

Minutes of the Work Session of the Syracuse City Council held on January 26, 2021 at 6:00 p.m., held virtually via Zoom, meeting ID 820 0569 6798, and streamed on the Syracuse City YouTube Channel in accordance with House Bill 5002, Open and Public Meetings Act Amendments, signed into law on June 25, 2020. Pursuant to written determination by the Mayor finding that conducting the meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present due to infections and potentially dangerous nature of Infectious Disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus.

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

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

City Employees Present:

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

The purpose of the Work Session was to take a virtual tour of Syracuse Museum and receive a presentation of the 2021 Museum goals from the Museum Board; hear public comments; discuss options for City-wide access to high speed fiber internet; discuss the following Planning items:

1. Preliminary Plat, Final Plat, and Development Agreement for Distant Serenade Subdivision, located at approximately 2866 S. 3000 W.
2. Final Plat, Criddle Farms Phase 5, located at approximately 4000 W. 700 S.
3. Application for General Plan Map amendment, old R.C. Willey Site, located at approximately 1693 W. 2700 S.
4. Discuss potential text amendment regarding on-street parking restrictions.
5. Review Syracuse City Code Section 8.10.090 pertaining to irrigation water share dedication requirements.
6. Discuss potential Redevelopment Agency (RDA) incentive option for a proposed office/retail/storage facility project.
7. Discuss potential Redevelopment Agency (RDA) incentive option for a proposed mixed-use office building project.
8. Discuss potential text amendment relating to the preliminary and final plat approval process.
9. Discuss potential text amendment relating to multi-family building signage identification standards for emergency response.
10. Report/re-cap regarding Mobile Active Transportation Tour (MATT) – Councilmember Savage and CED Director Steele.

Discuss proposed budget amendment for Public Works shop wall project; discuss opportunity to purchase 150 acre-foot of additional irrigation water from Weber Basin; discuss proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for West Point City participation in Syracuse Youth Court; continue discussion of town hall meetings – topics for discussion; discuss Council assignments and appointments; and discuss future agenda items/Council announcements.

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

Virtual tour of Syracuse Museum, hosted by Museum Board; presentation of 2021 Museum goals.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the Museum Board is a public body of the City that is appointed by the Mayor with the advice and consent of the City Council. The Museum Foundation is a private non-profit that was set up to care for the displays and fund the museum programs. Currently, the Museum Foundation Board members act as the City Museum Board members. By City ordinance, the Museum Board is responsible for the day-to-day management and operations for the Museum. The City owns and maintains the buildings and grounds for the use and operation of the museum, and provide staffing and other assistance as determined by the City Council. Museum Curator Elizabeth Najim and the Museum Board members have created a virtual tour of the museum, which we will preview at the meeting. Ms. Najim and Museum Board President Dean Hill will provide a presentation of museum goals for the upcoming year and discuss budgetary matters pertinent to the City.

Ms. Najim and Mr. Hill presented a video to the Council to serve as the virtual tour of the museum; video is available at the following link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p1ZVNtVOd5A&feature=youtu.be>. She and Mr. Hill then used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to discuss recent accomplishments of the Museum Board and present their 2021 Museum goals. The current five-year strategic plan identifies objectives to increase tourism, preserve history, improve the Museum's internal organization, and pursue education, collaboration, and public involvement. There are several employment positions needed to make a museum successful; this includes archivist, conservator, curator, designer, historian, education coordinator, gift shop manager, and registrar. All of these positions are necessary for running a museum successfully and currently, the City's part time curator wears all of these hats. When compared with other museums in the State in areas with comparable or lower population, staffing levels are much greater than those in Syracuse City and the Board feels that it is necessary to convert the part time curator position to full time in order to accomplish the Museum's goals.

The Council complimented Ms. Najim and Mr. Hill on their presentation and the goals that have been identified for the Museum. They also commended them for their response to the COVID-19 pandemic and making museum offerings available to the public during a difficult time. There was also a discussion about the concept of opening a gift shop in the Museum and the support the Board would need from the City to move in that direction.

Mr. Hill by reiterating the request of the Museum Board that the Council consider funding a full-time curator position for the Museum. The Council communicated that request can be considered and discussed in conjunction with other budget requests during the upcoming budget retreat meeting.

Public comment.

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

Mayor Gailey then invited Zoom participants to provide public comments.

Sterling Georgianna referenced the City's winter parking ordinance; he does not feel the ordinance is sufficient to address on-street parking in residential neighborhoods and the staff memo for the discussion item tonight seems to have a greater focus on industrial or commercial areas of the City. He stated that on-street parking in residential neighborhoods – specifically the parking of multiple vehicles or large trailers – creates a safety hazard for people living in the neighborhood. While residents of the neighborhood he lives in would prefer a year-round on-street parking ordinance, but would settle for adjustments to the winter-parking ordinance to prohibit on-street parking at all times, not just during a snowstorm.

Shane Payton stated he lives in the same neighborhood as Mr. Georgianne and he agreed there is a significant safety issue in his neighborhood throughout the entire year due to the actions of one homeowner; this homeowner abuses their ability to park their vehicles on the street. There are three vehicles parked on either side of the person's driveway and they are left in that spot for two to three days at a time. He stated he feels that this impacts the quality of life of adjacent neighborhoods and impacts their property values. He stated this is not fair to those who have made a considerable investment in their home and he would like for the City to address the problem; residents have tried to address it civilly and the homeowner is nonresponsive.

An additional resident – no name given – stated he lives directly across the street from the property mentioned by Mr. Payton; he has voiced his concerns to the property owner and their response was that he should use another entrance to the neighborhood to avoid driving past the property. He stated he cannot do that since he lives directly across from them. His property value and his personal safety have been impacted by this problem; he has young children as do several other families in the neighborhood, and their safety is impacted when walking or biking on a street or sidewalk and their view of oncoming traffic is impeded by multiple cars parked on the street. He stated that he has seen similar activities occurring in other neighborhoods throughout the City and he feels it would be appropriate for the Council to consider an ordinance

amendment that – at a minimum – would mirror the policies employed in neighboring cities.

Discuss options for City-wide access to high speed fiber internet.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the Mayor and City Council have received requests from residents to look into UTOPIA as an option for highspeed fiber to the home in Syracuse. Based on that feedback, the Council conducted a survey last summer to get more input from the public. See survey results attached. At the September 22, 2020 Council meeting, the Council requested that we put together some options for the City and discuss them at future meeting. Since that time, further research has been conducted on potential models for City-wide high-speed internet.

Option A: Partnership with Outside Fiber Company

Operating Model

- **Internet Service:** Open access to all internet service providers (ISP). All ISPs can use the fiber to provide internet service to customers.
- **Sign Up Requirements:** Citizens are not required to sign up.
- **Ownership & Maintenance:** Outside fiber company owns and maintains fiber infrastructure.
- **Billing:** Customer pays a monthly maintenance fee to the outside fiber company for the infrastructure. Customer pays a monthly service fee to their internet service provider for internet service.
- **Customer Service:** Outside fiber company manages customer service on fiber infrastructure. ISP manages customer service on internet service.

Capital Financing Model

- **Up-Front Financing:** Typically, the outside fiber company fronts the installation cost of the infrastructure.
- **Debt Payoff:** Typically, the outside fiber company pays the debt service over time.
- **Partnership:** Typically, the outside fiber company pays the debt service with revenue from subscribers. The City is a partner by bridging any shortfall in the debt service if revenue is not adequate. This is either through cash payment or a loan to the outside fiber company.

Option B: City Fiber

Operating Model

- **Internet Service:** Open access to all internet service providers (ISP). All ISPs can use the fiber to provide internet service to customers.
- **Sign Up Requirements:** Citizens are not required to sign up.
- **Ownership & Maintenance:** The city owns and maintains fiber infrastructure.
- **Billing:** Customer pays a monthly maintenance fee to the City for the infrastructure. Customer pays a monthly service fee to their internet service provider for internet service.
- **Customer Service:** The City manages customer service on fiber infrastructure. ISP manages customer service on internet service.

Capital Financing Model

- **Up-Front Financing:** The City fronts the installation cost of the infrastructure.
- **Debt Payoff:** The City pays the debt service over time.
- **Partnership:** No partnership. The City pays the debt service with revenue from subscribers. Debt service shortfalls would be handled through subsidy from other City funds. This could be a straight subsidy, or a loan from one fund to another.

Option C: Multi-City Partnership

Operating Model

- **Internet Service:** Open access to all internet service providers (ISP). All ISPs can use the fiber to provide internet service to customers.
- **Sign Up Requirements:** Citizens are not required to sign up.
- **Ownership & Maintenance:** The fiber infrastructure is owned and maintained by a joint entity. This is either through an interlocal agreement, but more likely through the formation of a local district. Cities do not need to be geographically near each other to form a district partnership.
- **Billing:** Customer pays a monthly maintenance fee to the joint entity for the infrastructure. Customer pays a monthly service fee to their ISP for internet service.
- **Customer Service:** The joint entity manages customer service on fiber infrastructure. ISP manages

customer service on internet service.

Capital Financing Model

- **Up-Front Financing:** The joint entity fronts the installation cost of the infrastructure. This is typically backed by the member cities.
- **Debt Payoff:** The joint entity pays the debt service over time.
- **Partnership:** The joint entity pays the debt service with revenue from subscribers. Debt service shortfalls would be handled through subsidy from the member cities. This could be a straight subsidy, or a loan from the member cities to the joint entity.

The memo concluded the goal of tonight’s discussion include a review and discussion of the possible models for providing city-wide high-speed fiber; and provide direction to the Administration on next steps.

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the current options available to the City as well as the type of programs other cities have pursued; Councilmember Bingham referenced pending legislation that may be considered during the 2021 Utah State Legislative Session and noted she would like to wait to understand the outcome of the session before moving forward. She added that she leans towards an option that limits the City’s involvement in creating a fiber network in order to encourage as much private market competition as possible. Councilmember Bolduc provided a summary of her understanding of the pending legislation regarding fiber opportunities and noted she agrees with Councilmember Bingham that it would be appropriate to wait to understand the outcome of the session. Councilmember Maughan indicated he is comfortable waiting as well, but expressed his hesitation regarding the option whereby the City would create a new fiber utility and force all citizens to pay for the service – even if they are not using it. Councilmember Teague stated he agrees with the position of waiting until the outcome of the legislative session; he also agrees with Councilmembers Bingham and Maughan regarding hesitation to create a City utility and force residents to pay for the utility. He added that he heard from a resident who was having difficulty providing public comment earlier in the meeting; he wanted to provide his input regarding a City-wide fiber network. When choosing his home, he was interested in access to fiber and indicated that many residents looking to purchase a home in Syracuse may share that same interest. Councilmember Teague then noted that during discussions of economic development priorities for the City, there was a focus on making areas of the City ‘shovel-ready’ for large economic projects and he feels that providing access to fiber is key to making a commercial property economically viable. He stated he leans toward supporting the UTOPIA fiber option, but would like to hear additional information regarding other providers and networks that are available to municipalities in the State. Councilmember Savage agreed with Councilmember Teague that creating a reliable fiber network would increase the attractiveness of Syracuse City to different businesses or developers; the City is currently extremely underserved and this is problematic not just for residents, but for businesses. Many people make decisions on where to live or locate their business based upon optimal internet speeds. While he is not advocating for one option over another, he leans towards the UTOPIA option, which received support from residents when they responded to the 2020 citizen survey. He stated he is comfortable waiting until the end of the legislative session, but he wants to move forward soon.

Mr. Bovero refocused the discussion on the models of various fiber companies and the role the City would need to take to ensure that residents throughout the City would have access to the service. Councilmember Maughan stated that he wants Syracuse residents to have access to fiber, but he wants to limit the City’s involvement in providing the service. He understands that the breadth of a fiber network will be based on user participation and he does not support a model that would require the City to pay for City-wide access to the service if required participation levels are not reached. The entire Council agreed and engaged in high-level, philosophical discussion with City Administration regarding possible participation levels, with Mr. Bovero noting he can reach out to UTOPIA to get clear information about their participation level requirements and the ‘breaking point’ at which the City would become financially responsible if certain participation levels are not met.

Planning item: Preliminary Plat, Final Plat, and Development Agreement for Distant Serenade Subdivision, located at approximately 2866 S. 3000 W.

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

Location:	2866 South 3000 West
Current General Plan:	Low-Density Residential
Current Zoning:	R-1 (Single-Family Residential at 2.3 Units per Acre)
Acreage:	6.23

City Council Work Session
January 26, 2021

The applicant is requesting approval for a final subdivision plat which will be the only phase of this subdivision. There is a parcel that will be utilized for detention and the remaining lots are residential. The subdivision plat meets all the requirements of the City Code. Due to the small size of the project, this qualifies for a 'Minor' subdivision approval process where preliminary and final plats are combined. Also, part of the item is to approve an agreement authorizing the city to pay to upsize some utilities while under construction that will be needed beyond the boundaries of the subdivision. CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo.

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

Planning item: Final Plat, Criddle Farms Phase 5, located at approximately 4000 W. 700 S.

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

Location:	4000 W. 700 S.
Current General Plan:	Low-Density Residential
Current Zoning:	R-3 (Single-Family Residential at Four Units per Acre)
Acreage:	8.18 acres

The applicant is requesting approval of a final subdivision plat which will be the fifth phase of this subdivision. This plat abuts 700 South which was dedicated separately as a public right-of-way dedication during the summer of 2020. The dedication was recorded and the road is currently public. The subdivision plat meets all the requirements of the City Code and all staff comments have been addressed. Because the plat meets the requirements of the City Code and all comments have been addressed, staff recommends it be approved. Planning Commission reviewed the item on January 19th and is forwarding a recommendation for approval.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo.

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

Planning item: Application for General Plan Map amendment, old R.C. Willey Site, located at approximately 1693 W. 2700 S.

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

Location:	1693 W. 2700 S.
Current General Plan:	Commercial, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential
Desired General Plan:	Medium Density Residential
Current Zoning:	R-a, G.C., A-1
Acreage:	Approx. 25 acres

The applicant Psion Homes is requesting approval to amend the General Plan Map. This is in preparation to build a proposed townhome and single-family PRD development. The project was initially proposed as just the RC Willey land (20.4 ac) but in order to improve traffic circulation and meet city standards, the Castle Creek (.48 ac), and Hall (4.067 ac) properties have been added to the project. A concept plan is required to be provided simultaneously with the application. The developer has worked with all of the landowners to create one cohesive design. One item of attention is that the plan's open space came up a little short of the required 20 percent so the developer is requesting to pay the in-lieu fee that would be used for improvements to the nearby Jensen Nature Park and Emigrant trail. Even with the fee, there are multiple amenities provided on site. More details on architecture and site plan would be provided in the future should the applicant be allowed to continue on with the rezone/preliminary plat process. Please review the attached concept plan, staff reviews, and application to decide if the item is harmonious with the general plan and land use ordinances for PRD developments. The Planning Commission reviewed the item on January 19, 2021 and is forwarding a conditional recommendation for approval. Conditions are that the north row of townhomes be replaced with single family lots facing the cul-de-sac and that 10 percent of the townhome units be removed because they felt the ratio of townhomes to single family homes was a little high. There are 102 townhomes proposed so 10 percent of that is 10 lots. There are eight lots on the north row so that would leave reducing just 2 more townhomes from the rest of the project to meet their recommendation.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the conceptual

plan the applicant has created for the project; there was a focus on the overall density of the project, after which the Council communicated they cannot support the application at this time given the dramatic increase in residential density in the middle of well established single-family residential neighborhoods. They indicated that with a move to a medium-density project rather than a mix of low and medium density, they do not feel the conceptual plan aligns with the General Plan for the area; they asked the applicant to work with City staff to adjust the plan responsive to concerns regarding density and access to the project and come back to the Council for continued discussion during a future meeting.

Councilmember Teague asked if the units in the project will be owner-occupied or rental properties. Mr. Steele stated that each unit in the project is considered independent of all others so that it could be sold to an individual property owner. The applicant stated that is correct; the units will be listed for sale to individual owner-occupants. He noted there will be a homeowner's association (HOA) established to pay for ongoing maintenance of the shared amenities in the project. He has heard the feedback from City residents, the Planning Commission, and the City Council and will continue to work on amendments to the plan responsive to that feedback. He stated that many of the concerns related to traffic associated with the increase in density, but it his belief that the traffic will be less impactful to existing residents when compared to heavy commercial traffic associated with the previous use of the property by R.C. Willey.

A resident, Greg Brustad, asked for permission to speak; he is concerned about townhome units fronting Gordon Avenue and Bluff Ridge Drive. This means there will be on-street parking on those two roads, which will create safety issues for existing residents in the area.

Planning item: Discuss potential text amendment regarding on-street parking restrictions.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained during public comment in a prior meeting, concerned residents solicited the Council's attention to address concerns with on-street parking and asked for the Council to amend its ordinance. The Mayor and staff met with their representatives, and discussed their situation. The specific concern in this case involves the use of on-street parking by a single residence, taking up many spaces while not utilizing existing garage space at the home. The number of cars varies, but there are several more than the space in front of that residence can accommodate. While this is not exclusively a problem during the Winter, the citizens have requested winter parking restrictions, similar to our neighboring jurisdictions, during Winter months as a means of alleviating the problem during the winter months. In Ninigret Industrial area, there is a trucking company that parks their trucks up and down the road 24 hours a day. The company does not have a brick and mortar presence in the complex. Being a public road, this is allowed but is causing safety, wayfinding, and marketability of the vacant building concerns. Large trucks are limited to parking on residential streets for 2 hours but may park on other streets for an unlimited amount of time. An element of this discussion is requesting to amend the parking ordinance to enable our code enforcement officer to clean the situation up. The memo concluded he goals of tonight's discussion are to discuss whether to amend the parking ordinance and direct staff to prepare an amendment reflecting the Council's desires.

City Attorney Roberts reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the issues that have been raised by residents in the community regarding on-street parking, as well as concerns identified by staff regarding on-street parking in commercial and/or industrial areas. He advised the Council of the many options available to them to address these issues and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of each of these options:

Current parking laws, related to these situations:

- A. Parking on public roads acceptable year-round, except when snow is falling or has accumulated on the road
- B. Parking of abandoned or broken-down vehicles limited to 7 days
- C. Only permit-only parking exists South of high school
- D. No restrictions on proximity of vehicles to other parked vehicles
- E. Vehicles over 50,000 pounds are restricted from parking in residential zones for greater than 2 hours; those between 10,000 and 50,000 pounds are similarly restricted for greater than 24 hours in residential zones.
- F. Trailers used in the course of business are restricted from overnight parking in residential zones.

Parking Enforcement Options Related to 1st Issue:

1. Prohibit all parking on roads during winter months
2. Prohibit parking on roads for more than 24/48 hours at a time
3. Hours restrictions
4. Create additional permit-only areas (limits of number of permits from one household)

5. Proximity restrictions – more than 3 feet between parked vehicles
6. Restrict parking in front of others' homes
7. Limitation on number of vehicles from one household
8. Red curb

All of these options carry the risk of residents being upset over the new regulations. I will refrain from commenting on whether a measure is more or less likely to incur this displeasure and leave it to the political leaders to assess that factor.

Leaving the ordinance "as is" is always an option, and I did not weigh pros or cons of doing so because that is also a question for the policymakers.

(1) Prohibit parking on roads during winter months

Prohibit parking during months of expected snowfall – such as Nov 15 – Feb 15, or Dec - Mar

Pros: Easily enforceable, no question of how long vehicles parked in location

Completely clears roads for snow removal operations

Results in empty roads (during winter months), increases visibility of pedestrians in and near roads

Applicable in neighboring communities without outcry

Cons: No parking for guests (during Winter months)

No parking if multiple drivers/vehicles in homes with insufficient off-street parking options (during winter months)

Residents accustomed to current ordinance

Relief limited to winter months

(2) Prohibit parking on roads for more than 24/48 hours at a time

Ordinance may restrict a vehicle from being parked in a specific location for greater than a certain amount of time – Many cities have a 48- or 72-hours timeframe for all vehicles

Pros: Ensures rotation of vehicles – keeps it on the minds of owners and makes it more likely they will move them in time for a winter storm

Better likelihood that vehicles are only parked on road if operable

Cons: Does not solve problem at hand because multiple drivers may come and go, parking on road as they please

Enforcement difficult unless neighboring cameras show that vehicle literally has not moved – other options could include chalking tires

Would make over-the-weekend or multiple-day visitor, on-street parking illegal

Education or signage needed. Learning curve for residents and new move-ins.

(3) Hours restrictions during winter months

Neighboring communities have adopted a Winter-only no-overnight parking ordinance (e.g. Clearfield, Clinton, Layton), which prohibits parking during early morning hours in winter months.

Pros: Ensures clear roads for snow removal

Require street-parkers to make other arrangements every day, but allow for short-term daytime guests to use the road for parking

Easily enforceable during nighttime hours

A common parking restriction, may make education easier

Parity with neighboring jurisdictions

Cons: Overnight guests during winter months limited to off-street only

Homes with multiple cars and inadequate off-street parking will struggle to park during winter months

Relief of nuisance related to on-street parking limited to wintertime months

(4) Additional Permitted Areas

The City has existing code that authorizes the establishment of permit-parking zones, with limited numbers on the number of a household's issued permits.

Pros: Partially solves problem of excessive vehicles associated with one home. Limitations on number of vehicles that may utilize one house's permits (3) is written into the ordinance. Those who exceed the limit may face permit revocation.

Existing protocols and signage would mean easy implementation

Cons: Prior experience saw the community divide over the issue of whether to become a permit-parking-only neighborhood

Allowing permit-only-parking in neighborhoods without externally caused need would seem arbitrary, or might invite more requests from other neighborhoods. Our current ordinance only allows it for roads near the high school, due to the influx of non-residents using the on-street parking during school hours.

(5) Proximity Restrictions

The City could require all cars parked on-street in the City to provide a certain amount of space between the vehicles (such as 3 feet), to allow other drivers or pedestrians to see one another before children enter the roadway.

Pros: Would increase visibility for pedestrians seeking to cross at non-intersections

Would reduce intensity of parking due to the extra space reducing the available parking areas for vehicles

Cons: No other jurisdictions have such a requirement, so education of residents and visitors would be a constant task

Violation would be widespread and likely need additional enforcement if the ordinance is to be enforced generally

Would not solve the problem brought to the Council's attention – it would result in cars being parked in a more spread-out pattern and filling up spaces in front of other residences

(6) Restrict Parking in Front of Others' Homes

The City could experiment with attempting to prohibit the annoying practice of others parking in front of a home at which they are neither a resident nor a visitor

Pros: Reduces the amount of on-street spaces to those that can feasibly be located in front of a home

Cons: Novel – I was unable to find any other jurisdictions that do this without a permitting scheme; a steep education curve would be faced

Some homes (particularly those on cul-de-sacs) have limited on-street parking options, so their visitors would have nowhere to park

Violations would be widespread and likely need additional enforcement if the ordinance is to be enforced generally

(7) Limitation on Number of Vehicles from one Household

The City could attempt to limit the number of vehicles from a single residence that may be parked on the street within a certain radius (such as .5 miles)

Pros: Would limit the number of vehicles parking on-street

Cons: Novel – With the exception of permitted parking areas, this would be an unfamiliar ordinance and would require education of new residents

Easily avoided by registering vehicles to other addresses – additional step would be to establish that the person driving the vehicle actually lived at the address

Additional time for enforcement – official would be required to check registration of every vehicle to determine address of owner.

(8) Red curb

We are authorized to red curb any area that the City feels should be a no-parking area.

Pros: Flexible and reversible if circumstances change

Cheaper than signs

General understanding by driving public

Cons: Without policy governing the deployment of red curbs in non-customary situations, could be deemed arbitrary or capricious

Invites neighborhood disputes into decision

There may well be additional solutions to the situation, whether by ordinance or other means.

Parking Enforcement Amendment Request for 2nd Issue:

It is requested that we apply parking restrictions for heavy duty vehicles and trailers to all areas of the City, rather than only in residential zones.

It is also requested that we reduce the weight limit triggering the 2-hour limit down to 26,000 pounds from 50,000 pounds.

Councilmember Savage stated he is comfortable with an ordinance amendment that takes suggestions from each of the options presented by Mr. Roberts; he recommended the Council support ordinance amendments that prohibit overnight on-street parking during winter months; including a 48-hour limit for on-street parking year-round; and limiting a resident's on-street parking area to the frontage located direction in front of their own home. Councilmember Bolduc stated she can support the first two recommendations, but not the third to limit a parking space to the property directly in front of the home.

City Council Work Session
January 26, 2021

The Council engaged in discussion and debate of the recommendation and ultimately concluded to support Councilmember Savage's first two recommendations, but not the third. They indicated they would like to define 'winter months' as November 15 to March 15 each year. They also advised that Mr. Roberts make appropriate adjustments to ordinances governing on-street parking in commercial areas to provide clear direction regarding the length of time the owner of a commercial property is allowed to leave a large truck or trailer on the road.

Mayor Gailey advised staff to include this item on the January business meeting agenda for additional discussion and/or action.

Planning item: Review Syracuse City Code Section 8.10.090 pertaining to irrigation water share dedication requirements.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department referenced two issues that have resulted in this item being added to the agenda:

Issue #1 – Requested exception to water share dedication. There is a resident Mr. Steven Scharp, who is requesting an exception to the water share requirement as allowed in ordinance 8.10.090 (C). He desires to buy vacant land behind his house and attach it to his property, effectively making his lot larger. This is done through a plat amendment, which he has applied for, although requested it be put on hold until his water issue is resolved. His lot is part of a subdivision, but the land he wishes to buy is not. Since his land was part of a subdivision, the city received secondary water shares for just the lot, but since the land he wishes to purchase was not part of a subdivision, the city has no record of receiving shares for that portion. His lot is .37 acres and part of the Harmony Flats subdivision, and the land he desires to buy is 1.1 acres of the adjacent 1.77-acre parcel. The 1.77 ac parcel has a house on it, and he would be purchasing just the rear yard area. The yard area is currently being irrigated with secondary water and the rear property appears to be irrigated pasture grass. Ordinance says that residents may not water more than one acre with city secondary water, but this is common with older homes on arterial roads that most likely bought into the secondary water system in the '90's when the system was created.

The City Council can waive the conveyance of water rights if the developer presents 'clear and convincing evidence' that:

1. water rights were previously given to the city,
2. the secondary water system is already serving a currently landscaped lot, and
3. the proposed subdivision will decrease the current burden on the city's secondary water system.

There has not been any evidence presented showing that the city has received water shares for the 1.1 acres. Secondary water is already serving the property. It is open for debate if the pasture would be considered as 'landscaped'. And lastly, it would be hard to believe that the 1.1 acres being added to the backyard wouldn't eventually be landscaped with grass and trees etc., equating to a most probable added burden above the current pasture grass. Staff opinion on this is that this would not qualify for a waiver.

Issue #2 – Small projects are unable to pay the exact amount of water required. The second issue is related to the fact that the minimum amount of water that is available from water companies is a half share. Depending on the water company, the amount of acre feet per share fluctuates. For example, Davis and Weber water is 6-acre feet per share so one-half share D&W is equal to 3-acre feet of water. Layton canal is 1-acre foot of water per share. Currently the water market is expensive and scarce. Water shares are hard to come by and often the asking price is high. Price for D&W water currently is about \$6,000 per acre foot. So, a full share of D&W water is near \$40,000 dollars. The city requires three-acre feet of water per acre, no rounding down. Projects less than half acre would have no other choice than to round up. The potential solution is to allow these small projects to pay the in-lieu fee since it is impossible to provide half of the required water that activates the in-lieu option.

The goal of the discussion is to decide if an exception to the water shares for Mr. Scharp should be granted and if the irrigation water ordinance should be amended to activate the in-lieu fee for the small fractions of water.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated high level philosophical discussion and debate among the Council regarding Mr. Scharp's predicament and the consideration he is requesting from the City Council; the Council indicated they are uncomfortable providing the exception as there have been other property owners in the same situation as Mr. Scharp and the City has required them to dedicate water at the time they chose to develop their property. They indicated that Mr. Scharp has the option of paying a fee in-lieu of dedicating the water share; or if he is able to secure one share of water, but is only required to dedicate a half-share, the City would consider purchasing the other half-share from Mr. Scharp. The Council asked Mr. Steele to research how many other properties in the City may be in a situation similar to Mr. Scharp's and present that information back to the Council to determine if any ordinance amendment for the amount of water to be

dedicated for a project on a small property is appropriate.

Planning item: Discuss potential Redevelopment Agency (RDA) incentive option for a proposed office/retail/storage facility project.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained an office/storage/warehouse/retail development is proposed to be built surrounding the Pizza Factory. In preparation for the development, the landowner is requesting that the RDA Board assist him in infrastructure improvements that would serve the future development and also make travel between commercial projects more convenient and safe. The improvements would also alleviate some pressure off the busy intersection of Bluff Ridge Drive and Antelope Drive. It may also assist in expediting the construction of the buildings and freeing up moneys that could be used to make the facades more attractive. The funds would be used to build the drive isles prior to the buildings. The drive isles are needed to ensure cross access between projects and also create a network of options for motorists attempting to turn left on Antelope from Bluff Ridge Drive. The funds would be used to install the needed sewer, storm drain, culinary waterlines, and pave the driveways needed to get the project rolling. The total requested for the entire project is \$512,897. This incentive is different than most as it is requesting money up front rather than tax rebate. As the 750 West RDA is more established than others, there are sufficient funds available should it be desirable to the RDA Board. The approximate breakdown of the project square footages are: Retail - 5,000, Flex Office/Warehouse - 20,000 square feet, Storage Units - 23,000 square feet. It is not common practice to offer tax increment funds to a project of this scale and use type, however, the immediate benefits of improved traffic safety and circulation could be enjoyed by the surrounding residents. The improvements may alleviate concerns expressed by them recently in conjunction with the proposed 'Brigg's' mixed use project. If the incentive is desired, staff recommends making the funds contingent upon the developer granting public access across the properties both to the east and to the west legalizing the improved traffic circulation described above. Also, staff recommends putting a required time limit to when the improvements will be made and a time limitation on when the project's buildings are required to be built. After the building is built, there may be additional opportunities to incentivize specific employers to locate into the building. The memo concluded the goal of the discussion is to decide if it is desirous to offer an incentive for the project and if yes, decide if what has been described is the preferred incentive structure. If yes, the item could be acted on during a future RDA board meeting.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and the conceptual plan provided by the applicant; the Council indicated they are not comfortable proceeding at the project at this time given the applicant has only secured one bid for the improvements for which he is seeking RDA funding. Additionally, they were concerned about providing RDA funding for parking improvements or increased asphalt in the area. Councilmember Savage stated he would like for the City's Public Works Director to get involved in developing a bid package for the type of road to be included in the project, which will be open to public traffic. Mr. Whiteley stated he can review the current plans for the roadway and work with Mr. Steele to advise the applicant on the type of information he should present to bidders for the project.

Planning item: Discuss potential Redevelopment Agency (RDA) incentive option for a proposed mixed-use office building project.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained A three-story office building of approximately 39,000 square feet is proposed in conjunction with the 'Dahl Mixed Use'. As recently reported, the real estate market for office has become unpredictable in recent months due to COVID-19 changing the office landscape. The developer has expressed concern over the risk involved with constructing a speculative office building without pre-leasing the building first. In fact, he has explained that lenders will currently not loan for buildings without a certain amount of pre-leasing to prospective tenants. Since the project is within a CDA area that is managed by the city RDA board, there is a possibility to provide a property tax rebate as an incentive after constructing the building. This incentive would not come from city capital funds but rather diverting property taxes that will be generated once the building is created back to the developer. Looking at the proposed office building and assuming a 9.9 million valuation, we can project the amount that could be rebated back to the developer if the board chooses. The property tax rate is .012474. The RDA only gets 60 percent of that. So that will generate roughly \$74,000 per year to the agency in property taxes. Then some of that gets taken in management fees/annual reporting costs etc. A common percentage that has been used in other incentive deals recently is offering 75 percent of the increment received from just this building to the agency. So, 75 percent of the 60 percent of what the building generates if that makes sense. That comes out to be approximately \$55,571 per year. If we extrapolated that out until the project expires in 20 years, that would be projected to return above \$1,000,000. That should help with getting lending and expediting the project. The incentive agreement wouldn't promise an amount, it is all a percentage based off the

assessed value and after we get the money year end, we would distribute it back out to the developer. Also, in the future, as a separate incentive deal directly with a specific company, the RDA board could consider incentivize up front money for tenant improvements or some other incentive such as rent reduction etc. The purpose of the CDA is to create jobs and having a large office building would definitely fit the bill. Currently there is considerable risk in building an office building of this size. The city's draft economic development strategy reports that vacancy rates for office are projected to go up, and lease rates to go down. The report also says that in Davis County between the one-year period of quarter one 2019 to quarter 1 2020 there was only 60,600 square feet of class A and B office absorbed. A 45,000 square feet building would represent close to what the entire county could occupy in a year. Also, there are many new projects in other communities in the works adding competition to the mix. Davis county is forecasted to not see a stability in the office market until 2023 or beyond. A projected payment of \$55,571 per year and average rental rates for class A office in Davis County is about \$26.96 per year. With this assumption, the incentive would be equivalent to pre-leasing about 2,061 square feet of the building at a 20-year lease. This is equal to less than 5percent of the building pre-leased which is in reality not a large amount in the grand scheme of things. If more incentive is desired to be offered, the value from the rest of the apartments could be factored into the incentive. Assuming the apartments, which are taxed at only 55 percent assessed value, are valued at \$15,000,000 bring in approximately another \$56,000 per year to the RDA and 75 percent of that is \$42,000, that brings the percent of the building leased closer to eight percent. Also, more than 75 percent of the 60 percent could be offered or we could factor a lower lease rate that would equate to a higher percentage of the building. Regardless, it is unknown what the magic number needed by the bank to loan on the project is needed but this incentive should 'grease the wheels' and show city support of our goals to create daytime population and employment opportunities for our residents. The memo concluded the goals of the discussion are to decide if it is desirous to offer and incentive for the project and if yes, decide if the 75 percent of the 60 percent post performance rebate over 20 years is the preferred incentive structure. If yes, the item could be acted on during a future RDA board meeting.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and the incentive agreement that has been drafted for this project. The Council expressed support for a use that includes office space, which is currently in demand and Mayor Gailey requested that staff work with the applicant to schedule action on the incentive application at a future RDA business meeting.

Discuss potential text amendment relating to the preliminary and final plat approval process.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained that currently Preliminary and Final plats are seen before the Planning Commission and City Council. Plat approvals are purely administrative; therefore, it is not necessary for City Council to review these items. Council would like to entrust the Commission to ensure that all plats are in compliance with the ordinances and would like to redirect Council's attention more towards legislative matters in the future. Please find attached the existing ordinance with proposed revisions to accomplish this goal. Ordinances chapters to be revised include: 8.25 Preliminary Subdivision Review, 8.30 Final Subdivision Review, 10.20.140 Land Use Decisions and Appeal Process. Planning Commission reviewed the item on December 15th and is forwarding a recommendation for approval. The goal of tonight's discussion is to determine whether to proceed with approval, conditional approval, or denial of the proposed text amendment.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the history of this subject; the Council indicated they are comfortable proceeding with action on the proposed text amendment. Councilmember Maughan expressed his reluctance to amend the ordinance because he is concerned that one less step in the approval process could make it possible for a developer to perform a 'bait and switch' by proceeding with a project that may be contrary to the plans initially approved by the Council at the time they requested a certain zoning designation for a property. City Attorney Roberts noted that the plans that are presented at the time of a zoning decision are conceptual in nature and should not be considered binding for a project. He noted that if the City wants to ensure very specific development criteria for a project, the Council should pursue a development agreement rather than requiring all plats to be submitted to them for their approval.

Discuss potential text amendment relating to multi-family building signage identification standards for emergency response

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the influx of new mixed-use projects has created a concern for the fire and police responders to be able to quickly identify and arrive at addresses in a large multi-family project. It is believed that standardizing the signage requirements for these type of projects

will improve response times. The goal of the discussion tonight is to determine if this item should be sent to the Planning Commission for a recommendation.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and the Council offered their support for moving the item forward.

Report/re-cap regarding Mobile Active Transportation Tour (MATT) – Councilmember Savage and CED Director Steele

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Councilmember Savage and CED Director Steele attended a Mobile Active Transportation Tour in Madison, WI on September 17, 2019. Mobile Active Transportation Tours (MATT) are educational bicycle tours that inform participants about innovative ways in which they can make their own communities better for bicycling and walking. Madison, WI is one of only five 'Platinum Bicycle Friendly Communities' in the country making them a model for health promotion, quality of life, and the center of the U.S. bike industry. The tour was organized by the Wasatch Front Regional Council and attendees included leaders from UDOT, Davis County, Draper City, Ogden City, Provo City, South Weber City, Weber State University, Bike Utah, and BYU.

Mr. Steele and Councilmember Savage used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation (included in the meeting packet) to facilitate discussion among the Council regarding the things they learned at the MATT; they have developed a list of recommendations/action items for the Council to consider:

- Update and Publish Trail Maps
 - Create a more user-friendly trail map and put it online and local shops
 - Add in center striping where possible
- Add Path Signage
 - Add signage at trail entrance points
 - Identify Points of Interest
 - Mark intersections
- Better Marked Trails
 - Clearly place and mark trail entrances
 - Identify trails with some uniform indication
 - The green paint and lane striping at strategic locations was extremely helpful
- Whenever possible, separate trails from roads
 - Make wider sidewalks instead of wider roads
 - Identify bike and pedestrian lanes
- Focus on interconnecting trails
 - Complete trails to Antelope
 - Connect disjointed trails, especially trails to/from other cities
 - Write to and coordinate with UDOT and local legislators for paths along State Roads
- Incentivize a bicycle shop or service in the city, especially with E-Bike Rentals.
- Consider working towards becoming a Bicycle Friendly Community.

Mayor Gailey stated he feels it would be best for the Council to discuss these recommendations further in the upcoming budget retreat given that many of them have financial implications.

Discuss proposed budget amendment for public works shop wall project.

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained that due to residential development adjacent to the Public Works Shop and a concern for security of the city's equipment, an 8' high concrete wall was proposed and approved in this year's budget. The purpose is to reduce visual and noise nuisance from the Public Works Shop to the new residential development along with increasing security. This will ensure the city maintains compliance with 10.30.080 Buffer Yards, which requires an 8-foot-tall pre-cast concrete privacy between residential and industrial uses. This subject was discussed in work session August 27, 2019 and at the Council retreat April 17, 2020. It was also presented in council retreat on January 8, 2021. The existing chain link fence on the east side of the public works property will remain as is without a concrete wall, because at this point there is no development plans along that border. The construction will begin immediately if approved and be complete by summer 2021. Bids were opened on January 5, 2021. There were 5 plan holders and one bid was

received. The bidder was Wasatch West Contracting with a total bid amount of \$198,166.00. This bid only includes the cost of the installation of the concrete fence. The storm drain outfall and the culinary main loop has already been done at the developers cost. The sign, lighting, landscape, RV dump, and water fill station will be done separate from this bid. Additional money may be needed to complete these items.

Fund	Scope	Currently Budgeted
Facility Maintenance	Sign, Lighting, Landscape	\$ 30,000
Sewer	RV Dump, Fence	\$ 75,000
Storm Drain	Outfall, Fence	\$ 30,000
Culinary Water	Water fill station, Loop main, Fence	\$ 35,000
Class C	Fence	\$ 25,000
Secondary Water	Fence	\$ 25,000
Total Budget		\$ 220,000

There are a couple of items that will reduce the overall cost. Woodside Homes had planned to install a 6-foot tall vinyl fence along the border of their subdivision. They are willing to pay the city the amount that would have been spent on the fence. Wasatch West was willing to reduce some of the costs if the city would provide the labor related to traffic control, survey, and site cleanup.

Woodside Homes	payment in lieu of vinyl fence	\$ 9,200
Wasatch West	reduction in lieu of city labor	\$ 9,800
Reimbursement/reduction		\$ 19,000

To complete the remaining items, approximately \$54,000 additional is estimated. This could be covered by cost savings from other projects and can be reconciled in the next budget opening.

Mr. Whiteley reviewed his staff memo. The Council indicated it is always difficult to absorb increased project costs into the adopted budget, but acknowledged the necessity of the project. They discussed options for deferring other project in order to utilize funding for this project and advised staff to proceed with advertising a public hearing for a budget amendment action at a future business meeting.

Discuss opportunity to purchase 150 acre-feet of additional irrigation water from Weber Basin

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained Syracuse City entered into an agreement with Weber Basin on July 6, 2006 whereby Weber Basin would reserve 25 shares of Davis Weber water (150 acre-feet) for use on properties inside Syracuse City limits at a time when the properties become developed. Weber Basin purchased these shares from shareholders in Syracuse City sometime prior to the 2006 agreement. This gave the original shareholders the ability to hold the water in reserve for their property without paying the annual assessments. The properties are indicated in the 2006 agreement. They are all located east of Bluff Road inside Syracuse City limits. Most of the properties have already been developed and are getting watered from the city’s pressurized irrigation system. Weber Basin retains ownership of the 25 shares of water and has no interest in selling them. However, they are willing to set up an agreement to allow Syracuse City to utilize all 25 shares perpetually. Each of the properties are summarized here based upon our knowledge and data:

- Syr 1 is watering completely from our pressure system. Unable to develop anymore of the land (except for accessory buildings/dwellings on the same property) and additional shares would not be required.
- Syr 2 is watering completely from our pressure system
- Syr 3 has a different property owner now (Keenan Fessler). This property is watering completely from our pressure system. Unable to develop anymore of the land (except for accessory buildings/dwellings on the same property) and additional shares would not be required.
- Syr 4 Delore Thurgood passed away. The parcel does not exist. The house that Delore lived in is fully developed and cannot be developed anymore other than accessory buildings. No additional shares required. It is being watered completely by our pressure system.
- Syr 5 was purchased by UDOT for the WDC road project. It will have a frontage road built on the property that will route Bluff Road to 2500 West. So it will be fully developed and the landscape will be watered by our

pressure system.

- Syr 6 is on a parcel that is already fully developed. It is being watered completely by our pressure system.
- Syr 7 did not show a parcel ID on the contract exhibit and I cannot find the property owner's name anywhere in Syracuse City.
- Syr 8 UDOT purchased the land for road widening of Antelope Drive at the same time WDC is in construction. The land currently is (and will continue to be) watered by our pressure system.
- Syr 9 is watering completely from our pressure system. Unable to develop anymore of the land (except for accessory buildings/dwellings on the same property) and additional shares would not be required.
- Syr 10 Both parcels are deleted. Some was sold to UDOT for Antelope road widening. The rest was sold to Elite Craft Homes LLC. There is an application for development that may get approval in Nov/Dec. This land will be watered by our pressure system.
- Syr 11 The parcel has been deleted and replaced with a subdivision (Arlington Estates). The subdivision is being watered by our pressure system.
- Syr 12 The parcel has been deleted. That property owner is on a parcel that is completely developed and is completely watered by our pressure system.

The goals of the discussion tonight are to review the draft agreement and provide staff with direction on the best way to proceed with this issue.

Mr. Whiteley reviewed his staff memo. The Council offered support for Administration proceeding with the proposed purchase.

Discuss proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for West Point City participation in Syracuse Youth Court

A staff memo from the City Manager explained Syracuse City operates a Youth Court whereby youth offenders can opt to subscribe to a peer-based, non-punitive process in order to encourage behavior improvement. Youth ages 14-18 (9th - 12th grade) who are either residents of Syracuse or attend a school located in Syracuse can serve on the Youth Court. West Point City officials, as well as West Point Jr High administration, have expressed interest in participating in Youth Court. Rather than starting a new Youth Court, better efficiencies and effectiveness can be obtained by joining with the Syracuse Youth Court. This MOU will outline the terms whereby Syracuse City and West Point City could participate in the administration of the Youth Court. The following is an outline of the general terms:

- West Point and Davis County Sheriff may refer youth offenders who reside in, or attend a school located in, West Point City to the Syracuse Youth Court.
- West Point can send volunteer students who either live or attend school in West Point City to participate on Youth Court.
- West Point can send adult advisors to assist in the administration of Youth Court. West Point is to send at least one adult advisor when three or more West Point students are participating on Youth Court.
- Syracuse City will provide administrative support and front all costs for operations of the Youth Court, including facilities, equipment, materials, etc.
- Syracuse City will provide up front funding and logistics for annual travel and training. An itemized bill will be sent to West Point City to cover the cost of West Point participants. West Point can require participants to pay their own way for annual travel and training.
- Annually, Syracuse City will bill West Point City for a portion of the costs to operate the Youth Court based on the percentage of hours volunteered by West Point students.

The memo concluded the goals of this discussion are to review the proposed MOU and provide direction to the Administration on participation with West Point City regarding Youth Court.

Mr. Bovero reviewed the staff memo.

Continued discussion of town hall meetings – topics for discussion

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that at the previous Council meeting, the Council expressed interest in setting up Town Hall meetings to encourage more dialogue surrounding issues brought up by citizens. The Council set aside some time at this meeting to discuss possible topics. The Council is considering a format that limits the discussion in the Town Hall meeting to certain topics which would be advertised on the agenda. The following is a list to help the Council

City Council Work Session

January 26, 2021

get started with brainstorming ideas for topics:

- Code enforcement
- Traffic enforcement
- Parking regulations
- General planning of the City
- Plans for parks and trails
- High speed fiber internet
- Economic development
- Snow plowing
- Construction project
- Road improvement projects
- Business licensing
- Building permits
- Recreation programs
- Secondary and culinary water service
- Street lighting
- Syracuse Heritage Days
- Other events
- COVID-19
- Other?

The goals of this discussion are to discuss topics that the Council would like to entertain in Town Hall meetings and consider the number of Town Hall meetings desired, and when to hold them.

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and the Council offered their support for the topics of discussion listed in the staff memo.

Council assignments and appointments

A staff memo from the City Recorder explained the process for considering annual Council appointments or assignments is defined in Syracuse City Code 2.45.030(C), which reads:

“Annual appointments shall be considered during a work session in January, followed by consideration of those presumptive appointees during the first regular Council meeting in February.”

The 2020 Resolution that was adopted to formalize Council appointments and assignments is included in the packet for reference. Please review the resolution and be prepared to discuss current and future assignments. Additionally, the City makes appointments to local districts: North Davis Sewer District, Mosquito Abatement District, and Wasatch Integrated Waste Management District. Section 2.45.060 of the Syracuse City Code defines the process for considering these appointments Councilmember Maughan is currently serving as the City’s appointee to the North Davis Sewer District. Councilmember Bolduc is currently serving as the City’s appointee to the Mosquito Abatement District. The terms for these positions run concurrent with Councilmember Maughan and Bolduc’s term as a member of the Governing Body. Mayor Gailey is currently serving as the City’s appointee to the Wasatch Integrated Waste Management District. The term of this appointment runs concurrent with his Mayoral term and, therefore, consideration of this appointment is not necessary at this time.

The goal of this discussion is to review the 2020 assignments resolution to determine any changes that should be made for 2021.

City Recorder Brown reviewed the staff memo and facilitated Council review of the 2020 assignments resolution; Councilmembers expressed their desire to retain or change current assignments. Ms. Brown indicated she will use the feedback provided to populate the proposed 2021 resolution to be considered at the next business meeting to formalize all assignments and appointments.

Discussion of future agenda items/Council announcements.

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

Mayor Gailey offered City Manager Bovero the opportunity to report to the Council. Mr. Bovero reported on

City Council Work Session

January 26, 2021

adjustments to City operations responsive to the State's adjusted COVID-19 guidelines and regulations.

The meeting adjourned at 10:18 p.m.

Mike Gailey
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: February 9, 2021