

Minutes of the Work Session of the Syracuse City Council held on July 27, 2021 at 6:00 p.m., held in a hybrid in-person/electronic format via Zoom, meeting ID 871 0242 1847, in-person in the City Council Chambers at 1979 W. 1900 S., and streamed on the Syracuse City YouTube Channel in accordance with House Bill 5002, Open and Public Meetings Act Amendments, signed into law on June 25, 2020.

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

City Manager Brody Bovero  
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

Excused: Mayor Mike Gailey

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; receive a report regarding secondary water; discuss water use and rates for dust control; discuss the following Planning items:

1. Application to rezone property located at approximately 2376 W. Antelope Drive from General Commercial (GC) to Planned Residential Development (PRD).
2. Continued discussion - proposed amendment to Development Agreement for Holt Mixed-Use Development (MXD) project, located at approximately 1283 W. 1700 S.
3. Continued discussion – application to rezone property located at approximately 817 W. 1700 S. from Mixed-Use Residential (MXD) to MXD/General Commercial (GC).
4. Continued discussion of potential text amendment in Syracuse City Code Section 10.100 pertaining to the Town Center Overlay Zone.

Discuss proposed adjustments to City Hall staffing levels; discuss Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-2021 General Fund surplus priorities and Fund Balance; discuss final Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2022 Budget and preparation for Truth in Taxation Hearing scheduled for August 10 2021; continue discussion of adjustments to City Council Rules of Order and Procedure regarding electronic meetings; and discuss future agenda items/Council announcements.

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

### **Public comment.**

Mayor Pro-Tem Maughan 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. City Attorney Roberts read the following public comments into the record:

"Dear City Council, Mayor, and Staff:

I appreciate the opportunity to address you tonight and would love an opportunity to discuss this further in an upcoming public hearing. We have worked with CVS the past 8-10 months to secure a new site to relocate our existing store located at Antelope Drive and 2000 West. As part of our negotiations with CVS, we are contractually obligated to build our site with the building next to the park, and dispensers in the front as to avoid eliminating their visibility of their store. The existing Maverik store is a small store that is located on a very small site. Our desire is to relocate across the street on a larger site to construct a new building, gas dispensers, outdoor picnic areas, sidewalks, and other amenities. Unfortunately, the new design standards that you're reviewing tonight will prohibit Maverik from rebuilding a new site at this location or any location within the zone regardless that the use is allowed. We have worked extensively with staff to modify a few items within their proposal to provide flexibility in the new design standards to accommodate the uses that are currently allowed in the current zoning code in the commercial zone including auto related, quick serve restaurants, and other convenience retail. These changes include: excluding a minimum front yard setback forcing buildings to locate to the street, and eliminating parking in the front and side of the buildings. This is an urban design requirement that is typically applied in downtown cities that offer bike

lanes, public trax/bus rapid transit, very high density, and is heavily focused on pedestrians. Pedestrian traffic was counted in front of the CVS site, and there were extremely low volumes of pedestrians.

We had the opportunity to ask our store manager in our existing store to present our design and architecture with the building placed next to the park to the public. The friendly poll lasted a few weeks, and there were over 600 signatures who support our new proposal including design and architecture; many of these signatures are residents of Syracuse. WE have provided a packet for you with these signatures. Since the poll was taken, our store manager is often asked when Maverik will be able to build our new site.

We would like to request your assistance in providing flexibility within the design code standards to allow us and other similar types of stores to have the ability to locate within Syracuse city. We would also like to request that a public hearing be scheduled to allow Maverik, residents, brokers, and other interested public to have the ability to provide our feedback on the design standards in a public hearing with the city council.

We respectively appreciate your time and efforts.

Leslie Mascaro Real Estate Manager”

“Thank you for taking the time to hear our comments.

Thank you for taking my comments. My team and I have had the pleasure of talking extensively with Mayor Gailey, your city manager and economic development director to find ways to construct a new store that complies with the requirements of the proposed Town Center overlay zone. After many attempts to reconfigure our plans, we have determined that due to preexisting conditions surrounding our property, the proposed zone code does not allow us to build a functional and safe Maverik in our desired location.

I urge you to vote no on the proposed amendment. We have confidence the City of Syracuse can create modifications to the zoning requirements that are walkable, attractive, and business-friendly.

Belinda Madsen, Planning Project Manager for Maverik”

Mayor Pro-Tem Maughan then invited Zoom participants and those attending in person at the meeting to provide public comments. There were no additional comments made.

### **Secondary water report.**

Public Works Director Whiteley provided the Governing Body and those in attendance at the meeting with an update regarding drought conditions and secondary water service in the City. He shared a graph illustrating the fluctuation in City-wide water usage, noting that residents’ efforts to conserve water have improved dramatically since the beginning of the summer.

Discussion among the Council and Mr. Whiteley centered on the number of citations and fines that have been imposed on residents who are violating drought secondary watering ordinances; Mr. Whiteley noted that he feels enforcement efforts have been successful and his staff has noted a reduction in violations. Discussion then shifted to the date that the secondary water system will be shut off for residents; Mr. Whiteley noted the Council initially decided to end the season on September 20 and the Davis and Weber Canal Company has indicated the City will have sufficient water to operate the system until that day. This is largely due to conservation efforts and the fact that the start of the 2021 season was delayed from April 15 to May 1. Mr. Whiteley noted he would like to continue discussions of this matter over the winter months and asked the Council to consider that the secondary season start May 1 each year. Concluding discussion then centered on Administration’s plan for watering park lands while trying to conserve water, but preventing sports fields from dying. Parks and Recreation Director Robinson noted that the fields are suffering, but her Department has been watering an extra day each week to keep them alive and available for fall recreation programs.

### **Discuss water use and rates for dust control.**

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained several contractors are building in Syracuse. They are required to maintain dust control for their own project. They use a water truck to moisten the ground to prevent dust. The water is culinary water and is metered. It is coming from a designated hydrant that is approved for construction use by public works. The volumes of water that is being used is averaging \$25,000 to \$50,000 gallons each construction day. Public works staff is reviewing the city water supply monthly from Weber Basin. The water use report indicates that the water use is doing okay but is getting on the high side from the use that we typically have seen in the past. If Syracuse goes over its limit of contracted water for the year, a surcharge will be assessed. The surcharge amount is a complex formula based upon actual peak summer use. The cost of water for construction dust control in Syracuse is about 1/3 the price of our neighboring cities. This lower rate may create a higher demand for contractors purchasing water in Syracuse and using it on projects that may be inside or outside the City. Dust control is a requirement of the Utah department of air quality; it applies to all projects in the City that are in construction and are ¼ acre or larger. So, water is mandatory to fulfill that requirement. Water also is

July 27, 2021

necessary to achieve soil compaction for road construction. As strange as this year is with the drought, the dry lakebed of the Great Salt Lake is the source of much of the local dust.

Mr. Whiteley reviewed his memo and asked the Council if they would consider increasing the construction water rates to resemble rates charged in neighboring communities. The Council discussed the item and concluded to offer support for advertising a public hearing and placing an action item on the next business meeting agenda to consider increasing the rate.

**Planning item: Application to rezone property located at approximately 2376 W. Antelope Drive from General Commercial (GC) to Planned Residential Development (PRD).**

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

|                  |                                       |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Project Name:    | Aspire at Canterbury Park             |
| Location:        | 2376 W. Antelope Drive                |
| Current Zoning:  | GC (General Commercial)               |
| Proposed Zoning: | Planned Residential Development (PRD) |
| Units per acre:  | 9                                     |

Peter Matson with Ovation Homes has applied to rezone approximately 3.56 acres of land located between Canterbury Park and Walmart for a 32-unit townhome project. The City recently approved a general plan amendment to 'High Density Residential' in preparation for the rezone. The PRD zone requires that an increased level of detail be provided with the rezone, including architectural elevations and a development agreement. Each of the units will feature a two-car garage and corresponding driveway totaling 4 stalls per unit. The townhomes are proposed to be a maximum of two stories tall. The plans call for a central shared grassy open space and a drive isle connection to the park. The City Council is the land use authority for amendments to the zoning map. Planning Commission's voted five to zero on July 20, 2021 to recommend conditional approval of this item. Conditions included adding a rail fence between the roundabout and play field for safety.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo.

General Council discussion centered on other improvements to the project design since the Council's last review of it, with a focus on the road layout relating to transportation flow, traffic calming, and connectivity; and the amount of open/green space in the project.

Mayor Pro-Tem Maughan invited input from the applicant. Peter Matson referenced the plat and street connectivity improvements. He stated he loves the open space that is being preserved at the front of the project area and does not want to reduce the size of that open space by making further adjustments to the ingress/egress to the project. The Council agreed, after which Mayor Pro-Tem Maughan concluded to move the item to the next business meeting agenda for continued discussion and/or possible action.

**Planning item: Continued discussion - proposed amendment to Development Agreement for Holt Mixed-Use Development (MXD) project, located at approximately 1283 W. 1700 S.**

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

|                 |                                      |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Location:       | Approximately 1225 W. Antelope Drive |
| Current Zoning: | Mixed Use Development (MXD)          |
| Proposed Use:   | Office condos                        |

The Holt Garden Homes development was approved by the city in 2020 and its corresponding development agreement was signed in October of 2020. The development consists of 309 apartment units and 43 townhomes. The required commercial component of the project is located on the northeast corner of the property and is proposed to be 16,800 sf. The commercial portion of the development has undergone site plan review with the Planning Commission but was denied because the proposed architecture for both buildings was not two stories as required by ordinance. The Planning Commission reviewed the potential of amending the MXD ordinance to allow for the proposed design but decided that was not recommended. The applicant then petitioned the City Council to amend the development agreement asking for an exception to the architectural requirements which was met with a favorable outlook. Council found the proposed development to be attractive even though it did not meet all of the architectural requirements. Anytime a development agreement approves an exception to the ordinance, it must be routed through the same process as an ordinance amendment, which includes holding a public hearing, receiving recommendation from Planning Commission, and final approval by City Council. The Planning Commission recommended approval of this item with a five to zero vote following a public hearing where no comments were received.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of the development agreement amendments. There was a heavy focus on the adjustments to building design and

July 27, 2021

elevations, after which Mayor Pro-Tem Maughan indicated he is not entirely comfortable with the proposed adjustments, and it will be necessary to engage in further discussion/review of the proposed amendments before a vote can be taken. He determined to move the item to the next business meeting agenda for continued discussion and a possible vote.

**Planning item: Continued discussion – application to rezone property located at approximately 817 W. 1700 S. from Mixed-Use Residential (MXD) to MXD/General Commercial (GC).**

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

|                          |                                                                                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Location:                | 817 W. 1700 S                                                                    |
| Current General Plan:    | Commercial                                                                       |
| Current Zoning:          | Mixed Use Development (MXD) for previous apartment project, otherwise A-1        |
| Requested Zoning:        | MXD/General Commercial (GC)                                                      |
| Acreage:                 | 4.47 for townhomes (MXD proposed), .848 for GC (offsite)                         |
| Units:                   | 54 townhomes                                                                     |
| Units per acre:          | 12                                                                               |
| SF Commercial:           | 0' onsite, but 5,300 square feet future multitenant one-story commercial offsite |
| Previous units:          | 115                                                                              |
| Previous units per acre: | 21.7                                                                             |
| Previous SF commercial:  | 4,500 sf vertical mixed-use onsite                                               |
| Acreage:                 | 5.92                                                                             |

Logan Johnson with Wright Development group is requesting the mixed-use zoning designation for a townhome development on the 'Briggs North' site. The city previously approved a mixed-use development on this site with approximately 117 units of three-story apartments and a vertical mixed-use building. The developer desires to amend the plans in order to reduce density and building height which will appease some neighbors. They are also wanting to avoid mixed use architectural standards on the commercial building by utilizing the 'off site' option. Application to the mixed-use zone requires architecture, landscape, and site concept plans be reviewed simultaneously with the rezone request. Staff has some concerns with the roadway design and concerns over considering the commercial portion as 'offsite'. Please find the proposed plans and more detailed staff analysis to this report. The Planning Commission is forwarding a conditional recommendation for approval. They felt that the townhomes were a much more compatible use but had some concerns with the specifics of the plans. They recommended that parking in front of each unit's garage be provided, no residential traffic back into commercial traffic, and concluded that the front porches provided were undersized and not in conformance with the zone requirements. The developer has since modified plans to resolve the backing and porch concerns but not the perceived parking shortage.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo. The Council debated whether the application can actually be defined as a MXD project in the traditional sense. Mr. Steele stated that is why staff has developed five options for the Council to consider responsive to the application and the updated concept for the project. He reviewed the five options (summarized in the packet materials) and presented photos of existing MXD or PRD projects in other cities that serve as an illustration of the different options the Council can consider for the subject property. The developer prefers option five, which is to build a GC compliant project in the front of the property and a MXD project in the rear; the developer prefers this option because there is no other residential zone that allows 12 units per acre, they openly admit they do not want to build mixed use as most of us understand it. Ordinance allows a mixed-use project to provide commercial in this way only if it is 'off-site'. See ordinance below. Staff interprets this as an 'on-site' pad and that utilizing the 'offsite' option in order to skirt the architectural requirements of the MXD zoning is not exactly what was in mind when the zone was drafted. The concept of allowing 'off site' commercial was to insert residential density next to a struggling shopping center that had vacancies in existing buildings, or existing outparcel pads that had been sitting that could be built on. Sort of like how you see the empty pads in Shadow Point, or the vacant space in the Verizon building. Using the zoning tool in this way sets a precedence that will prevent the zone from building the type of 'town center' project that it was intended to do. In the future, staff fears, if the City exercises this option, every developer will build in to his or her project an 'off-site' pad resulting in exactly what the City didn't want mixed use to be. Plus, it may mean extending multi-family proposals into areas not envisioned for residential.

Council discussion centered on the updated conceptual plan for the project; there was favor for the ratio of residential to commercial space in the project. They debated whether to support option two or five; a few Councilmembers indicated they feel it would be appropriate to adjust the MXD ordinance, while the majority indicated they feel that the updated concept plan can be defined as a MXD project, and they are comfortable proceeding with consideration of an action on the application subject to option five. Councilmember Savage stated he supports option five because the City will ultimately receive the same amount of commercial space in the project, but the residential uses will not be apartment buildings. The residential density is greatly reduced and the ratio of residential to commercial space is much more favorable.

Councilmembers Bolduc and Teague agreed, after which Mayor Pro-Tem Maughan noted the item will be moved forward to the next business meeting agenda for possible action.

**Planning item: Continued discussion of potential text amendment in Syracuse City Code Section 10.100 pertaining to the Town Center Overlay Zone.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained one of the goals of the City's recently adopted Economic Development 'PEP' Plan is to "Establish the city as the "Un-I-15" alternative to 'typical' cities on the Wasatch Front." 'Typical' cities on the Wasatch Front are commonly built with automobile-oriented land uses and designs. The 2019 General Plan visioning committee identified during a survey that 'Highway Commercial' was among the least desirable themes for new development. The Town Center Overlay Zone implements standards with the goal to create a pedestrian friendly and mixed-use core. This is for economic development but also pedestrian safety. The City has experienced multiple pedestrian injuries and even death from auto collisions in recent history. There is a proposal to build a 'typical' gas station within the town center where there is concern that the proposed typical design will reduce pedestrian safety and detract from the desired mixed-use core. Recently a 'Designing for Pedestrian Safety' training was given to Planning Commission and this slideshow is included in this report as it relates to this topic of economic development branding and placemaking. The Planning Commission voted on July 20, 2021 to forwarding a positive recommendation to amend the Town Center Overlay Ordinance.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated high-level discussion among the Council regarding the implications of the proposed ordinance amendments. He referenced the comments provided earlier in the meeting by representatives of Maverik; they expressed opposition to the ordinance amendments because the amended ordinance would prevent them from building a new store on the north side of Antelope Drive near the intersection of 2000 West. Council discussion centered on the current layout of commercial projects in the Town Center and whether they would comply with the proposed ordinance amendments. The Council indicated that the emphasis on walkability for commercial areas along Antelope Drive and 2000 West may be impractical, and it would be better to focus on parking and transportation improvements in the Town Center. The Council indicated they would like to have additional discussion with representatives of Maverik regarding the proposed amendments to the Town Center overlay ordinance before taking action on the proposal.

**Discussion regarding proposed adjustments to City Hall staffing levels.**

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the City has been notified by two employees, a husband and wife, that they will both be terminating their employment with the City to serve a church-related mission. While a specific date has not been given, it is expected to take place in the November-December timeframe. At the current time, one of those employees is taking several weeks of leave due to a medical issue. One of the employees is a combined building inspector/code enforcement officer for the City. The other employee is a part time court clerk.

***Dynamics in Court Activity:*** Since December 2020, the court has experienced an accelerated number of cases, with the most recent quarter reaching the highest number of cases in three years. The primary driver of the court activity is traffic citations. This increase coincides with the City's deployment of a patrol officer dedicated primarily to traffic enforcement. Earlier this year, the City reduced the court's staffing level to match it with the historically low level of activity. Currently, the court is staffed with one court clerk supervisor and a part-time court clerk (the same clerk who is leaving later this year). Based on the increased activity, it is proposed that the City add an additional part-time clerk to the justice court, in addition to backfilling the vacancy of the existing court clerk. This would raise the justice court's staffing levels back to its pre-pandemic levels. Additionally, it is proposed that the City may need to plan for an additional part-time or full-time court clerk in the near future depending on the activity that may be generated due to a full-functioning traffic unit in the police department. This decision would not need to be made now, but it is in the foreseeable future.

***Dynamics in Community & Economic Development:*** Over the last three years, the number of annual building permits in the City has steadily risen, reaching historically high numbers in the last year. Based on recently approved residential and commercial developments, the next two years are expected to reach record numbers. Additionally, with the addition of the West Davis Highway, further development is expected to accelerate even further into the foreseeable future. With the current building inspector/code enforcement officer on medical leave, along with his expected departure, our current building inspection staff is facing unsustainable workloads. Administration is concerned that the City will not be able to keep up with the permits, and/or critical mistakes will be made in the rush to get applications processed on time. At a minimum, it is proposed that the City hire an additional full time building inspector. For now, this person would replace the outgoing staff member, but could start now and get trained in time for when the current inspector/code enforcement officer leaves. At the same time, it is proposed that the City detach the code enforcement duties into a dedicated part-time position. This will allow the building inspector to focus fully on building inspections and help relieve the oncoming workloads. Additionally, it is proposed that the City make plans to hire an additional full time building inspector in the near future, perhaps during this fiscal year, in order to cover the expected workload over the next several years.

**Budgetary Discussion Related to Proposed Changes:** All of the proposed staffing additions in this discussion are commensurate with increased activity in their respective departments. Additionally, the staffing additions are related to fee-based revenue, not necessarily tax-supported activities.

Court Staffing

**Step 1 (now)**

|                                                          |                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Proposed staffing increase in justice court: 0.5         | \$17,000- midpoint              |
| Projected additional annual revenue from court activity: | \$25,000                        |
|                                                          | Net Difference: <b>+\$8,000</b> |

**Step 2 (near future)**

|                                                          |                                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed staffing increase in justice court: 1 FTE       | \$56,000- midpoint               |
| Projected additional annual revenue from court activity: | \$15,000                         |
|                                                          | Net Difference: <b>-\$41,000</b> |

Total Difference – both 1 & 2 positions: **-\$33,000**

CED Staffing

**Step 1-a (now)**

|                                                           |                                  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed staffing increase in building inspections: 1 FTE | \$80,000 - midpoint              |
| Projected additional annual revenue from permits:         | \$125,000                        |
|                                                           | Net Difference: <b>+\$45,000</b> |

**Step 1-b (now)**

|                                                               |                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed staffing decrease in building inspections: - 0.5 FTE | -\$28,000                        |
| Projected additional annual revenue from permits:             | \$0 – see above                  |
|                                                               | Net Difference: <b>+\$28,000</b> |

Total Changes – both 1a & 1b positions: **+\$73,000**

**Step 2 (near future)**

|                                                           |                                  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposed staffing increase in building inspections: 1 FTE | \$80,000 - midpoint              |
| Projected annual revenue from permits:                    | \$0– see above                   |
|                                                           | Net Difference: <b>-\$80,000</b> |

**Total Changes – both 1a, 1b, & 2 above: -\$7,000**

The memo concluded the goal of this discussion is to listen to and consider the presentation of staffing issues in CED and Justice Court; and discuss and give guidance to Administration on the direction moving forward.

City Manager Bovero reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the proposed staffing adjustments. Councilmember Savage referenced adoption of legislation in the 2020 Utah Legislative Session that gave developers the option of hiring their own inspector to perform building inspections; with the attrition in the Building Division of CED, he wondered if it would be appropriate to leave the building inspector position vacant and simply allow developers to exercise their legal right to hire their own building inspector. The Council discussed this idea and staff noted that is an option for the Council to consider, but it may create a scenario where the City is Syracuse is viewed as ‘difficult’ or trying to obstruct development; the City’s image – in terms of level of service – may suffer. Councilmember Savage agreed, but noted he simply wanted to discuss the option. He noted that so long as building inspection fees are covering the cost of providing the service, he is comfortable with staff’s proposal to adjust staffing levels. Mayor Pro-Tem Maughan added that he is concerned about the skill level of private building inspectors and their ability to properly inspect certain high density residential projects for building code compliance. The Council briefly discussed the appropriate division of the City for code enforcement staff to be assigned, after which Mr. Bovero reported that City Administration will determine the actual budget amendments the Council needs to consider as part of a mid-year budget amendment.

**Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-2021 General Fund surplus priorities and Fund Balance discussion.**

A staff memo from the Administrative Services Director explained it is projected that the General Fund will have an FY21 surplus of somewhere between \$1 Million and \$1.5 Million. With its budgetary authority, the City Council has the means to appropriate the surplus funds to fulfill the needs and goals of the City. Surplus funds are considered “one-time” money. From a financial prudence standpoint, this means that any surplus spending should be made on capital improvements, large vehicle purchases, or land acquisition; and not ongoing to expenses such as wages, yearly service contracts, or other operating items. In the 2021 State legislative session, the law was changed to allow cities to retain a General Fund balance up to 35 percent of annual revenues. In the most recent audit, the City had a fund balance that was a little higher than 25 percent of annual revenues. The City’s adopted Fund Balance Policy indicates that it will retain a minimum of 16.7 percent (two months’ worth) of annual revenue in its fund balance unless additional spending is needed due

July 27, 2021

to an emergency or “rainy day”. The Council has broad discretion on uses of the surplus funding. Based on the 2021 annual goals retreat, here are few of the adopted and stated priorities of the Council that could be eligible for surplus funding:

Economic Development (Prioritized Economic Plan)

- Pursue development of 2500 West to SR 193
- Actively Recruit quality office, retail, restaurant, and experiential retail businesses. Set aside money for market studies and/or incentives for these types of businesses.
- Strategic Areas to prepare for targeted development:
  - Town Center (currently \$200k budgeted for parking improvements)
  - City-Owned WDC/3000 W property
  - Farm Village Boutique Retail Concept (Boysen site)
  - 1000 West/Antelope Drive Redevelopment Corner
  - Create small area plan for 1000 W, 2000 W, 3000 W nodes

Parks & Trails

- Regional Park Construction
- Park Land Acquisition
- Development of Great Salt Lake Shoreline Trail
- Accelerate Park Projects: See attached 5-yr Parks Plan

Roads

- Various Road Projects- See marked projects on attached 5 Yr. Plan

Other Considerations

Technology

- Park security (cameras)
- Further development of online transactional services and public interaction

Property Management/Water Conservation

- Convert turf areas to low-water landscapes (Currently \$25k)

Parks & Trails

- Bike paths (comprehensive system signage and markings)
- Dog Park
- Paved Trail to Causeway on Antelope Drive
- Fishing platforms and interpretive signs at Jensen Park
- Cemetery Expansion

Economic Development

- Branding- City signage to develop branding (currently \$60k budgeted for park signs)
- Branding- “Welcome” gateway entry for the WDC/Antelope Interchange

Unallocated

- Place money in fund balance for future allocation

The memo concluded the goals of the discussion are to review the Council’s priorities for purposes of allocating the FY21 General Fund Surplus and receive direction from Council to refine the allocation of surplus monies.

Administrative Services Director Marshall reviewed the staff memo and he and City Manager Bovero facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the amount of fund balance they want to retain in the General Fund. The Council determined to maintain the current fund balance at 24.5 percent of the total budget. They then discussed their priorities for utilization of funds exceeding the 24.5 percent level. There was a focus on various capital projects and infrastructure maintenance, with the Council ultimately concluding to retain the funds until the mid-year budget opening in the event unexpected needs arise or revenues decrease, perhaps from the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

**Discussion of Final Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2022 Budget and preparation for Truth in Taxation Hearing scheduled for August 10 2021.**

A staff memo from the Administrative Services Director referenced the proposed final budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2022; no changes have been made to the tentative budget since the Council accepted it as an operating budget on June 8, 2021. The budget includes a proposed property tax increase, which will be noticed in the newspaper one week before the August 10 meeting. Prior to accepting public comment at the Truth in Taxation hearing, City Manager Brody Bovero will provide an informational presentation on the tax proposal being considered by the Council. The truth in taxation process is defined by the State of Utah; as required by Utah Code Annotated 10-6-113, the governing body shall establish the time and place of a public hearing to consider its adoption and shall order that notice of the public hearing be published at least seven days prior to the public hearing. This requirement has been met since the City Council adopted the tentative budget on May 11 and set a public hearing on June 8, 2021 to consider adoption of the final budget. As required by Utah Code Annotated 10-

July 27, 2021

6-118, “before the last June 22 of each fiscal period, or, **in the case of a property tax increase under Sections 59-2-919 through 59-2-923, before August 17 of the year for which a property tax increase is proposed**, the governing body shall by resolution or ordinance adopt a budget for the ensuing fiscal period for each fund for which a budget is required under this chapter. A copy of the final budget for each fund shall be certified by the budget officer and filed with the state auditor within 30 days after adoption.” The council is considering a truth in taxation process and raising property taxes by \$486,000 to fund the paramedic program (\$450,000) and benchmark adjustments for positions that have fallen greater than 5 percent behind the market (\$36,000). Since the Council is considering increasing the tax rate above the county certified tax rate, it is considered a tax increase under state law and requires a truth in taxation process. The council set the Truth in Taxation public hearing to August 10 to discuss increasing the tax rate. The city will be required to advertise in the newspaper once individually and once on a county combined advertisement the intent to increase taxes. This increase will be show on the property tax bills sent to all residents during late July. The tax bill will show that a TNT meeting will be held and will give a date and time of the public hearing.

Administrative Services Director Marshall reviewed the staff memo. There was no detailed Council discussion of this item.

**Continued discussion regarding adjustments to City Council Rules of Order and Procedure regarding electronic meetings.**

A staff memo from the City Attorney summarized draft provisions related to electronic meetings, designated by redline in the draft version of the Rules document. The changes accomplish the following:

- Indicates that councilmembers are still “present” for quorum purposes, even though they are participating virtually.
- Establishes that connection or other technological issues do not require the meeting to end, unless there is no longer a quorum.
- Requires councilmembers to keep their video cameras on.
- Authorizes staff to mute those who speak without being recognized by the Mayor, and to disconnect individuals who are disrupting the meeting.
- Confirms that Syracuse does not have a minimum number of Councilmembers that must be attending a meeting in person.
- Permits entirely virtual meetings, with an anchor location (unless exigencies or emergency declarations apply).
- Establishes rules for participants and councilmembers who are participating in a closed session, such as a requirement for headphones and personal responsibility for leaked information.

Mr. Roberts reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of the amendments; the Council indicated it is important for a quorum to be physically present at the anchor location and that Councilmembers should attend meetings in person unless they are ill or physically out of town. They suggested 80 percent in-person attendance, allowing for extenuating circumstances that may require a member to participate electronically. Mr. Roberts indicated that he will adjust the document responsive to the feedback provided in advance of an action item being included on the next business meeting agenda.

**Discussion of future agenda items/Council announcements.**

The Council discussed and reported on community events and discussed any needs for future agenda items. City Manager Bovero also the calendar of upcoming work session agenda items.

The meeting adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

---

Mike Gailey  
Mayor

---

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC  
City Recorder

Date approved: September 14, 2021