and Councilmember appointed to the Arts Council being voting members. Additionally, removal of members should be done by a two-thirds majority vote rather than a simple majority. Mayor Gailey asked the Council if they would like to refer the document back to the Arts Council for further consideration and an updated recommendation. The Council answered yes and Mr. Roberts indicated he will make the recommended adjustments and provide it to the Arts Council for further review.

Discussion regarding concept of transitioning paramedic services from the County level to City level

Fire Chief Byington stated that in 2019 discussion began amongst EMS providers in Davis County about the transition of paramedic services from the Sheriff's Office to individual cities or districts. He used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to summarize the findings of study of the matter. He first reviewed the origination of the Davis County EMS program dating back to 1978. The Davis County Sheriff's Office (DSCO) was providing ambulance transport and began providing paramedic services. At this time, fire departments were all being operated with volunteer crews; as cities have grown and fire departments have moved from volunteer status, the services have shifted. In 2004, Layton City began providing ambulance transport and in 2001 they began their own paramedic service. In 2002 the DSCO discontinued its ambulance service and shifted that service to Clinton, Clearfield, Syracuse, Kaysville, and Farmington cities. In 2005, South Davis Metro Fire began providing paramedic services. DSCO plans to discontinue its paramedic service in 2023 and shift that service to Clinton, Clearfield, Syracuse, Kaysville, and Farmington cities. At present, there are nine total paramedic units in: four in the DSCO, two in Layton City, and three at South Davis Metro Fire. Chief Byington then provided a comparison of EMT advanced and EMT paramedic programs; EMT paramedic programs are more intensive in terms of hours of training for individuals, who receive the highest level of EMT training. He discussed the standard of care defined by the Utah State Administrative Code; two paramedics are required on the scene of 911 calls requiring advanced life support (ALS) and ALS services must be on scene within eight minutes from dispatch 90 percent of the time. As Davis County has grown, the need for both paramedic service and law enforcement have also grown. Issues associated with responding to this need include addressing increased response times and providing a consolidated and uniform paramedic response. Paramedic service discussions have been underway among local Fire Chiefs for several years; more intense discussions began in the Spring of 2019 and a group was created in the fall of 2019 to include City Managers, County officials, Fire Chiefs, the DSCO, and representatives of local dispatch. They defined study areas for the purpose of evaluating coverage, service delivery, revenues, and expenses. In the spring of 2020, this group reported their findings and recommendations relative to the transition timeline, proposed interlocal agreements, education requirements, and financial aspects of the transition. They recommend 11 paramedic units to provide adequate coverage in four defined areas:

- **North Davis County** (*Syracuse, West Point, Sunset, Clinton Clearfield, HAFB*)
 - Three paramedic units – Station #21, Station #31, Station #42
- **Layton City** (*Layton, South Weber, HAFB*)
 - Three paramedic units – Station #51, Station #52, Station #53
- **Central Davis County** (*Kaysville, Fruit Heights, Farmington*)

- Two paramedic units – Station #61, Station #71
- **South Davis Metro Fire** (*Centerville, Bountiful, W. Bountiful, NSL, Woods Cross*)
- Three paramedic units – Station #81, Station #82, Station #83

Relative to service delivery, the group recommends a borderless system that could be serviced via continued use of mutual aid agreements, automatic vehicle location (AVL) dispatch to ensure the closest ALS unit is identified in emergencies, and County-wide paramedic training to ensure continuity. Relative to response units, paramedic response vehicles will be staffed with two licensed paramedics and all additional paramedic units must be non-transport mobile rescues.

City Manager Bovero then noted the Fire Chiefs in Davis County have been asked to determine the best ‘borderless’ system option for the area. A group of north Davis County cities – Clearfield, Sunset, West Point, Clinton, and Syracuse – considered how to achieve the desired level of service with three units in the area. They considered a consolidated method using one provider, as well as a coordinated method, whereby existing units would provide the service, but in a coordinated borderless fashion. Sunset, West Point, and Clearfield preferred to manage paramedics through NDFD, while Clinton and Syracuse preferred a coordinated service delivery from Clinton Fire Department, NDFD, and Syracuse Fire Department. There was a brief discussion about the costs associated with the two methods; Councilmember Maughan inquired as to the taxes residents would be paying if the coordinated service method relying upon NDFD were chosen. He asked if residents would pay a tax to NDFD as well as taxes to cover Fire service in Syracuse City. Mr. Bovero answered yes and noted he will expound on the current tax structure for fire and EMS services in the County later in the presentation.

Chief Byington then discussed current revenue structures for Fire Departments; these structures are managed by the State of Utah. The State has defined the billable rate as \$554.00 plus supply costs per transport. In 2017, the Department had 991 total calls; 682 were for EMS services. The total revenue collected in 2017 was \$43,390.08. Calls increased to 1011 in 2018, with EMS calls at 618. The total revenue that year was \$50,067.72. And, in 2019, total calls were 1,048, with 686 being for EMS services. The total revenue in 2019 was \$44,851.84. In 2020 to date, there has been an 11.8 percent increase in call volume. Mr. Bovero reported the County tax rate is 0.000123 and this tax would be shifted from the County to cities if EMS service is no longer provided by the County. This would result in an additional \$200,000 per year to the City in EMS tax revenue. He then discussed expenses associated with the Syracuse Fire Department assuming EMS service; there would be an \$150,000 capital expense in the first year, \$738,000 in wages and benefits for nine new paramedics, \$32,000 in wages for current paramedics, and \$45,000 in operational expenses. He noted that the wages and benefits for the new paramedics could be covered in part by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) SAFER grant that would cover 75 percent of wages and benefits in the first two years and 35 percent of wages and benefits in the third year. He then noted that cities have considered a timeline for transitioning paramedic services away from the County. There would be a thorough public involvement process spanning from January 2021 to the summer of 2022; throughout this time period, cities would continue to pay the County for paramedic services while pursuing the formation of service districts where needed and applying for the license to provide paramedic services. Cities could begin providing paramedic services as early as the fall of 2022, after which the County would eliminate their paramedic services program. Chief Byington added that one issue he can foresee is that other cities will be following this same process at the same time as Syracuse, which means that many different entities will be recruiting employees to work as paramedics. This will create a great deal of competition and the longer the City waits to make a decision, the more difficult it will become to find quality individuals.

Mayor Gailey thanked Mr. Bovero and Chief Byington for the information provided tonight; the intent of this discussion was to introduce the Council to the issue so that they can be prepared for future discussions on the topic at upcoming work session meetings.

Potential General Plan Map Amendment pertaining to assignment of the newly created Indoor Storage Unit Zone.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City Council recently created a new zone - Indoor Storage Unit Zone. The City needs to decide into which General Plan designation the new zone should be inserted. The staff proposal is to make it an option within the industrial and commercial designations.

The Planning Commission reviewed the item and held a public hearing on November 3, 2020, and is recommending approval of the proposed amendments. The goal of this discussion is to determine whether more discussion is needed or if the item can be included in the next business meeting agenda for a vote.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and the General Plan map to draw the Council's attention to the legend and reiterated that staff recommends adding the Indoor Storage Unit Zone as an allowed use in the industrial and commercial designations.

The Council briefly discussed the proposal and offered their support for moving the item to the consent agenda of the Council's next business meeting.

Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.30.040 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to regulations for farm animal pens/enclosures

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City's animal keeping ordinance prohibits new pens/coops/enclosures etc. from being built within certain distances to roads and adjacent houses. This ordinance was meant to prevent smells, noises, insects, etc. related to the animals from negatively impacting the adjacent households. An unintended consequence of this ordinance is that if a new road or home were to be built near an existing farm, the new development could significantly limit the construction of new animal enclosures on the property. City Council would like to protect the rights of existing farms as much as possible and felt that a small adjustment could be made. Council is seeking the Planning Commission's advice as to what the appropriate number of feet an animal pen should be located to nearby homes and roads etc. Please see a draft potential rewording of the ordinance. The Planning Commission reviewed the item and held a public hearing on November 3, 2020, and is recommending approval of the proposed amendment as enclosed. The goal of this discussion is to determine whether more discussion is needed or if the item can be included in the next business meeting agenda for a vote.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and also added that new language would be added to the regulations for code enforcement relative to this matter; if a new resident moves near an established agricultural property and begins complaining about noise and odor, the City will not respond or pursue enforcement action unless there are severe issues, such as animal abuse.

Councilmember Maughan asked if the ordinance includes clear definitions of the types of uses that constitute 'agricultural activities' so that there is clear direction for residents, property owners, and staff in the future regarding the types of activities that could be classified as a nuisance for code enforcement purposes. City Attorney Roberts answered yes; the City Code includes a detailed list of the types of activities that are considered to be 'agricultural' in nature and that includes raising animals, farm animal keeping, and less intensive uses.

The Council offered their support for moving the item to the Council's next business meeting for discussion and action.

Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.20.070 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to zoning map amendments

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Section 10.20.070 of the City Code requires that all proposed zoning map amendments match the general plan map. This ordinance was meant to require developers to 'stick to the plan'. An unintended consequence of this ordinance is that at times, a developer's proposal may be less intense than the general plan and regardless, would still require an amendment to the general plan as well as the zoning map which adds cost and time to a proposal that from the City Council's perspective would be acceptable because of the lower intensity. This assumes that the city desires the lowest intensity development as possible in all locations as a default. From initial discussions by City Council, a 'downzone' could potentially be acceptable as a deviation from the general plan. Council is seeking the Planning Commission's advice as to if it would be appropriate to modify the part of ordinance that requires the zoning map from following the general plan exactly. The Planning Commission reviewed the item

and held a public hearing on November 3, 2020, and is recommending approval of the proposed amendment as enclosed. The goal of this discussion is to determine whether more discussion is needed or if the item can be included in the next business meeting agenda for a vote.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo.

The Council briefly discussed the proposal and offered their support for moving the item to the consent agenda of the Council's next business meeting. Councilmember Savage stated that he would like to adjust the legend on the General Plan map to clearly define the different zones that are allowed in general plan classifications.

Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.92 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to maximum dwelling units per building in the Mixed-Use Development (MXD) Zone

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the Mixed-Use development ordinance limits the number of dwelling units to a building to 24 maximum. This ordinance was meant to prevent overly massive buildings that are imposing and out of scale with surrounding development. City Council discovered that a building in a recently proposed MXD project exceeded 24 units. However, due to its unique design on a corner, and 'L' shape, Council felt that in this narrow circumstance perhaps more than 24 units in one structure could nevertheless be allowed. Council is seeking the Planning Commission's advice as to under which circumstances would more than 24 units per building, if at all. Please see a draft potential rewording of the ordinance. Also, the MXD ordinance requires that resident parking shall be located no further than 100 feet from the unit. The intent of this is to ensure that parking is well designed and convenient for future residents. However, in order to calculate the measurement for each unit is complicated and may also result in unintended consequences relating to the site layout of the property. It is proposed that in the spirit of adding flexibility in site layout, that the 100' requirement be amended. The Planning Commission reviewed the item and held a public hearing on November 3, 2020, and is recommending approval of the proposed amendment as enclosed. The goal of this discussion is to determine whether more discussion is needed or if the item can be included in the next business meeting agenda for a vote.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of the proposed ordinance; there was a focus on the manner in which the 100-foot measurement would be taken and Councilmember Savage indicated he would prefer the measurement follow the easiest walking path from the parking area to a unit rather than a direct/straight line. The Council supported this suggestion, but indicated that the 100-foot distance should be increased to allow for deviation from a straight line; they debated the appropriate distance to be included in the ordinance – focusing on a 300-foot measurement according to a natural pedestrian path from parking areas to building units. They reviewed the concept plan for the MXD application for the property at 1850 W. 1700 S. to determine if a 300-foot measurement is too broad or too restrictive. They ultimately concluded to change the distance to 300-feet and offered their support for moving the item to the consent agenda of the Council's next business meeting if the distance is changed from 100-feet to 300-feet.

Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.40.030 of the Syracuse Code pertaining to tandem parking.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Section 10.40.030 of the City Code prohibits tandem parking. This ordinance was meant to prevent unrelated people from being parked behind each other in a commercial or multifamily setting. The resulting shuffle would be cause for conflict and inefficient circulation patterns. City Council discovered that a recently proposed MXD project proposes tandem parking. Council felt that in this narrow circumstance perhaps tandem parking could be allowed. Council is seeking the Planning Commission's advice as to under which circumstances tandem parking could be allowed in a mixed-use development, if at all. Please see a draft potential rewording of the ordinance. The Planning Commission reviewed the item and held a public hearing on November 3, 2020, and is recommending approval of the proposed amendment as enclosed. The goal of this discussion is to determine whether more discussion is needed or if the item can be included in the next business meeting agenda for a vote.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of the proposed ordinance. Councilmember Maughan wondered whether the 'and/or' language regarding the location of the parking space is appropriate. He suggested the 'or' be removed to specify that for residential units in the same household, the parking space may be within the driveway area in the required front yard and in front of the unit's enclosed garage. The Council accepted the adjustment and offered their support for moving the item to the consent agenda of the Council's next business meeting.

Continued discussion of proposed Zoning Map amendment from Agricultural (A-1) and General Commercial (GC) to Mixed-Use (MXD) for property located at approximately 1850 W. 1700 S.

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

Location:	1600 West 1700 South (Antelope/SR 108)
Current General Plan:	High Density Residential
Current Zoning:	A-1
Proposed Zoning:	MXD
Total Site Area:	15.015 acres

The MXD zone requires detailed plans to be provided up front. These plans have been included in the packet. Staff has evaluated the plans for compliance with the requirements of the ordinance. Any outstanding issues would be worked out during the site plan process with Planning Commission should the zoning be granted. Planning Commission reviewed the item during their meeting on 8-18-20. They also held a public hearing where the neighbors expressed concern over the proposed building heights, the pedestrian connection, stormwater detention, water pressure, connection on Dahl Lane, noise, property values, school capacity, and privacy to summarize. Planning Commission heard the comments and discussed the project at length where ultimately they unanimously voted to forward a recommendation for approval. The City Council reviewed the item during their work meeting on August 25, 2020 and forwarded on to the next meeting for a vote. The project was reviewed again by City Council on September 8, 2020. There were discussions surrounding the feasibility of the office portion and how to ensure that the office will indeed be built. Ways to minimize impacts to the neighbors to the south were also discussed. The item was tabled so council could have more time to discuss the application. The item was again discussed on 9-22-20 where the council continued discussion on architecture and the office buildings. It was requested that elevations for the second office building be provided which the developer has since furnished and are included in the packet. On October 13 council discovered various conflicts with the proposed plan to various land use ordinances and tabled the item until potential amendments to the ordinance could be properly discussed. Now that the ordinance amendments are nearing completion, and a revised site plan has been created, the applicant desires to continue the process for the zoning amendment. The goal of this discussion is to determine whether more discussion is needed or if the item can be included in the next business meeting agenda for a vote.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and reviewed the updated site plan to orient the Council to the changes that have been made to the proposed project since the Council's last review. There as a focus on the building layout and whether it is appropriate to allowed stepped up building height from two to three story buildings or whether the entire project should be limited to two story buildings; the Mayor and Council ultimately concluded to support the stepped-up layout. They also offered support for moving the item to the next business meeting for a vote, with Councilmember Maughan asking that it be listed as a discussion and action item to allow for continued review of any further adjustments that may be made between now and December 8.

Discussion regarding potential text amendment to Section 10.20.140 pertaining to plat amendments.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City Council requested a review of the land use approval process for plat amendments. Table 1 of Section 10.20.140 of the 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. City Council reviewed this item in the October 27 meeting without arriving at any consensus. The goal of this discussion is to decide if this should be sent to the Planning Commission for a recommendation and to provide instruction to staff on desired wording.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion regarding whether the City Council should be designated as the land use authority for plat amendments. The Council asked if they would have the ability to reject a plat amendment if the proposal meets the City Code, but is unpopular. Mr. Steele answered no and indicated that would put the Council in a difficult situation where they would be going against a group of residents who may have the perception that the Council has the ability to deny a plat amendment for any reason. He added that the Council's authority over land use lies in the zoning and initial subdivision plat approval for a project. When zoning is assigned, a property is vested to pursue land uses allowed in that zone. A plat amendment that complies with those regulations must be approved or the applicant would have legal recourse against the City. City Manager Bovero clarified that plat amendments are defined as an administrative function and he would recommend that any administrative matter be handled by either staff or the Planning Commission. The Council concluded that based upon that direction, it would be appropriate to leave the plat amendment action with the Planning Commission. They indicated a desire to monitor plat amendment actions that are taking place in the City.

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'. We have completed the program and been deemed 'development ready'. 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 assumptions. The third step, was 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 (you all) 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. On September 22, council reviewed the latest revised draft and requested an internally produced vision document be created that summarizes the most important items from the study, solidifies the city's economic development vision, and provides specific guidance as to what are the specific action items that we believe will most likely bring the city's vision to fruition. Since that time, staff has worked with the task force (Councilmembers Bingham and Savage, Mayor Gailey, City Manager Bovero, and CED Director Steele) to create the summary document. On October 27, the summary document was reviewed and additional input received. Revisions are provided in the attached document. The goal of the discussion is to review and discuss the summary document and 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. Lastly, decide approximate date to be on business meeting for adoption or if it needs more discussion on another work session.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated review of the updated Plan document to identify the adjustments that have been made since the Council's last review. There was a brief focus on the separate actions to be taken in regard to the Plan document and the summary document; they indicated they would like to include an additional goal/objective for the City to maintain an open door policy towards existing and future opportunities and actively/strategically prepare areas to be 'shovel-ready'. Mayor Gailey stated that the Plan will be brought back to the Council during the December 8 meeting for discussion and a potential vote.

Biennial Review for Court and Records, Public Works, and Legal

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that as outlined in the City's Recruitment and Retention Policy: *"Every 2 years, the City Council will conduct an in-depth review of each department. The primary purpose of the in-depth review is to discuss the operations, issues, overall direction of the department, and the goals of the City Council. The biennial in-depth review will also be a time to discuss any wage abnormalities or other special adjustments that the administration feels is needed. If wages scales of any position have moved more than 5% off of the 60th percentile (or whichever percentile the Council has set for that position) of the market, the City Council will examine the benchmarks and consider making adjustments to the wage scale and the associated wages of applicable employees of that position. The departments will be reviewed on a rotating basis as follows:*

- *Year 1: Police, Fire, Park & Rec*
- *Year 2: PW, CED, IT, Courts, Finance (Administrative Services, and Legal)*

This meeting will review Public Works, Court/Records, and Legal. The December meeting will cover CED and Administrative Services.

Public Works Director Whiteley used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to conduct the Biennial Review of his Department. He presented the organization chart for his Department, after which he reviewed the five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for roads; this Plan is updated annually to conform with Citywide vision statement number one, which reads "we are a City with well maintained infrastructure, including roads, utilities, and parks, and provide services efficiently". Priority guidelines have been established for road and utility projects and routine preventative maintenance programs have been created. The Public Works Department's vision statement number one reads "utilities provided by the City are affordable, but also cover the real cost of service". Responsive to this vision statement, he reviewed the City's current utility rate structure and compared utility revenues with expenses, ultimately concluding that the rate structure is appropriate at present, but staff performs regular evaluations of utility rates to determine if adjustments are needed. Public Works vision statement number two is that "public works and utility billing employees are customer service oriented". He stated that his Department has developed a public notification protocol to increase customer service and communication with users; different communication methods have been identified based upon the urgency of the message to be distributed and the protocol seems to be working very well. Public outreach has also been increased by utilizing the City's social media pages and website to communicate with residents. Public Works vision statement number three is "Syracuse City has a well-organized infrastructure replacement and maintenance schedule that ensures well maintained systems". The Department has acquired over \$10 million in grants for road projects since 2014; in 2020 his staff secured an additional \$2 million grant for 500 west and they have applied for an additional \$3.3 million and \$1.5 million grant. The American with Disabilities Act (ADA) plan has been completed and wheelchair ramps will be updated with new road projects. He presented a chart illustrating the miles of infrastructure his staff maintains, including roads, culinary water mains, secondary water mains, and sewer mains. Infrastructure miles have grown while staffing levels have remained the same. He presented the routine duties performed by employee in each of the Divisions of his Department. In order to maintain the increasing demand for road integrity, staff should be keeping up with crack sealing, sidewalk trip hazards, and asphalt surface preservation. He would like two full time street maintenance worker positions and the ability to advance one existing maintenance worker three to a crew leader position. The Engineering and Inspections divisions work on capital project management, infrastructure master planning, development reviews, mapping, permitting, and contractor coordination. The Engineering Division is dealing with high demands and a heavy workload due to the West Davis Corridor Project and other large projects in the City. Essential

duties are delayed as a result, including mapping infrastructure, pre-development reviews, base-map for design work, and interdepartmental mapping. Mr. Whitely then concluded his presentation by discussing goals he has set for improving efficiency in his Department, as follows:

- Continue culinary water meter conversions to radio.
 - 38% complete (3400/8900)
 - Meter read collection
 - 14 days/month with a pickup truck prior to 2015.
 - 6.5 days/month with a Polaris Ace ATV 2015-2018.
 - 3.5 days/month with a Polaris Ace ATV and drive-by radios.
 - Cost Savings
 - Fuel (reduction of 7 to 10 gallons per day).
 - Tires, bearings, brakes, and maintenance.
- Add a full time CAD/GIS technician.
 - Infrastructure mapping
 - Development review assistance
- Software for plan reviews
 - Bluebeam
- Software for improved fix-it-request reporting.

The Council thanked Mr. Whiteley for the detailed information provided and for the manner in which he leads and manages his Department.

City Recorder Brown used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to conduct the Biennial Review of her Department; she indicated that she provides services responsive to City-wide vision statement number four, “The City will incorporate improvements, events, and services that create an overall feeling of connection and pride in the City by its residents” as well as Administration Vision Statements number one and two: “(1) Syracuse City Administration employees are knowledgeable, courteous, and customer-oriented” and “(2) Syracuse City Administration demonstrates transparency in conducting City business”. Additionally, she oversees the City’s Justice Court, which has two of its own Vision Statements:

1. Syracuse City’s justice court meets the needs of justice in the City.
2. Syracuse City’s justice court is administered fairly and efficiently.

She noted that City Attorney Roberts will expound on some of the services provided in the Justice Court later in his presentation as well. She then provided an overview of the duties assigned to herself as the City Recorder as well as to Justice Court staff. City Recorder functions include Governing Body support, i.e. prepare Council agendas, packets, and minutes; maintenance of the City Code; oversight of the City’s contract routing process; Records Management, GRAMA compliance; management of the City’s Passport Acceptance Facility; supervision of Justice Court staff; and Election coordination. The Justice Court staff responsibilities include coordination of the daily functions of Justice Court; Records Management; knowledge of laws and legal codes; and public relations/customer service. She noted that one Justice Court Clerk is also assigned to support City Administration. She then provided a chart providing a breakdown of the time spent on different functions in her Department, after which she noted that the City’s latest electronic document management system has been functional for the past three years. It has improved internal service levels and efficiency as access to active and inactive records has become easier; this is a service level increase for City departments as well as the public. She noted she would like to begin working on an internal policy regarding ongoing electronic records management. Utah State Code Title 46 gives the City the ability to determine the records types for which an electronic record can serve as the record copy. Development and implementation of a policy to oversee those determinations could be part of updates to the City’s Strategic Operational Plan, which will be discussed in greater detail in January 2021. She noted development of the policy will be time intensive, but implementation of the policy will be crucial for the management of the City’s vital records in the long term. She then provided a breakdown of the time spent by Justice Court staff on different functions; she indicated that since the last review of her Department, Justice Court staff has implemented an on-line payment program for customers. This has reduced the

amount of time spent in person and on the phone assisting customers with making payments. It is also a service level increase for defendants. Ms. Brown concluded by discussing the City's Passport Acceptance Facility; this is a service that was created in April 2016. The program is self-sustaining and has actually generated additional revenues for Syracuse City. It is currently staffed by one full-time Passport Agent/Deputy Recorder and one part-time Passport Acceptance Agent who also provides support for the City Attorney. Back-up support is provided by employees in other Departments at City Hall. She presented a graph providing a comparison of program revenues and expenditures; since 2016, revenues have increased steadily every year by approximately \$20,000, but they leveled off in 2020 due to COVID-19 and related travel restrictions. The revenues are still covering operations as well as the salaries of the employees assigned as Passport Agents and she expects that revenues will increase again once normal travel activities resume. She concluded her presentation by thanking the Council for their support of her Department.

City Attorney Roberts used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to conduct the Biennial Review of his Department, which encompasses internal legal support, victim services, and prosecution. Internally, he performs policy review, contract review, land use advice and support to the Planning Commission, and ordinance review and City Council support. He also performs prosecution in the City's justice court. The Victim Services Advocate provides in-court support and inter-departmental support for both Syracuse and Clinton cities. Responsive to Administration's vision statement number one, he participates in annual training for his department with the Utah Municipal Attorney's Association (UMAA), Utah Prosecution Council (UPC), State-Wide Association of Victim Advocates (SWAVO), Children's Justice Center (CJC), risk conferences, and the annual Crime Victims Conference. Responsive to Justice Court vision statement number one, he believes the Justice Court has improved its victim support over the past two years and has kept victims involved in and informed of the process. Early in the COVID-19 pandemic, there was a shift to telephonic and webcam court, which has been difficult, but is profoundly more convenient for many defendants and attorneys. He and the Justice Court Judge will likely propose continued tele-court options after the pandemic. Responsive to Justice Court vision statement number two, he does believe the Court is administered fairly due to attempts to reach fair resolution under all circumstances, youth court referrals, a decline in cases of conduct driven by mental illnesses when a defendant accepts help, and resolutions designed to correct underlying problems. Mr. Roberts then noted that during the last review of his Department he requested a quarter-time legal secretary; the Council approved the request combined with approval of a quarter-time Passport Agent position. The individual who filled this position processes all discovery requests and completes e-filing of screened charges. Prior to her hire, discovery requests would pile up for a week or longer, but it is now common to have a discovery response to attorneys within 24-hours of their request, including the delivery of bodycam/dashcam footage. He then reported the City's Victim Services Program was created in October 2017, with 80 percent of the total cost paid by a VOCA grant. The City shares the 20 percent matching costs with Clinton City. Victim services have increased dramatically in 2020 due to approval of victim services to be temporarily offered to victims of felony crimes and police references in cases that might not appear before a court. In closing, Mr. Roberts provided several pie-charts illustrating trends in different types of cases that appear before the Justice Court dating back to 2017; case types include traffic cases, misdemeanor cases, and different types of criminal charges, i.e., drug, theft, alcohol, driving under the influence (DUI), animal abuse, and domestic violence. He thanked the Council for their continued support of his Department.

Councilmember Bingham thanked Mr. Roberts for his attitude toward those that find themselves in the City's Justice Court and for the manner in which he represents Syracuse City. Councilmember Teague echoed that gratitude and inquired as to the types of programs that he uses as diversionary measures for Justice Court defendants. Mr. Roberts stated that he has explored several different types of mental health diversion programs, but recently learned of a program that the City's Police Department has access to and which he is able to refer people to. Councilmember Teague thanked Mr. Roberts for that approach; it is efficient and innovative.

Mr. Bovero then reviewed the biennial benchmark data for Public Works, Recorder/Courts, and Legal; every fourth year, the City adjusts wage scales based upon a thorough benchmark process. However, the City's Recruitment and Retention Policy was changed recently to allow the Council to consider adjustments every two years if a position's wage is more than five percent off of the 60th percentile of the market. If the City were to consider a full correction of wages and benefits for all

positions that meet this criteria in the three Departments, the fiscal impact would be approximately \$100,000. This is an issue that will be discussed in greater depth throughout the upcoming budget process before a final decision is made.

First reading – proposed revisions of City Mission and Vision Statement.

A staff memo from the City Manager referenced the latest adopted Mission and Vision Statements for the City and its associated departments. It is anticipated that the Council will discuss suggested amendments, additions, and deletions at the December work session, with a final consensus on the revision at the annual strategic goals retreat in January. The goal of tonight's discussion is for the Council to accept the mission and vision statements for a first reading and to begin working on suggested edits as well as to review the amendment process that has been proposed by staff.

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and facilitated a high-level overview of the current Mission and Vision Statements; he noted he would like to engage in discussion regarding suggested edits during the December 8 work session meeting in hopes of nearing finalization of the edits prior to the strategic goals retreat that is scheduled for January 8. He asked that the Council provide him with any feedback or suggestions before the December 8 meeting and be prepared to discuss the matter that night. There was a brief discussion about the visions in the current Strategic Plan that may have been achieved and whether those vision statements will be replaced with new statements. Mr. Bovero stated that while it will not be necessary to replace or rewrite any or all mission and vision statements, it will be necessary to consider new projects or goals that are responsive to those statements as many of the goals or projects included in the existing Plan have been achieved. He asked the Council to think of the Plan as a management document for the City; once a new set of vision statements have been settled upon, goals and projects will be defined responsive to those updates.

The meeting adjourned at 10:19 p.m.

Mike Gailey
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: December 8, 2020