

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on January 10, 2023, at 6:00 p.m., held in a hybrid in-person/electronic format via Zoom, meeting ID 891 3499 7280, 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
Jennifer Carver
Paul Watson
W. Seth Teague
Paul Watson

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

City Employees Present:

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

1. Meeting Called to Order/Adopt Agenda

Mayor Maughan called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. as a regularly scheduled meeting, with notice of time, place, and agenda provided 24 hours in advance to the newspaper and each Councilmember. Councilmember Teague provided an invocation and Councilmember Watson led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM MOVED TO ADOPT THE AGENDA. COUNCILMEMBER CARVER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR

2. Public comment:

There were no in-person public comments.

City Recorder Brown read the following emailed public comment for the record of the meeting:

“My Name is Price Seim.

I would like the City Council to consider changing city ordinance 11.20.060 to remove the dates and times from it.

What is the purpose of this ordinance? If you ask me, it's to make snow removal operations easier and safer for our city employees. Having parking restrictions when there isn't snowplow operation on-going doesn't make it safer for them.

Why was this ordinance changed to add dates and time restriction versus only during snow events? The change was made after a few residents had an issue with one neighbor parking many vehicles in the street. The council decided to change the winter parking restrictions.

There wasn't any discussion about the plowing the streets or snow except when deciding the start and end dates for the restriction. In other words, it wasn't a winter parking issue, but an attempt to resolve a personal dispute.

Is it being enforced? From my observation, no it's not. Last winter I noticed dozens of cars parked in the street and I didn't even drive into neighborhoods, I looked into neighborhoods from main roads. This weekend I drove through random neighborhoods in Syracuse between 5:30 and 6:00 a.m. Every one of them had cars parked in the street. The number of vehicles depended on whether it was a R1, R2, or R3 zone. As you can probably guess the neighborhoods with smaller lots had more cars on the street. Also, during the December 14, 2021 work session meeting, the Police Chief stated he would only enforce this ordinance if it was snowing.

When do snow removal operations take place in residential areas? I can't answer this question definitively, but I don't think it happens between 12 a.m. and 6 a.m. except for specific roads around schools, which is done by the Davis School District, to ensure buses can get to the school.

Here are some justifications I heard during meetings:

Some council members stated that they grew up with this restriction. I'm sorry that isn't a valid reason to have it. For example, the speed limit on interstate 15 was lower when I grew up. After the experts said it would be safe, the state legislatures decided it made sense to increase the speed limit. Having a blanket parking restriction doesn't make sense. What makes sense is no parking on public streets if snow is accumulating on the road.

They also stated that other cities in the area have this restriction. That is true. Some cities have a winter parking restriction with different dates and/or times from ours, but there are other cities in the area that don't specific date/time restrictions. So, again that isn't a valid reason to keep it. Here is another example (at the state level), the states surrounding Utah allow lotteries and/or sport betting. Does that mean that the Utah legislature needs to change our law because the states around us do it?

I feel you should change this ordinance back to the previous version for two reasons. First, it doesn't make sense to prevent our residents from parking on public streets when there isn't a valid reason for it. Second, it isn't being enforced. Even though it isn't being actively enforced, a police officer having a bad night can decide to cite 100 vehicles because it is on the books. Either enforce it or change it.

For your information I have adequate off-street parking but prefer to park one vehicle on the street to prevent blocking in another vehicle. So, for me it is a matter of convenience not necessity.

Thank you for your time.

Price”

3. Approval of minutes.

The following minutes were reviewed by the City Council: Work Session of November 15, 2022, and the Business Meeting and Work Session of December 13, 2022.

COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES LISTED ON THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. COUNCILMEMBER CARVER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED AYE.

4a. Proposed Resolution R23-01 authorizing the Syracuse Fire Department to enter into a contract for the purchase of a Fire Engine truck and authorizing other such action as is necessary in connection therewith.

A staff memo from the Fire Chief explained that for the fire department to manage increased service needs a second station will need to be built in the near future; resulting in a need for one additional fire engine to be added to our fleet. This will allow for one front line fire apparatus and one back-up fire apparatus at each station. Due to factors beyond our control, current lead times for fire engine purchases are up to 44 months; requiring us to begin the ordering process sooner than anticipated. There is a possibility that this order could be completed as soon as 26 months based upon request for priority ranking due to need. The engine will be ordered following Syracuse City Purchasing Policy. The purchase price will be locked in at contract and payment will not be required until delivery. Funding for the fire engine could come from our capital fund, public safety impact funds, or by financing the vehicles using a capital lease.

Fire Chief Byington reviewed his staff memo.

Councilmember Savage stated this if the first that he is hearing of these recommended expenditures, and he would like a clear understanding as to whether the City can afford the purchases; he inquired as to the terms of the contract that would allow the City to cancel the purchase if the determination is made the City does not have adequate funding. Chief Byington stated that for the following item, the proposed ambulance purchase, Horton has communicated that once the chassis has been built and delivered, the City owns it. The same is true for all components of the ambulance as they are built and added down the line. For the fire engine, there are percentages defined in the contract; once the order is placed, the vendor will begin purchasing items to fulfill the order and there is a penalty schedule and the penalty for cancellation is increased by 10 percent at different stages of the process to build the engine.

City Manager Bovero discussed the demand for the equipment; the City is contemplating the construction of a second fire station and the opening of that new facility could actually occur before the engine can be delivered. For the ambulances, it is necessary that the delivery of those pieces of equipment coincides with the opening of the emergency room that will be located in the new hospital that is being built in the City. Administration truly feels that it is necessary to order the equipment now; the City can afford the equipment, but there are various funding mechanisms that the Council can consider and it would be appropriate to determine the funding mechanisms in development of the budget for the fiscal year in which the equipment will be delivered. Mr. Bovero acknowledged this is an uncomfortable position for the Council to be in and it is something that has never occurred in the past, but conditions surrounding the purchasing and delivery of equipment are extraordinary at this time. Mayor Maughan agreed and noted that it is important to lock in current pricing for the equipment; pricing continues to increase from month to month and it is smart to secure the purchase price at the lowest amount possible. Chief Byington agreed.

Councilmember Savage asked if it is a fair assessment that there no money will be expended in this fiscal year and that the City will essentially have two years to save for these purchases. Chief Byington answered yes; there are no progress payments required and full payment is due upon receipt.

Councilmember Watson asked if the City could sell its position on the equipment if the determination were made to cancel the order at a later date. Chief Byington stated he is unsure about that option given that there is a great deal of customization for the fire engine; however, for the ambulances there is such a demand for the equipment and there may be more flexibility relating to cancellation or transfer of the City's position. The alternative is also true; it may be that another entity cancels their ambulance order and if the Council approves the proposed resolution and contract, it may be possible for the Syracuse City to assume someone else's 'place in line'.

Councilmember Teague noted that this item was discussed briefly during the last budget retreat meeting, so it should not be too much of a surprise to the Council that the Department needs to order this equipment.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED RESOLUTION R23-01 AUTHORIZING THE SYRACUSE FIRE DEPARTMENT TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE PURCHASE OF A

FIRE ENGINE TRUCK AND AUTHORIZING OTHER SUCH ACTION AS IS NECESSARY IN CONNECTION THEREWITH. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4b. Proposed Resolution R23-02 authorizing the Syracuse Fire Department to enter into a contract for the purchase of two Fire Ambulances and authorizing other such action as is necessary in connection therewith.

A staff memo from the Fire Chief explained that for the fire department to manage increased service needs a second station will need to be built in the near future; resulting in a need for two additional ambulances to be added to our fleet. This will allow for one front line ambulance and one back-up ambulance at each station. Due to factors beyond our control, current lead times for ambulance purchases are up to 30 months; requiring us to begin the ordering process sooner than anticipated. There is a possibility that this order could be completed sooner based upon request for priority ranking due to need. The ambulances will be ordered following Syracuse City Purchasing Policy. The purchase price of the chassis and box will be locked in at contract and payment will not be required until delivery. Funding for the ambulances could come from our capital fund or by financing the vehicles using a capital lease.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED RESOLUTION R23-02 AUTHORIZING THE SYRACUSE FIRE DEPARTMENT TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE PURCHASE OF TWO FIRE AMBULANCES AND AUTHORIZING OTHER SUCH ACTION AS IS NECESSARY IN CONNECTION THEREWITH. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

4c. Proposed Resolution R23-03 authorizing the Syracuse Public Works Department to enter into a contract for the purchase of two Bobtail Trucks and authorizing other such action as is necessary in connection therewith.

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained the five-year capital equipment plan has programmed replacement for two 1999 bobtail trucks. These trucks are used as snowplows in the winter and dump trucks in the summer. There is a limited availability of trucks on the market. It is possible to get two trucks this summer, but the order would need to occur very soon. Once these are sold out, the next round of trucks are subject to higher emission standards and will take at least 12 months after the order. They also will increase in cost about 15 to 25 percent. Cost savings of \$60,000 to \$80,000 will be realized if the trucks can be ordered now. No payment would be required until the trucks are delivered (eta July 2023).

Mr. Whiteley reviewed his staff memo.

The Council briefly discussed the proposed purchase and indicated they did have some knowledge of this matter given that it has been planned for in the development of the capital equipment plan.

COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT PROPOSED RESOLUTION R23-03 AUTHORIZING THE SYRACUSE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE PURCHASE OF TWO BOBTAIL TRUCKS AND AUTHORIZING OTHER SUCH ACTION AS IS NECESSARY IN CONNECTION THEREWITH. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

5. Authorize the Mayor to execute contract with Weber Basin Water Conservancy District for the sale and use of treated water.

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained Syracuse culinary water is supplied from Weber Basin with some supplemental water that comes from a well. The contract with Weber Basin has a limit of 1925 acre feet annually. In 2022 the limit was reduced 10 percent due to the drought. In 2020 and 2021, Syracuse has met the contracted amount, but has exceeded the drought reduced amount this year. Population growth plays a part in the higher demand. Another factor is how beginning in 2020 more people are working from home which increases the daytime water use. The City's master plan indicates a shortfall of 350 acre-feet for future buildout. This presumes the well reliably operates at full production. Due to the low level of the Great Salt Lake, the governor is not allowing any new water wells or diversions in the watershed. At some point, Syracuse must increase the water supply to meet demand. Beginning Feb 2, 2023, water contract prices will increase dramatically from Weber Basin. This item was discussed in the Council's December 13, 2022 work session.

Mr. Whiteley reviewed his staff memo.

Councilmember Bingham inquired as to the difference in price when new contract prices are increased in February. Mr. Whiteley stated the price increase by more than 100 percent.

COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE CONTRACT WITH WEBER BASIN WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT FOR THE SALE AND USE OF TREATED WATER. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

6. Authorize Administration to award contract for Marilyn Acres Phase Five capital improvement project.

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained this project consists of installation of new secondary water main and storm drain main along with replacement of the existing culinary water line, defective curb and gutter and asphalt.

Relative to scheduling, 1250 West Street will begin construction in the spring and be completed by May 2023. 1350 South will be completed during Cook Elementary’s summer vacation. Public Works has met with the school principal, and they are aware of the upcoming closures and impacts. Bids were opened on January 4, 2023. Seven bids were received. The low bidder was Craythorne, Inc. with a total bid amount of \$1,254,442.20. The funding for this project is proposed from the following sources:

	20-40-70 Class C	50-16-70 Culinary Capital	30-16-70 Secondary Capital	53-16-70 Sewer Capital	40-16-70 Storm Drain Capital	
Current Bid	\$332,315.77	\$365,373.73	\$283,238.36	\$61,841.32	\$211,773.02	\$1,254,442.20
1250 W/1350 S Budget	\$180,000.00	\$370,000.00	\$300,000.00	\$170,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$1,170,000.00
1290 South 12” Culinary Budget	\$150,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$260,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$810,000.00
1100 West Phase 1 Budget	\$100,000.00	\$300,000.00	\$130,000.00	\$107,000.00	\$325,000.00	\$962,000.00
1575 South Budget	\$45,000.00	\$180,000.00	\$125,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$540,000.00
*Difference	**\$142,684.23	\$684,726.27	\$531,761.64	\$515,158.68	\$353,226.98	\$1,712,399.12

*Remainder for Marilyn Acres Phase 6 to be bid and put on February Council meeting.

**Administration anticipates this fund is going to go over budget due to higher-than-expected asphalt costs.

There is fund balance or surface treatment money that can be utilized to cover this overage.

Mr. Whiteley reviewed the staff memo and concluded he recommends the Council award the project to Craythorne, Inc.

Councilmember Teague asked if this project would coincide with the construction of a park in the area. Mr. Whiteley stated that the park will be coordinated with phase six of Marilyn Acres, which is out to bid at this time.

COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE ADMINISTRATION TO AWARD CONTRACT FOR MARILYN ACRES PHASE FIVE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT. COUNCILMEMBER CARVER SECONDED THE MOTION, ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

7. Discussion regarding proposed Memorandum of Understanding with Lime Scooters for bike and scooter sharing services

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Lime Scooters would like to formalize the company's operation in Syracuse through a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The document will formalize the expectations for each party. The company will operate with a business license and is willing to limit parking areas if the scooters/bike parking become problematic.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo and briefly summarized the terms of the draft MOU.

Mayor Maughan stated that the City has been open to this type of operation, but he noted another vendor has tried to operate a similar business in the City and chose not to continue. The Lime Scooters representative stated he is aware of that fact and would still like to proceed.

Councilmember Savage asked if Lime will offer bikes and scooters, to which Mr. Steele answered yes.

High level discussion among the Council centered on the company’s practices of monitoring their equipment to ensure that it is not abandoned in a neighborhood; parking locations; and range of travel.

The Council expressed a willingness to consider action on the execution of the proposed MOU at a future business meeting.

8. Discussion regarding application for zone change for property located at approximately 3176 W. 1700 S., Agricultural (A-1) to General Commercial (GC), for the construction of a reception center/restaurant.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department provide the following information about the subject property:

Location: 3176 W. 1700 South
 Current General Plan: Commercial
 Current Zoning: A-1 (Agricultural)
 Proposed Zoning: GC (General Commercial)
 Acreage: 2.98
 Parcel Number: 12-047-0319

The applicant is requesting a rezone of 2.98 acres from Agriculture (A-1) to General Commercial (GC) with the intent of constructing a reception center/restaurant. The existing golf course is zoned A-1 because recreational uses are a permitted use in the zone. Their proposed use of a stand-alone reception center and restaurant is not listed as a permitted use in the A-1 zone. Restaurants are listed as a permitted use in the General Commercial zone. The proposed zone is consistent with the

General Plan. The General Plan for this area reflects the intent of encouraging commercial or otherwise professional development in proximity to the 1700 South West Davis Corridor interchange. There are no abutting neighbors to this property and a State Highway (1700 South) divides it from properties to the south. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the application on December 20, 2022. No public comment was received, and the Planning Commission is forwarding a unanimous recommendation for approval.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo and concluded the purpose of this agenda item is to determine if the Council is ready to schedule an action item responsive to the zone change application. He facilitated high level discussion among the group regarding the implications of the proposed rezone and the current use of surrounding properties. The Council concluded they are comfortable moving the application to the next business meeting agenda for consideration of approval.

9. Review and discussion of impact fees charged for detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs)

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City has received requests to review its application of impact fees towards detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs). Detached ADUs have recently become more popular and are touted by the state as a way to create more affordable housing. The city allows detached and attached ADUs and charges impact fees during the building permit approval only for the detached. The city doesn't charge all of the impact fees, just the transportation, public safety, and parks. These impact fees total \$4,644 dollars on large or small ADU. The other impact fees like culinary water and secondary water are not charged because the ADUs aren't allowed to have separate water/sewer connections and must share a connection to the existing home's lateral. The reason for this is to avoid creating a separate unit of density and maintaining that the new structure is accessory to the principal structure. The city does not collect impact fees for attached ADUs like basement apartments because the state law prohibits municipalities from doing so. The city does have an ordinance governing impact fee collection and is found in chapter 13.55. See attached. Also attached in this report are some examples of the impact fees recently charged for ADU's built within the last year and the adopted fee schedule.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and indicated the goal of this discussion is to decide if an ordinance amendment or modification to administrative procedure is appropriate. He then facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the factors that currently contribute to the calculation of fees for ADUs and asked whether they would like to consider an adjustment to the fees. The Council debated the true impact of an ADU; current regulations for the attached versus detached ADUs in the City; and the role ADUs play in the City's moderate income housing plan. They ultimately determined they would like to consider adjustments to impact fees for ADUs, on a scale based upon the value of the ADU, the manner in which it is built out and used, and the number and types of inspections required for the ADU. Mr. Steele stated that he can work on a recommendation for the Council to consider in a future work session meeting.

10. Discussion regarding current ordinances and policies related to the different types of utility systems allowed pursuant to Syracuse City Code.

A memo from the City Attorney explained there has been a request for City staff to review and compile Syracuse City's current ordinances and any policies the City has related to the different types of utility systems that are allowed by the City, particularly exploring the regulation of grinder pumps and pressurized sewer systems and permitted systems for secondary water pressure. The purpose of this discussion is to provide an overview of the current ordinances in place and determine what, if any, changes or clarifications the City Council would like to discuss or propose or what, if any, further information City Council would like to direct staff to provide. The City mandates that all subdivisions, building lots, proposed development and structures requiring sanitation facilities, located within the City connect to the water, secondary water and sewer systems of the City. See attached City Code Sections 4.10. 8.10.100, 8.10.120, 10.30.060(C). Additionally, the City is within the area of the North Davis Sewer District (the "NDS"), which has its own ordinances, rules and regulations, which the City has adopted and incorporated. See attached City Code 4.10.010. The NDS also requires that any houses, buildings or properties used for human occupancy, employment, recreation other intended uses connect to sewer facilities. See attached NDS Code Sections 3-2-19 through 3-2-27.

In regard to pump stations or pressurized sewer systems, the City will not accept responsibility for or allow the dedication of any lift stations, sump pumps or other facilities designed to cause sewer or land drain to move to higher elevations. See City Code Sections 4.10.130 and 4.45.020(D). The City does allow such facilities, but requires that those facilities be privately owned, operated, maintained and annually inspected through a special public service district. Id. The NDS, allows where elevations are too low to permit adequate gravity flow, that sewage discharge be lifted by approved means. See attached NDS Code Sections 3-3-3 and 3-3-4. The NDS; however, requires sewage pump stations to be within a city and be controlled and maintained by the City. The memo referenced NDS Code Sections 3-9-1 and 3-9-2.

In regard to grinder pumps, the City has only one particular code section which references grinders specifically. That section only applies to commercial and industrial users that have the potential to discharge deleterious wastewaters containing elevated levels of fat, oils, grease, or granular sediment to the sewer collection system and allows the installation and use of food grinders in new or remodeled food establishments. See Code Section 4.10.104. While the use of food grinders in food establishments is not necessarily the focus of this conversation, this is included to show there is the absence of specifically

regulating sewer grinder pumps, by name, in the code. The City does have a somewhat catchall provision in code that states a person may not discharge into the sewer system any substance or in a manner which, under ordinary circumstances, either (1) is harmful or detrimental to or interferes with either the sewer system, the functioning of the sewer system, the environment, or the public health or (2) causes sewage to pass through the sewer system without treatment and thereby creating a significant health hazard or diminishing the quality of the environment. See attached City Code Section 4.10.100. If a person were utilizing a grinder which causes either (1) or (2) stated above to occur, then arguably the manner in which the discharge was performed is prohibited. This would be a very fact specific circumstance. As stated above, the City will not accept responsibility for or allow the dedication of any lift stations, sump pumps or other facilities designed to cause sewer or land drain to move to higher elevations. See City Code Sections 4.10.130 and 4.45.020(D). However, the City does allow such facilities, but requires that those facilities be privately owned, operated, maintained and annually inspected through a special public service district. Id. For single lot subdivisions or individual site plans, these facilities shall be owned, operated, and maintained privately. NDSO also allows for commercial grinders with specific requirements; the memo referenced NDSO Code 3-2-6.

In regard to utility systems for secondary water pressure, the City requires all new residential to connect to the City secondary water. The existing residential, at the time of adoption in 1984, was encouraged to connect to secondary water as well. The memo referenced City Code Section 4.15.510. The City also regulates sprinkler systems connected to the City's secondary water system and prohibits a system that materially affects the pressure or supply of water in the City water system or any part thereof. See attached City Code 4.15.420. The particular section leaves open the possibly for additional equipment to aid in the water pressure so long as it does not affect the City system. There are also City code sections that prohibit the water waste that would also come into play should the system the user installed become an issue.

The memo concluded the goals of this discussion are to provide information to the Council about the current ordinances related to allowable utility systems in the City; and receive direction from the Council about any proposed changes to the current ordinances or further research or information needed to make any proposed changes or clarifications, if desired.

City Attorney Brass summarized her staff memo and provided an overview of the relevant City ordinances and NDSO regulations, which were included in the Council's packet for reference.

Mayor Maughan stated that the matter before the Council deals with a potential conflict between the City Code and the NDSO Code; NDSO will not serve certain sewer improvements, but the City's development code does allow for some of those improvements, which means that the City would be left to service or maintain it. He asked if the Council would like to consider adjustments to City Code to ensure that the City is not left with responsibility for certain sewer improvements by default. Ms. Brass stated that it would be possible to include language in the City Code to ensure that the City will not assume certain improvements, such as lift stations, by default; rather, there would be a review process that would allow for staff review of the requested improvements before they are included in a project application.

The Council then engaged in discussion with Public Works Director Whiteley about specific sewer infrastructure, such as grinder pumps and lift stations, and the City's ability to maintain them; there was a focus on the risks associated with each of the different pieces of equipment and whether private residents should be expected to have the ability to maintain the equipment independent of the City or the NDSO.

Councilmember Teague asked if other cities that are part of the NDSO currently allow grinder pumps and lift stations. Mayor Maughan stated that there are three cities that allow the equipment: Clinton, Layton, and West Point. All three regret that they allowed the equipment because they require increased staffing levels to respond to a failure of the equipment or in the event of an emergency. The equipment has a high failure rate; there are seven lift stations in the Central Davis Sewer District and they have been very difficult to maintain and have cost millions of dollars. This is the basis for NDSO's refusal to accept responsibility for the equipment. The Council discussion centered on the potential fiscal impact of allowing lift stations; they indicated a desire to consider ordinance amendments that clarify the types of sewer equipment that both NDSO and the City will accept and maintain; Councilmembers expressed a desire to have continued discussion of the risks associated with lift stations and to possibly hear from other cities about their experiences. Mayor Maughan stated he will calendar the item for continued discussion in the next work session meeting.

11. Discussion and/or action on Proposed Ordinance 2023-01 amending Section 11.20.060 of the Syracuse City Code related to off-street parking during winter months.

A memo from the City Manager explained enforcement of the winter parking ordinance shed light on specific language in the ordinance that may be confusing to residents. The section in question reads:

11.20.050 Off-street parking during winter months.

Between the dates of November 15th and March 15th, it shall be unlawful to park any vehicle or allow a vehicle to remain parked within the public right-of-way of any street within the corporate limits of Syracuse City:

(A) At any time during the accumulation or removal of snow unless special permission is granted by the Syracuse Police Department; or

(B) Between the hours of 12:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m.

The language "unless special permission is granted by the Syracuse Police Department" has spurred some residents to ask for pre-authorization to park on the street during a snowstorm, similar to a permit. A closer reading of the ordinance, however, shows that the special permission is only applicable during a snow event. The staff's understanding of paragraph (A)

is that a police officer may authorize someone to park on the street if the officer believes it would be safer for the public to do so during a snow event. For example, a car breaks down during a snowstorm and the police officer authorizes the driver to leave the car on the side of the road while they work toward getting it repaired or towed. This item is on the agenda for discussion and possible vote due to the timeliness of winter parking enforcement.

The suggested amendment is to eliminate the phrase “unless special permission is granted by the Syracuse Police Department” from the ordinance. An officer may still direct someone to park the car on the side of the road during a snowstorm. If for some reason the car gets ticketed later that night, the owner could file an appeal and explain that the driver was directed to park the car on the street by a Syracuse police officer.

City Manager Bovero summarized his staff memo and indicated the goal of this discussion is to consider the reasons for the proposed ordinance change and decide whether to vote on an amendment to the ordinance.

Councilmember Carver expressed concern that the hours of 12:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. for off-street parking are unreasonable and that many families do not have adequate room to park off the street. She suggested allowing on-street parking unless it is snowing, in which case vehicles should be moved off the street.

Councilmember Bingham acknowledged the earlier public comments about the ordinance not being enforced and stated that the police cannot monitor every instance of on-street parking during the specified time frame. She acknowledged that cars parked on the street during a storm can impede the City's ability to perform snow removal and suggested a policy is necessary.

Councilmember Savage stated that not everyone checks the weather forecast before going to bed, and suggested a policy requiring off-street parking during winter months in case of overnight snow is appropriate. Councilmember Carver questioned where residents are expected to park their vehicles and Councilmember Savage stated that on-street parking is not a right and every home should have enough off-street parking spaces. Councilmember Carver argued that there is enough room for a car to park on both sides of the road when plowing, but Councilmember Savage stated that a car could be damaged if it is parked on the street and the snowplow gets close enough to it. Councilmember Carver agreed it is wrong for people to park on the road when it is snowing, but during any other time, on-street parking should be allowed. She asked Chief Atkin if the Police Department is enforcing the ordinance. Chief Atkin stated that the City has written more citations for violations of the winter parking ordinance this year than in any previous year. He added that it is not the Department's highest priority, but they will focus on the issue when it is snowing. Citations will likely not be issued when a car is parked on the street if it is not snowing.

Mayor Maughan asked if the Council would like to take any action on the matter before them. Councilmember Carver stated she does not agree with the requirement for off-street parking all winter; she only thinks it should be required when it is actually snowing. During a storm, she parks off the street in an area that is not technically an authorized off-street parking space. She would support an ordinance amendment that would remove the requirement to park off-street all winter long between the hours of 12:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m.

Councilmember Teague stated that the adopted ordinance was not a knee-jerk reaction to issues that were raised by the public and that it was one of the issues for which he has received the most emails since being a member of the Council.

Councilmember Watson stated a plow driver should not need to worry about damaging a car when roads need to be plowed. He agreed that not everyone is aware when it is going to snow, but it is not unreasonable to restrict on-street parking during the winter when there is any chance that a storm can occur.

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MOVED TO ADOPT ORDINANCE 2023-01 AMENDING SECTION 11.20.060 OF THE SYRACUSE CITY CODE RELATED TO OFF-STREET PARKING DURING WINTER MONTHS. COUNCILMEMBER TEAGUE SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL VOTED IN FAVOR, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF COUNCILMEMBER CARVER, WHO VOTED IN OPPOSITION.

12. Discussion/review of draft Syracuse City Communications Policy.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained as the City grows larger and more complex, so does the need for better coordination and controls on official communications of the City. A communications policy, adopted by the city council would create the standards and guidelines for this communication to occur. Good communication will help the City be more responsive to citizens and help build and maintain trust with the public. The draft policy addresses the following items:

1. **Guiding Principles:** Outlined the “spirit” of the policy and “how” the city’s representative should conduct the communications of the city.
2. **Policy Statement:** Summarizes the city’s official policy on its communications efforts.
3. **Administration and Guidance:** Outlines the authority to enforce compliance of the policy.
4. **Duties and Responsibilities:** Provides the various roles and responsibilities of staff members and elected officials pertaining to communications of the city.
5. **Procedures:** Outlines the protocols for engaging in different communications efforts of the city.

This policy incorporates the skills and talents of the new communications specialist into a more centralized communications structure. The current communication methods tend to be rather decentralized with all departments operating somewhat autonomously, with coordination through the city manager and part-time communications person. This policy would provide a means to give a central coordinating role to the communications specialist via the department heads and/or city manager, depending on the issue. This will help us better coordinate all of the messaging going in and out of the City.

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and indicated the goal of the discussion is to review the draft communications policy and provide comment and guidance to the administration on any changes, if needed. Additionally, staff would like for the Council to either schedule a second review of the draft policy or place it on future business session for adoption. He then facilitated a review of the draft policy, focusing briefly on the fact that the policy will apply to all City employees, including elected officials, but is not intended to restrict anyone's first amendment rights to free speech as an individual. The Council concluded they are comfortable with the guiding principles of the proposed policy and indicated a willingness to consider adoption of the policy at the next business meeting.

13. Public comments.

There were no public comments.

14. Mayor/Council announcements.

The Council and Mayor provided announcements about upcoming community events and other opportunities for public involvement.

15. Consideration of adjourning into Closed Executive Session pursuant to the provisions of Section 52-4-205 of the Open and Public Meetings Law for the purpose of discussing the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual; pending or reasonably imminent litigation; or the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property (if necessary).

There was no need for a closed session.

At 8:10 P.M. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER CARVER SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Dave Maughan
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: February 14, 2023