

Minutes of the Work Session of the Syracuse City Council, held on June 28, 2022 at 6:00 p.m., in a hybrid in-person/electronic format via Zoom, meeting ID 821 0617 2815, in-person in the City Council Conference Room at 1979 W. 1900 S., and streamed on the Syracuse City YouTube Channel in accordance with House Bill 5002, Open and Public Meetings Act Amendments, signed into law on June 25, 2020.

Present: Councilmembers: Lisa W. Bingham
Jennifer Carver
Jordan Savage
W. Seth Teague
Paul Watson

Excused: Councilmember Paul Watson

Mayor Dave Maughan
City Manager Brody Bovero
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:
Administrative Services Director Steve Marshall
City Attorney Paul Roberts
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Fire Chief Aaron Byington
Police Chief Garret Atkin
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; receive report regarding progress of American with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan for Syracuse City; discuss Request for Proposals (RFP) for pool of Engineering Services contracts; discuss the following planning items:

1. Discussion regarding updates to General Plan moderate income housing elements in compliance with Utah House Bill (HB) 462.
2. Application for zone change and preliminary plat for property located at approximately 1700 S. Banbury Drive, Agriculture A-1 to Planned Residential Development (PRD) and General Commercial (GC).
3. Application for zone change for property located at approximately 1100 S. 1675 W., Residential R-2 to Residential R-3.
4. Planning Commission recommendation regarding text amendment, Syracuse City Code Section 10.30.020, regulations for buildings and structures.
5. Review and consideration of Cooperative Corridor Preservation Agreement with Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) pertaining to the State Road 193 project.
6. Discussion regarding possible creation of Good Landlord/Crime Free Housing Program.
7. Report on current Redevelopment Agency (RDA) project areas and associated tax increment.

Discuss aesthetic improvements on West Davis Corridor/Antelope Drive expansion project; discuss proposed amendment to Syracuse City Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual related to secondary employment; and participate in General Budget discussion and preparation for Truth in Taxation process.

Public comments

Mayor Maughan invited in-person public comments.

Alan Thurgood addressed the City's consideration of disposal of a parcel of property adjacent to Legacy Park, which was sold to the City by his mother, Alma Thurgood. The Planning Commission has considered this matter and they voted unanimously that the land should be left as it is and dedicated for future expansion of Legacy Park.

Barbara Thurgood also addressed the use of Legacy Park property; she noted the property has always been on the City's master plan for future park space. She noted part of the existing park property was donated by a member of the Thurgood family and the property in question was sold by Alma Thurgood. The City is proposing to sell 2.5 acres and secure an additional acre of land from Ivory Homes to be used for a sports court type of amenity. The problem with that is that Legacy Park is a family park, and the planned extension was intended to be the same; it has never been planned to be used as sports park. She added she has heard of plans to locate a fire station on the property in the future, but that would also impact the use of the land for open space. She stated the 71 homeowners that will live in the Ivory development will be charged a park impact fee and the revenue from that fee could be used to develop the 2.5 acres of property adjacent to the existing Legacy Park. Ivory Homes offered \$800,000 for the 2.5 acres of property. She asked that the Council save Legacy Park and honor the commitments made to Alma Thurgood in the past.

Melanie Turner addressed Legacy Park as well; her grandparents were the former owners of the Legacy Park land, and the Thurgood family has played a significant role in the history of Syracuse City. She asked that the Council honor the commitments made to Alma Thurgood and the rest of the Thurgood family and keep the property for future expansion of Legacy Park.

Fred Panucci thanked Councilmember Savage and City Manager Bovero for their responsiveness in bringing a matter before the Council; he is interested in discussing business licenses for rental properties in the City. He personally owns rental properties in other communities that employ a Good Landlord Program and participation in such a program makes landlords better and ensures quality tenants. If the City Council can act quickly, adoption of a Good Landlord Program can help to keep Syracuse City ranked as the second safest city in the State of Utah. If a program is not adopted, he is afraid that tenants who are not able to secure housing in other communities will come to Syracuse as rental guidelines are not as strict.

Terry Frederickson addressed the Legacy Park matter; he has personally known the Thurgood family since moving to Syracuse many years ago. He noted Alma Thurgood sold her property to the City with the thought in mind that it would be used to beautify the area and extend Legacy Park. He noted he lives on 1000 West and traffic is atrocious; if Grants Lane is used as an access road, the traffic conditions will worsen.

The following residents also spoke to the Legacy Park matter and communicated their desire for the City Council to uphold the City's past commitments to Alma Thurgood to use her property for the extension of Legacy Park: Julie Alta Thurgood Johnson, Pamela Kemp, Grant Thurgood, Fred Bolingbroke, Chad Ritter, Brett Weaver, Kathy Thurgood Ostler, Autumn Thurgood, Richard Thurgood, and Geri Thurgood Waite.

Report to City Council regarding progress of American with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan for Syracuse City.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained In February 2020, the City Council adopted a Transition Plan which identified potential barriers to accessibility in the City. The Plan addressed both physical barriers and those in policies. The Plan sets a goal for all items identified in the Plan to be corrected by 2040. The accompanying update indicates the progress that the city has made to previously identified barriers to accessibility since February 2020. The first few pages address adjustments to policy and establishing procedures for those seeking accommodations. Right of way improvements are largely focused on curb ramps sufficient for those in a wheelchair safely to access the sidewalk. The City still has over 1,000 curb ramps that do not comply with current ADA standards. These ramps presumably complied with ADA when installed, but the standards have changed. The City is not required to tear out and replace previously compliant ramps, but when road projects touch those ramps, they must be updated. Otherwise, the City is free to update those ramps as the opportunity arises. The list of corrected curb ramps is included in the update in the orange chart. Parks facilities with identified barriers are included in the green chart. Other facilities are included as well.

City Attorney Roberts reviewed his staff memo and noted the goal of tonight's agenda item was simply to update the City Council on the progress on 2020 ADA Transition Plan; no action is required on this item. There was brief high-level discussion of items that have been completed since the adoption of the 2020 Plan and projects that are included in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 budget for completion.

Discussion regarding Request for Proposals (RFP) for pool of Engineering Services contracts.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained in 2010, the City conducted a competitive RFP process for a consulting engineer. Based on that competitive process, one engineering firm was selected to be the City's designated consulting engineer. This allowed the City to assign projects and tasks on an as needed basis in order get design work and studies done in a streamlined fashion. The Administration believes it is time to re-examine the consulting engineer arrangement utilized by the City. From time to time, this is healthy and prudent as the City grows and conditions change. Rather than having one consulting engineering firm, Administration feels it is in the best interest of the city to solicit a competitive process to create a pool of engineering firms, perhaps in the neighborhood of 3 to 4, to be able to use as needed. Under this scenario, the City could either select the firm in the pool that it feels is best for the project/task, or it could ask for price quotes from the pool and quickly get a selection for any given task. This would, for example, give the City the ability to select the firm with the strongest skills in water for a water project, but then select a different firm for another project like roads or parking lot projects. This type of arrangement does not bind the City only to the firms in the pool. The City would still have the freedom to go out to competitive bids for large projects if it wanted to. The expected timeframe for this arrangement with the pool would be 5 years, after which the City would conduct another competitive process if it so chooses. The memo concluded the goal of this discussion is to consider the proposed approach and give direction to the Administration on whether to pursue it further.

Mr. Bovero reviewed his memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the options available to them at this point in the RFP process; the Council concluded to support the approach recommended by Council to create a pool of engineering firms from which to receive support for specific engineering projects in the City. They asked to receive

additional information from staff regarding the parameters that would be used to determine which projects can be handled by in-house engineering and which projects would be submitted to the pool of engineering firms.

Planning item: Discussion regarding updates to General Plan moderate income housing elements in compliance with Utah House Bill (HB) 462.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained HB 462 of the 2022 Utah Legislative Session included some requirements that must be addressed in the City's general plan:

- Adoption of an implementation plan
- Selecting at least three strategies for the implementation plan

It is proposed that we update the General Plan to meet these requirements. The strategies may be one-time goals or ongoing goals. The implementation plan requires more than just selecting strategies and writing it down in the general plan text. It must include specific and measurable benchmarks and a timeline for the implementation of the strategies selected. It should also be flexible so that the city can make adjustments based upon changes in the community and market. The General Plan amendment will need to be considered by the Planning Commission with public hearings on the amendment. The implementation plan and MIH elements must be adopted by cities by October 1, 2022.

The City selected the following strategies in its October 2019 general plan:

- Study barriers to creating Accessory Dwelling Units on single family lots
- Apply for a TLC grant with Wasatch Front Regional Council to commission a Housing Plan
- Create a mixed-use development zone
- Plan for increased supply and diversity of housing stock
- Here is the list of potential housing strategies from the State Code (10-9a-403):

iii. for a town, may include, and for other municipalities, shall include a recommendation to implement three or more of the following moderate income housing strategies:

- (A) rezone for densities necessary to facilitate the production of moderate-income housing;
- (B) demonstrate investment in the rehabilitation or expansion of infrastructure that facilitates the construction of moderate-income housing;
- (C) demonstrate investment in the rehabilitation of existing uninhabitable housing stock into moderate income housing;
- (D) identify and utilize general fund subsidies or other sources of revenue to waive construction related fees that are otherwise generally imposed by the municipality for the construction or rehabilitation of moderate-income housing;
- (E) create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, internal or detached accessory dwelling units in residential zones;
- (F) zone or rezone for higher density or moderate-income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers;
- (G) amend land use regulations to allow for higher density or new moderate income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors;
- (H) amend land use regulations to eliminate or reduce parking requirements for residential development where a resident is less likely to rely on the resident's own vehicle, such as residential development near major transit investment corridors or senior living facilities;
- (I) amend land use regulations to allow for single room occupancy developments;
- (J) implement zoning incentives for moderate income units in new developments;
- (K) preserve existing and new moderate-income housing and subsidized units by utilizing a landlord incentive program, providing for deed restricted units through a grant program, or, notwithstanding Section 10-9a-535, establishing a housing loss mitigation fund;
- (L) reduce, waive, or eliminate impact fees related to moderate income housing;
- (M) demonstrate creation of, or participation in, a community land trust program for moderate income housing;
- (N) implement a mortgage assistance program for employees of the municipality, an employer that provides contracted services to the municipality, or any other public employer that operates within the municipality;
- (O) apply for or partner with an entity that applies for state or federal funds or tax incentives to promote the construction of moderate income housing, an entity that applies for programs offered by the Utah Housing Corporation within that agency's funding capacity,

- an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by the Department of Workforce Services, an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by an association of governments established by an interlocal agreement under Title 11, Chapter 13, Interlocal Cooperation Act, an entity that applies for services provided by a public housing authority to preserve and create moderate income housing, or any other entity that applies for programs or services that promote the construction or preservation of moderate income housing;
- (P) demonstrate utilization of a moderate-income housing set aside from a community reinvestment agency, redevelopment agency, or community development and renewal agency to create or subsidize moderate income housing;
 - (Q) create a housing and transit reinvestment zone pursuant to Title 63N, Chapter 3, Part 6, Housing and Transit Reinvestment Zone Act;
 - (R) eliminate impact fees for any accessory dwelling unit that is not an internal accessory dwelling unit as defined in Section 10-9a-530;
 - (S) create a program to transfer development rights for moderate income housing;
 - (T) ratify a joint acquisition agreement with another local political subdivision for the purpose of combining resources to acquire property for moderate income housing;
 - (U) develop a moderate-income housing project for residents who are disabled or 55 years old or older;
 - (V) develop and adopt a station area plan in accordance with Section 10-9a-403.1;
 - (W) create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, multifamily residential dwellings compatible in scale and form with detached single-family residential dwellings and located in walkable communities within residential or mixed-use zones; and
 - (X) demonstrate implementation of any other program or strategy to address the housing needs of residents of the municipality who earn less than 80% of the area median income, including the dedication of a local funding source to moderate income housing or the adoption of a land use ordinance that requires 10% or more of new residential development in a residential zone be dedicated to moderate income housing;

A copy of the page dedicated to housing in the General Plan, along with the Appendix providing the analysis backing up that page, accompanies this report. The memo concluded the goal of this discussion is to give general direction on which strategies the Council wishes to implement. Staff will take these selected strategies to the Planning Commission for them to develop an implementation plan – i.e., suggesting how and when we will achieve those goals. After a recommended amendment to the General Plan is adopted by the Commission, it will return to the Council for final review and adoption.

CED Director Steele and City Attorney Roberts reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion of the menu items; the Council was able to identify two menu items that may be viable in Syracuse City but were unable to decide upon a third. The Mayor decided to move the item to the July 12 business meeting for continued review/discussion of the menu items with the goal of providing direction to the Planning Commission as they are required to consider the matter and provide a recommendation to the City Council.

Planning item: Application for zone change and preliminary plat for property located at approximately 1700 S. Banbury Drive, Agriculture A-1 to Planned Residential Development (PRD) and General Commercial (GC).

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Erik Craythorn has applied to amend approximately 2.5 acres of the city's zoning map from A1 to PRD and GC. The applicant intends to build a 95-unit townhome project and to sell the corner land for commercial development. The proposed townhome development is approximately 9.45 acres, and the commercial pad is approximately .5 acres. The applicant already has PRD zoning for approximately 7 acres of the project. The project is located at approximately 1700 S Banbury Drive. Density for the project is approximately 10 units per acre. The change is consistent with the General Plan which is slated as 'High Density Residential'. There is only one place in the entire city where the high-density residential designation is planned for. The process as described in city ordinance for an amendment to the zoning map includes holding a public hearing and receiving a recommendation from Planning Commission. The hearing and recommendation results are then reported to City Council who makes the final decision. The PRD ordinance requires that along with the zoning application, a preliminary plat, architectural plans, and landscape plan. There is also a requirement for a development agreement (DA). The DA, Zoning, and Preliminary Plat are considered concurrently for a PRD development. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on June 21, 2022 and voted to recommend denial of the requested rezone. The vote was 6-1. The public hearing was well attended where the neighbors to the north expressed opposition to the project and to its perceived impacts to traffic, schools, police, and infrastructure among other concerns expressed.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the preliminary plat; there was a focus on the viability of commercial uses in the project area and the amount of parking included in the project. The Council concluded to move the application forward to the July 12 business meeting agenda to take action on both the zoning and preliminary plat applications.

Planning item: Application for zone change for property located at approximately 1100 S. 1675 W., Residential R-2 to Residential R-3.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Lance Cheshire has requested to rezone his property at 1100 S 1675 W from R-2 to R-3. He desires to construct a stairway and entrance into his basement. Our current practice for measuring setbacks associated with a building permit is to measure from the foundation to the property line. Since his concrete retaining wall stairs tie into the concrete foundation of the home, for purposes of setback measurement, the stairways addition places the home closer to the rear property line. The R-2 rear setback requirement is 30 feet and the R-3 setback requirement is only 20 feet. As measured, the new stairway would encroach into the 30-foot setback. For this reason, he is applying to the R-2 zone for an additional 10 feet of rear-yard for his desired stairs down to his basement. The homes along his rear yard boundary are already R-3 so this rezone doesn't create an island. The rezone is also still consistent with the General Plan designation of 'low density residential'. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on this item on June 21, 2022. No comments were received from the public. The Commission voted to recommend approval 6-1. The dissenting vote felt that the item should have been a variance and not a rezone.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of the proposed zone change and an alternative option to consider a variance for the subject property. He indicated the other lots in the area are smaller than allowed in the R-2 zone and are more compliant with the R-3 zone. If the applicant is referred to the Board of Adjustment (BOA), a variance is not guaranteed. The Council concluded support the zone change based upon the fact that the subject property and surrounding lots are already compliant with the R-3 zone based upon lot size. They also indicated it would be appropriate to amend the current land use ordinances to prevent this type of situation from occurring in the future. The Mayor directed staff to include an action item on the July 12 business meeting agenda to consider the zoning application.

Planning item: Planning Commission recommendation regarding text amendment, Syracuse City Code Section 10.30.020, regulations for buildings and structures.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Jared Stoker has requested to amend the ordinance to allow him to place an accessory structure closer to the street than currently allowed. Currently ordinance requires that accessory structures not be placed in the front yard setback. They may be placed in the rear or side yards and setbacks are determined by the height of the accessory structure. The applicant's house is in an R-1 zone which has a front setback of 25 feet. The applicant's house is also located in a cul-de-sac. The applicant argues that the unique context of this situation would have minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood since there is low traffic on his street. The Planning Commission reviewed the item and held a public hearing on June 21, 2022. No public comments were received. The Planning Commission voted to recommend denial of this amendment. They all felt that rather than amend the ordinance, instead the item would be a better candidate for a variance through the Board of Adjustment.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the options available to them regarding this application; they concluded to move the application to a business meeting for formal action but directed Mr. Steele that they would like to consider a code text amendment to ensure that this is not an issue in the future.

Planning item: Review and consideration of Cooperative Corridor Preservation Agreement with Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) pertaining to the State Road 193 project.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the State Road 193 extension between State Street and 2000 West was built in 2014. The extension between 2000 W and 3000 W was completed in 2018. UDOT owns and maintains the facility including controlling all access roads and driveways feeding onto the facility. The current allowed access points that UDOT has approved are located 1/2 mile at signalized full movement intersections. UDOT is protective of the access points because the facility's designed speeds and projected traffic volumes could create a dangerous traffic condition when cars pull out and accelerate into traffic or brake to pull out of traffic flow. To facilitate development, West Point and Syracuse have jointly approached UDOT to ask for more access onto the facility for economic development and improved circulation. UDOT has agreed to granting additional access by allowing additional right in right out (RIRO) intersections with center medians at the 1/4-mile marks. The RIRO intersection according to UDOT is safer since it doesn't allow a left-hand turn movement which has been proven to be the more dangerous traffic movement since you are crossing multiple lanes of oncoming traffic resulting in 'T-bone' or head on collisions. The goal of this

June 28, 2022

discussion is to review the agreement document and decide if it is ready to be forwarded to the business meeting for approval on July 12.

City Manager Bovero reviewed the staff memo. The Council expressed support for the terms included in the agreement and the Mayor directed staff to include an item on the July 12 consent calendar to authorize execution of the agreement.

Planning item: Discussion regarding possible creation of Good Landlord/Crime Free Housing Program.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Syracuse currently does not require a business license or require payment of a fee to those seeking to rent out residential units, including apartments. Utah law allows cities to require business licenses for owners of rental dwellings, if the city so chooses. UCA § 10-8-85.5(2). If it does so, then it would be required to apply that requirement to all rentals equally, and the fee would be limited to covering the cost of administration of the licensing. The fee would be determined by the overall cost of administration and divided among all landlords equally. A business license fee may not be higher based upon the number of units, nor can the city require a separate business license for each unit. Such a program could include inspections by City officials to ensure safety and habitability. The City is prohibited from collecting a fee for these inspections, however.

Good Landlord Program and Disproportionate Rental Fees:

In addition to the administrative licensing fee, cities are also allowed to impose a disproportionate rental fee, under specific circumstances. The fee must be determined by a study that demonstrates that rental properties present a disproportionate cost of providing municipal services to residential rental units, compared to similar owner-occupied housing. Such a study could be commissioned by the Council and conducted by an independent firm that does these types of studies. Generally, they will partition the city into single-family and rental units, and then use geolocation to assign enumerated municipal services to the addresses. The list includes many services which may or may not be trackable. See Utah Code Ann. § 10-1-203.5(1)(g). The two are compared on a per-dwelling basis. If the City expends more resources on the rental dwellings than it does on owner-occupied housing, then the study has justified a disproportionate rental fee. Unlike the business license fee, this fee would be imposed on a per-unit basis, rather than on a per-landlord basis. A City that imposes a disproportionate rental fee may also operate a Good Landlord Program under state law. Participation in the good landlord program provides a “carrot” to those landlords who wish to participate. No landlords are required to participate in any city in the state. A landlord who participates in the Good Landlord program is entitled to a reduction of any imposed disproportionate rental fee, in a standardized amount determined by the Council. A City may choose to also reduce the business license fee for good landlord participants but is not required to do so. Certain landlords are exempt from the disproportionate rental fee in any case, regardless of whether they create a burden: those who operate owner-occupied rental units of four or fewer units. A single-family home with an accessory dwelling unit in the basement or in a small home on the property would therefore be exempt from the fee, so long as the owner also lives on-site. Good landlord participants may be required to run background checks on potential tenants, evict those that commit crimes on the premises, comply with the Fair Housing Act, keep the property properly maintained and similar restrictions. Good landlord programs may not require a landlord to reject a tenant based upon the results of the criminal background check, with a very narrow statutory exception for which our city does not qualify. They are not subject to random or unannounced inspections merely because they are on the program. See UCA § 10-1-203.5(3). This is not a one-sided proposal. Municipalities with good landlord programs dedicate resources to providing information to landlords of criminal activity on their properties. We find that landlords often are not aware of the activity, because tenants are not likely to self-report.

Crime-Free Multi-Housing Program:

Through contractual agreements connected to land use approvals, the more recent multi-family housing projects have agreed to participate in crime-free housing programs with the City. The Police Department has made preparations for the City to effectively participate in the program with the landlords. The Crime Free Multi-Housing program consists of three phases that must be completed under the supervision of the Police Department. The property becomes certified upon successful completion of all three phases. The anticipated benefits are reduced police calls for service, a safer plus more stable resident base, and improved police/community relationships. According to <http://www.crime-free-association.org>, “fully certified properties have reported reductions in police calls for service up to 70% over previous years.”

Training Coordinators:

Sgt. Ryan Carter and Administrative Professional Mariana Luna have completed 24-hours of intensive training and becomes certified as an instructor of the program. Chief Atkin also has extensive experience running this program from his time as a Community Resource Officer with Layton PD. Our PowerPoint is nearly complete. We are working on obtaining subject matter experts to help teach various components of the training. Our plan is to schedule a date in August 2022 for this training.

Crime Free Multi-Housing Program Benefits:

- A stable, more satisfied tenant base. Increased demand for rental units with a reputation for active management

- Lower maintenance and repair costs. Increased property values
- Improved personal safety for tenants, landlords, and managers

Below is a brief outline of the three phases of program that are required for property certification:

- Phase I - Management Training (8-Hours) Taught by the Police
- Crime prevention theory
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) theory
- Resident screening guidelines
- Lease agreements and eviction issues
- Crime Free Lease Addendum
- Key control and master key use
- On-going security management monitoring and responding to criminal activity
- Gangs, drugs activity, and crime prevention
- Legal warnings, notices, and evictions
- Working smarter with the police
- Fire and life safety training
- Community awareness

A 100-page resource manual is supplied with additional handouts. Phase II - CPTED - Survey by the Police

- CPTED on-site survey/evaluation
 - Minimum door, window, and lock standards compliance inspection
 - Minimum exterior lighting standards evaluation
 - Key Control procedures evaluation
 - Landscape maintenance standards compliance

Phase III - Community Awareness Training

- Annual crime prevention social held by property management and supported by the Department.
- Community awareness and continuous participation is encouraged

Full certification (gold certificate) permits the right to post the Crime Free Multi-Housing Program sign and advertise membership in the Crime Free Multi-Housing Program in the print media using the official logo. This certificate usually expires every year unless renewed following compliance with Phases II & III.

Administrative Cost of Respective Programs:

The Police Department has the Crime-free Multi-Housing program ready to go; the amount of time and resources required to maintain the program is not currently quantified. If expanded to include all willing landlords, the program's administrative burden would increase correspondingly. A Good Landlord Program would require the establishment of a business license to operate a rental property. And in order to provide an incentive for participation in the program, the City would need to fund a study of disproportionate impacts due to rental properties and establish a disproportionate rental fee. The program would be available to all landlords who maintain rental properties in the city, which was reportedly estimated to be about 10% of households in Syracuse. This likely would require additional allocation of resources to the business licensing division of the CED Department. Roughly the same level of police resources would be required to maintain the Good Landlord Program. The goal of this discussion is to provide information to the Council about the program available to the City related to crime-free rental housing and receive direction from the Council.

CED Director Steele and Police Chief Atkin reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the options before them; the Council compared a Good Landlord Program with a Crime Free Housing Program and concluded to pursue the creation of a Good Landlord Program. They also indicated they would like more information about certain elements of a Crime Free Housing Program during the next discussion of the matter.

Planning item: Report on current Redevelopment Agency (RDA) project areas and associated tax increment.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the Council has requested a report on the City's RDA/EDA/CDA areas. The City has four Tax Increment Financing (TIF) project areas. All four are managed by the RDA board which is also the City Council. Please see attached for a summary table of the four project areas. The memo referenced a five-year financial report of the areas and Zion's bank report, included in the Council packet.

CED Director Steele reviewed his staff memo and summarized the report of the tax increment report included in the Council's meeting packet; he discussed projects that have been completed in the past utilizing tax increment funding as well as eligible future expenses/projects the RDA Board can consider. The Council discussed the importance of planning for future tax increment projects in project areas throughout the City.

**Discussion regarding aesthetic improvements on West Davis
Corridor/Antelope Drive expansion project.**

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that as part of all new highway projects, UDOT dedicates a percentage of the project budget to Cities for aesthetic improvements. The amount allotted to Syracuse City for the West Davis Highway project is approximately \$800,000. The highway project is scheduled to be completed in 2024 but could be finished as soon as 2023. Planning for any aesthetic improvements will need to happen soon in order to coordinate irrigation, stormwater, lighting, etc. as needed. The memo discussed options available to the City; in order to design the aesthetic improvements, the City will need the services of a design consultant to work with Council on the overall vision, design options, and actual construction drawings. This could be achieved through an RFP process through the City, or even as a shared contract with other cities. Either way, the specific goals and improvements would be unique to Syracuse. Budgetarily, the City has \$800,000 from UDOT to use toward improvements. The City also has the option of using additional funds from its own budget to put more improvements in the designated areas along the highway and along the Antelope Drive expansion area. While details of the actual improvements would be discussed once the design consultant was on board, this discussion is primarily intended to discuss the overall process and direction for moving forward.

City Manager Bovero reviewed his staff memo and indicated more information regarding the project and aesthetic improvements will be forthcoming; the Council will have the ability to provide input regarding specific aesthetic improvements along the project corridor, but not on the highway structure itself. This includes landscaping or monuments at interchanges in the City. Staff is looking for direction from the Council regarding the process that will be employed to make decisions regarding aesthetic improvements along the corridor; one option would be to hire a design consultant that could make recommendations to the Council. Mayor Maughan added that he has been discussing cooperative efforts with other cities, which could save the City some money; he indicated that further discussion will be had with the Council before a final decision is made.

**Discussion regarding proposed amendment to Syracuse City
Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual related to secondary
employment.**

A memo from the Administrative Services Director explained the Council has requested that this item be added to the council meeting for further discussion. Below is the policy related to secondary employment:

9.100. Outside Employment.

In order to reduce mental and physical fatigue, limit conflicts of interest, and reduce liability insurance expenses, no Full-Time employee shall be permitted to engage in any outside employment except as provided herein. Any Full-Time employee desiring to engage in outside employment or has any change in outside employment status must fill out and submit the Notice of Second Employment form (See Appendix H) and turn it in to his or her department head. The department head shall review the request or status change based on the considerations set forth in this Section and make a recommendation to the City Manager regarding the same. The City Manager shall review the request for outside employment and approve or deny the same based on the following considerations:

- (a) whether the outside employment will in any way interfere with the employee's ability to meet the City's work schedule, including reasonable overtime and standby assignments;
- (b) whether the outside employment will be directly connected with or contingent upon a representation that the employee is in any way representing the City, either directly or indirectly;
- (c) whether the outside employment is consistent and appropriate with the employee's position held with the City; and
- (d) whether the outside employment will interfere with the employee's physical, mental, or emotional ability to fully and completely discharge the job duties of his or her City position.

The City Manager shall notify the Human Resources Manager of any approved outside employment request and such request and approval shall be retained with the employee's personnel records. The City reserves the right to cancel an approval for outside employment when it is deemed such employment is not in the City's best interest. Any employee engaged in outside employment without prior approval required herein may be subject to discipline up to and including termination. City employees may not use City equipment or uniforms in connection with outside employment, nor may they engage in outside employment while on City time. In no event shall any full-time outside employment be permitted for full-time employees. Employees may not accept other employment which might impair his or her independence of judgment in the performance of his or her public duties as an employee of the City or which might interfere with the ethical performance of such duties.

The memo concluded the goal of the discussion is to determine if changes are necessary in the City's outside employment policy.

City Manager Bovero referenced the policy language included in the staff memo. Councilmember Carver expressed concern about the restrictive nature of the policy, specifically for employees that may need to secure secondary employment for personal financial purposes. The Council debated the purpose of the policy, with several Councilmembers indicating that

City Council Work Session

June 28, 2022

they feel the policy is intended to ensure safety for employees and their respective Departments. Councilmember Carver argued she believes that employees should only be denied the ability to secure secondary employment when the employment they are pursuing presents a conflict of interest. Councilmember Watson stated it is not odd for an employer to place conditions on full time employment and he is not concerned about the current policy's language.

Mayor Maughan polled the Council to determine the level of support for amending the policy; Councilmembers Savage, Watson, and Teague indicated they are comfortable with the current language. Councilmember Bingham stated she is supportive of language in the policy that allows the City to deny secondary employment based upon a conflict of interest. Councilmember Teague stated the policy currently includes that language. Councilmember Carver stated that she feels the policy expresses that the City has ownership of an employee even when they are off work. Mayor Maughan stated the majority of the Council is comfortable with the current language and the policy will remain unchanged.

General budget discussion and preparation for Truth in Taxation process.

Mayor Maughan stated there is no update for the Council at this time; staff has begun the process of advertising the Truth in Taxation hearing for August 9, 2022.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Dave Maughan
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: August 9, 2022