

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on April 23, 2019 at 6:00 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Lisa W. Bingham
Corinne N. Bolduc (participated via electronic means)
Dave Maughan
Doug Peterson
Jordan Savage

Mayor Mike Gailey
City Manager Brody Bovero (participated via electronic means)
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:

City Attorney Paul Roberts
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
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 receive public comments; review Cemetery maintenance regulations; discuss LESO Memorandum of Agreement with State of Utah; review 2019-2020 Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with Davis County Sheriff's Office for Dispatch Services; discuss proposed Athletic Field Usage Policy; discuss proposed creation of Interactive Water Feature (Splash Pad) ordinance; continue review and discussion of draft Parks Master Plan; discuss bike ramp component of Linear Park project; review the following planning items: (i) proposed amendment to the General Plan Map, R-1 to Planned Residential Development (PRD), located approximately 2900 S Bluff Road; (ii) potential creation of Mixed-Use Development Zone; (iii) discuss Final Plat for Sunset View Estates Phase 4, located at approximately 2474 W. 2175 S.; (iv) discuss Final Plat for Legend Point Subdivision, located at approximately 3695 W. 900 S.; (v) discuss Home Occupation Parking Standards; and (vi) discuss proposed amendment to Residential R-1 Cluster Subdivision Ordinance; participate in initial discussion and review of the draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 City budget; receive public comments; and discuss future agenda items/Council announcements – specifically adjustments to City Council meeting agendas and staff reports.

A local Boy Scout led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance, after which Councilmember Bingham offered an invocation.

Public comments

Steve Meadows addressed a construction project on the road he lives on. He and his neighbors were not informed of the City's plans to proceed with the project; when he contacted the City to express his concerns, he was told that the proper notification was made with resident living on the street. He stated that is not the case and he and others have experienced property damage, specifically to their landscaping, irrigation, and fencing improvements. He stated that if the neighborhood had been informed of the project, they could have prepared by relocating certain improvements to preserve them during the project. Additionally, some residents have accessory vehicles or trailers parked on their property and they are unable to get them off of their property due to limited access associated with the project. He then noted that he is concerned about the impact that the road improvements will have on traffic levels in the neighborhood.

Mayor Gailey noted that the City Council cannot discuss the issues that are raised during public comment, but these concerns will be forwarded to the Public Works Director, who will be asked to make contact with Mr. Meadows.

Barbara Nichols stated that she lives in the Trailside Subdivision and she is concerned about the threat of growth in the community. She promoted slow, sustained growth that will serve to improve the quality of life of the residents of the City. She is not supportive of the proposed high-density project on Bluff Road that will impact the area in which she lives. She noted the Planning Commission denied the project and she wondered why it is still being considered by the City Council. Residents do not want the project, yet the Council continues to entertain it. This type of project will ruin quality of life and serve as the demise of her neighborhood; she asked that the Council work to make Syracuse greater instead of worse.

Terry Palmer also discussed high-density residential development; he is not concerned about increased density so long as the quality of the development is high and conforms with the standards of the community. He stated that some homes

that have been built on very small lots are high quality and sell for upwards of \$300,000; however, apartment buildings or attached dwellings up to six units in a building is concerning to him. He would prefer detached single-family units to this type of development. He referenced the manner in which East Layton has developed and changed over the last 40-years; in the past, East Layton was a desirable community and people were moving from Syracuse to go there. Now, people are moving from East Layton due to the manner in which it has built out. He is deeply concerned by the use of the word 'six-plex' and he would like for the Council do define what that means and what type of design standards would be imposed; without that clarification, he is not supportive of increased density.

Robin Dubois stated she also lives in the Trailside development and she shares many of the concerns that have been expressed; she asked if the City has thought about the additional improvement that will be required to handle the increased density. This relates to school capacity, streets that can handle additional traffic, and adequate underground infrastructure lines.

Jeannette McEntire stated that she also lives in the Trailside development and she added her concern about the reduction of green space in the community in favor of building high density developments.

Jim Markles stated he lives in the Trailside Subdivision and he is concerned that the Council has not considered matters such as use of the trail system in the area of Jensen Park and proposed high density projects; the impact that the addition of 200 families to the area will have on the roads and traffic levels; the demand on public safety and public works services; and the adjustments to the land use of the current R.C. Willey property.

Ralph Vaughan stated the City Council has an advantage that no other City Council in the past has had: it has the Syracuse Connection magazine that is delivered to all residents in the City. He suggested that the Council utilize at least one page of that publication to perform a public survey to solicit feedback on the types of issues that have been raised tonight. It is not possible for all residents to attend Planning Commission and City Council meetings and a public survey will give those residents the opportunity to engage with their local government leaders.

Ms. Nichols re-approached and stated she supports Mr. Vaughan's recommendation.

Review Cemetery maintenance regulations.

An administrative staff memo explained During the public comment portion of the April 9 business meeting, a resident addressed the Council with concerns about the City's removal of decorative items from grave markers at the cemetery. Councilmembers Bingham and Maughan asked that a brief discussion item be added to the work session agenda to allow for review of the current maintenance regulations and standards. The current version of Cemetery maintenance standards can be found [here](#).

Parks and Recreation Director Robinson reviewed her staff memo and facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the City's current policy regarding cemetery maintenance, with a focus on removing items from headstones in order to facilitate cemetery-wide cleaning projects on scheduled dates each year. Councilmember Savage stated that he supports the current policy and feels that it promotes community pride. Councilmember Bingham asked if items must be removed from concrete vases that are attached to a headstone. Ms. Robinson answered yes; all items must be removed for a three-day period twice each year to allow for complete clean-up of the cemetery, which includes cleaning headstones. She stated that this regulation has always been part of the City ordinance, but the City only recently began enforcing it and that is likely why some residents have been upset when items have been removed from the grave markers of loved ones. The Council ultimately concluded to support the current policy, but emphasized that they sympathize with those residents who have been negatively impacted by any action to remove any personal item from the cemetery.

Discussion of LESO Memorandum of Agreement with State of Utah.

An administrative staff memo explained for at least the past decade, Syracuse City has been a party to a State Plan of Operation (SPO) relative to receipt and use of excess department of Defense (DOD) personal property that is transferred to the State of Utah. The City has been asked to execute an updated version of the agreement, which includes a clause specifying that Governing Body approval is preferred by the State. Although there is no fiscal impact associated with the agreement, City Administration is presenting it to the Council for consideration given the referenced clause.

City Attorney Roberts reviewed his staff memo and the Council indicated their support for proceeding with formal action on the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).

Review 2019-2020 Interlocal Cooperation Agreement with Davis County Sheriff's Office for Dispatch Services.

A staff memo from City Manager explained a summary of the annual agreement between Syracuse City and the Davis County Sheriff's Office (DCSO) regarding dispatch services are as follows:

- Services:
 - The County, through DCSO and the dispatch center, shall provide dispatch services and emergency dispatch services to the City for police, fire, and EMS services twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week, and three-hundred-sixty-five days per year.
 - These services shall include dispatching appropriate response units to and from an incident, acting as the central point of ordering and dispatching resources, and providing accurate incident reports.
- Compensation:
 - Syracuse City will compensate Davis County \$29,947.61 for Fire Department fees. (average of \$30.59 per call, based on the five-year average of calls received.)
 - Additionally, Syracuse City will compensate Davis County \$54,165.00 for Police Department fees. (Amount is calculated per police officer which results in \$2,355.00 per officer)
 - Total amount paid will be \$84,112.61.
 - Total amount shall be paid in equal monthly payments during the fiscal year (1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020).
- The term of this agreement is from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020.

City Manager Bovero reviewed the staff memo.

The Council briefly discussed options for effecting change relating to the manner in which dispatch services are administered; this included the concept of consolidating dispatch services throughout the County. Mayor Gailey indicated that he will be discussing those issues with the Davis County Council of Governments (COG) to determine if there is an appetite among other city governing bodies to pursue those types of adjustments. He noted he will report back to the Council.

Discuss proposed Athletic Use Policy.

A staff memo from the Parks and Recreation Department explained provided an introduction to the draft version of the Athletic Field Use Policy, which has been prepared by City Administration.

Parks and Recreation Director Robinson and Assistant Director Smout reviewed the staff memo and facilitated a discussion about the implications of the proposed policy; Ms. Robinson emphasized she does not want to pursue this type of policy if the Council is not willing to uphold it as organizations or individuals will approach them seeking deviation from the policy.

Discussion of the Council centered on the activities and events programmed for the various athletic fields in the City, fees for usage of the fields, penalties for violation of the policy. The Council provided feedback to staff for adjustments to the policy before it is formally considered at a future business meeting.

Discuss proposed creation of Interactive Water Feature (Splash Pad) ordinance.

A staff memo from the Parks and Recreation Department explained City Administration has drafted safety rules and regulations for the City's Interactive Water Feature. Several of the rules are required by the local Health Department.

Parks and Recreation Director Robinson reviewed the staff memo and facilitated review of the draft ordinance. Council discussion centered on the allowance of animals at the park, advertising of the regulations, options for enforcing the ordinance, and monetary penalties for violation of the ordinance. The Council emphasized that they want to escalate penalties for intentional vandalism or damage to the splash pad or any other area of the park. Discussion concluded with a focus on the hours that the splash pad will remain open to the public and the cost an individual will be charged to rent a pavilion at the facility; the Council ultimately reached consensus to advertise hours of operation listed in the draft ordinance and to charge \$25 per hour per pavilion.

Mayor Gailey then invited Councilmembers Maughan and Savage to report their plans for the grand opening/ribbon cutting ceremony for the splash pad. Councilmember Maughan noted that the June 22, 2019 grand opening will kick-off the Syracuse Heritage Days festivities and there will be a soft opening in advance of that date to ensure that the water feature is fully operational. He noted he and Councilmember Savage continue to work to secure sponsors or donors that can contribute to the event.

Continued review and discussion of draft Parks Master Plan.

A staff memo from the Parks and Recreation Department explained the intent of this agenda item is to allow the Council to continue their review and discussion of Councilmember Savage’s proposal for amendments to the draft version of the Parks Master Plan.

Mayor Gailey invited Councilmember Savage to facilitate the review of his proposed edits; throughout this discussion, there was a focus on the level of service to be included in the plan, which is the amount of park space the City shall provide per 1,000 residents; technical adjustments to correct clerical issues in the document; and the process for proceeding with consideration of adoption of the Plan. The Council concluded to include an action item on the May 14 agenda to provide the Council with the ability to consider adoption, but Mayor Gailey

Discuss bike ramp component of Linear Park project.

A staff memo from the Parks and Recreation Department explained that on April 9, 2019, the City Council awarded Landscape Specialties the Linear Park Project. Part of the bid included a bike ramp component as a separate line item. After discussion, Councilmembers Maughan and Savage asked that the bike ramp component be pulled, as part of the awarded contract, and be placed on a work session agenda for further discussion. Councilmembers Maughan and Savage wanted to discuss possible art components as other options.

Parks and Recreation Director Robinson reviewed the staff memo and referenced the bid for the bike ramp component of the project. Councilmember Maughan stated that he would like to include art that will add value to the community, and he suggested a rustic buffalo similar to those that will be located at the Interactive Water Feature. Ms. Robinson noted each of those buffalo are approximately \$6,000. Councilmember Maughan presented a draft sketch that he had prepared to identify where he envisions art components being placed. City Manager Bovero noted that the total bid for the project was approximately \$18,000 under budget so it is an option for the Council to approve one bike ramp and a sign/art component. The Council discussed this option and ultimately concluded their support for proceeding with the bike ramp that has three bumps and a large and small buffalo at one end of the park that could be considered the entrance/exit area.

Planning item: Proposed amendment to the General Plan Map, Residential (R-1) to Planned Residential Development (PRD), located approximately 2900 S. Bluff Road.

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

Location:	approx. 2900 S. Bluff Road
Current Zoning:	A-1
General Plan:	R-1
Proposed General Plan:	PRD
Total Subdivision Area:	20.24 Acres

Mike Bastian has requested to amend the General Plan and Zoning Map from R-1 to PRD. The General Plan map amendment will be considered first. The application was received within the open application period consistent with Ordinance 10.20.060. The open amendment period is Jan. 1 to Jan 31 on odd numbered years. The ordinance describes the standards for approval:

“(H) Approval Standards. A decision to amend the general plan is a matter within the legislative discretion of the City Council. After the public hearing described in subsection (G) (4) of this section, the City Council may make any modifications to the proposed general plan amendment that it considers appropriate. The City Council may then adopt or reject the proposed amendment either as proposed by the Planning Commission or after making said modifications. The City Council may also table the matter for further information, consideration or action.”

The property’s general plan map designation is R-1. The applicant has expressed a desire to build townhomes on the property which is not allowed within the R-1 Zone, but is an allowed use in the PRD zone. The property is located adjacent to vacant land that recently was rezoned to PRD, the future West Davis Corridor freeway, the 55+ Trailside community, and Bluff Road arterial that has single family and duplex homes fronting onto it.

Planning Commission held a public hearing on February 19, 2019. Around 40 residents attended the meeting and shared comments and concerns about the change to PRD. Many comments were centered around not wanting traffic from the development cutting through their neighborhood. They also were opposed to 'high density'. Other suggestions included providing landscape buffering between the two neighborhoods. The commission voted six to zero to recommend denial of the amendment to the General Plan Map.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and Mr. Bastian was given the opportunity to review the adjustments he has made to his plan since the Council's last review; he held an open house with residents of the Trailside community and used the feedback he received during that meeting to inform these adjustments. He highlighted adjustments to the layout of the development and connectivity to the existing road that runs through Trailside as well as the option to connect to Bluff Road to alleviate or reduce traffic levels in Trailside. He also presented his draft concept plan and indicated highlighted the areas that the two-story units will be restricted to and the areas where the patio homes will be located. Discussion then shifted to the building design options that Mr. Bastian would like to include in the proposed project.

Mayor Gailey then asked the Council if they are comfortable proceeding with action on the requested General Plan Map amendment. Councilmember Maughan indicated his discomfort with considering approval of an application for which the Planning Commission recommended denial. He added that many residents have spoken against this project and he is not willing to go against their desires, along with the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Bolduc stated she understands the hesitation, but indicated her belief that there is a potential for much higher density on the subject property upon the completion of the West Davis Corridor extension. She feels what is proposed at this time is a great option for a development that will be located adjacent to a major thoroughfare in the City.

Mr. Bastian stated that he has been working on this proposal for over one-year; he initially recommended a project with much higher density at 188 townhome units. However, he has dramatically reduced the density based on the opposition from residents in the area and from the City, and based upon his knowledge of the character of the Trailside community and the proposed development of other adjacent properties.

City Attorney Roberts advised the Council that they must vote on the matter as it is a formal application; that vote cannot be taken in this meeting and the Council cannot direct Administration to not place the item on a future agenda. The issue for the Council to decide at this time is whether an action item should be placed on the next business meeting agenda or whether to continue review and discussion of the application in a future work session meeting.

Councilmember Bingham acknowledged the adjustments that Mr. Bastian has made to his plan in response to the community opposition; she feels it is disingenuous to expect a property owner to preserve the current open space nature of his property rather than allow him to proceed with a development that will be harmonious with existing development. She does not support a high-density project, but she does support a project that will be very similar to the Trailside development.

Councilmember Savage also acknowledged that Mr. Bastian has dramatically adjusted his plan, but noted that until he hears support from the Trailside community or from a Planning Commissioner, he cannot vote to support it. He has not yet heard a vote of support from anyone other than the developer and a few Councilmembers. He stated he has been elected to represent the people and he wants to support them.

Councilmember Peterson wondered if the item should be referred back to the Planning Commission given that the plan has been altered since their vote to recommend denial. The Council discussed this issue and Councilmember Bolduc noted that there were some absences on the Planning Commission during the meeting in which their vote to recommend denial was taken. She offered to reach out to the entire Planning Commission to seek their input on the adjusted plan. Mayor Gailey stated that he will instead order the item to be added to the May 14 business meeting agenda for a vote.

Planning item: Potential creation of Mixed-Use Development Zone.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City Council has requested the opportunity to explore the basic concepts of a mixed-use zone. After discussion during a previous work session meeting, staff was directed to continue research and provide more information about what surrounding cities have adopted for mixed use development. The Council also requested the perspective of a developer that has experience building mixed use developments. The requested information has been provided to the Council in the packet for this meeting.

Additionally, on March 26, 2019, the Council discussed the topic and expressed interest in a form-based code type of ordinance and they specifically referenced the Provo City mixed use ordinance. Staff has gathered the requested information concerning form-based code and included in the packet as well.

Staff requests direction from the Council in the direction to proceed;

1. Is it desired to send this to Planning Commission for further refinement?

2. Is it desired for staff to create a first draft for this body's review?
3. Is it desired for staff to compile additional research prior to drafting ordinance language?
4. Is it desired to discontinue discussion on this item?

The following are the basic bullet points of the zone that have been discussed:

- Allows residential and commercial uses together either 'vertically' (in the same building) or horizontally (within close proximity)
- Be limited to locations in the city that are adjacent to existing commercial development or along state highways.
- Feature high quality design and benefits of sales and property tax above 'just another apartment complex'
- Allow proper residential density to incentivize development of office and commercial development. It is anticipated that this number is in the neighborhood of 25-30 units per acre
- Feature proper height restrictions to ensure that 'too tall' buildings are not built adjacent to small buildings.
- Feature high quality common space landscaping for its residents
- Afford a unique streetscape experience with front doors that address the street architecturally, on street parking, plazas, seating, and opportunities for social interaction.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the manner in which to proceed. The Council discussed topics such as the appropriate areas of the City for mixed-use or form-based code types of developments and whether there is a desire among the development community for this type of land use in Syracuse City. The Council ultimately concluded to direct staff to prepare a draft version of a form-based code or mixed-use ordinance for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider.

Planning item: Discuss Final Plat for Sunset View Estates Phase 4, located at approximately 2474 W. 2175 S.

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

Location:	2474 W. 2175 S.
Current Zoning:	R-2
General Plan:	R-2
Number of lots:	3

The applicant has requested approval of a three-lot final subdivision called West Sunset View Estates Phase 4. This splits one lot into three and is the final phase of the West Sunset View subdivision. This subdivision has been approved in 2008 in a very similar format the what is shown here. All lots meet the minimum lot standards for the R-2 Zone and all staff comments have been addressed. The memo concluded the Planning Commission is forwarding a recommendation for approval.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo. Councilmember Maughan referenced a small parcel of property that is adjacent to the subject property and inquired as to its ownership. Mr. Steele stated the City owns the property, after which Mr. Bovero added that the property is used as a storm water detention basin for the existing subdivision in the close proximity of subject property.

The Council authorized the movement of this item to the consent agenda of the next business meeting agenda.

Planning item: Discuss Final Plat for Legend Point Subdivision, located at approximately 3695 W. 900 S.

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

Location:	3695 W. 900 S.
Current Zoning:	R-2
General Plan:	R-2
Total Subdivision Area:	12.95 Acres
Number of lots:	29

The applicant has requested approval of a 29-lot final plat called Legend Pointe. This name was changed from Hunter's Glen which preliminary plat was previously approved. This will be the western-most phase of this subdivision. The

Planning Commission is recommending granting conditional approval of this item. The condition of approval is to extend the temporary fire access to Dunes Drive rather than install a temporary fire turnaround. The applicant agreed to pave said access drive after two years if the subsequent phase of development has not occurred. The plans should be modified to reflect these changes prior to construction.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo. Public Works Director Whiteley discussed the presence of two existing water wells on the property; according to the Utah Division of Water Rights, the applicant needs to research the wells to determine if they are active and if they need to be abandoned in order for the development project to proceed. Proper documentation of this action must be provided to the City, which is also a condition of approval recommended by the Planning Commission.

The applicant, Steve Bingham, approached and discussed the timelines of meeting the conditions of approval. He indicated he does not believe that it will be problematic to complete what is being requested of him and he asked that the Council grant conditional approval at their next meeting. The Council discussed the implications of conditional approval and the controls the City has over what is being asked of them once the Council has voted to approve an application. They ultimately concluded to include an action item on the next business meeting agenda to give the Council the opportunity to consider conditional approval.

Planning item: Discuss Home Occupation Parking Standards.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained a resident with a business on 2700 South requested that the City Council address these regulations. In response, the Planning Commission reviewed the issue and provided a recommendation to maintain the requirements for home occupation vehicles with a finding that if the business is successful, they should re-locate to a commercial space, rather than put undue burden on a residential neighborhood. Upon reviewing this item in the previous City Council meeting, it was requested that a more lenient option be presented. This option is one that the Planning Commission had entertained but failed to gain consensus. The amendment allows the parking of multiple vehicles which may have been previously prohibited due to size, signage, or the number of vehicles on properties that front busy sections of road if certain requirements are met, such as being located on an arterial road, having one half acre of land or more, and installing screening fencing and landscaping.

CED Director Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the Planning Commission's unanimous recommendation to deny amendments to the home occupation parking standards. He asked if the Council would like to consider variations from that recommendation or uphold it. The Council participated in philosophical discussion and debate regarding the implications of allowing parking of additional vehicles associated with a home occupation and the potential impact that allowance could have on a residential neighborhood. Mr. Steele indicated he will use the feedback provided by the Council to prepare a draft ordinance that allows for parking of additional vehicles or trailers associated with home businesses with stipulations on the total vehicle weight and regulations prohibiting on-street parking. The Council acknowledged that this would be a deviation from the Planning Commission's recommendation, but that they feel it is very important to be business friendly, especially given the fact that the majority of the City's businesses are home-based.

Planning item: Discuss proposed amendment to Residential R-1 Cluster Subdivision Ordinance.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City Council has expressed a desire to amend the City's land use code to change the R-1 Cluster land use from a major conditional use permit to a freestanding zone. The Planning Commission voted to forward a recommendation for approval of the amended ordinance.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the implications of the amendment. Councilmember Bolduc noted that the most important thing for the Council to consider is that if the ordinance is approved, the cluster land use can be applied for at any location in the City and not just R-1 residential land use. The Council indicated they understand that fact and were comfortable proceeding with consideration of the proposed ordinance during the next business meeting.

Initial discussion and review of the draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 City budget.

A staff memo from the Administrative Services Director explained that City Administration provided the Council with the draft City budget documents approximately 10 days in advance of this meeting. The goals of this agenda item include discussing any questions the Council has regarding the draft budget and discussing options for funding the construction of a Parks Maintenance Facility. The cost estimate for the facility could be in the range of \$1.5 to \$2 million; a loan for this amount would likely carry a three percent interest rate with a 10-year payback term. In order to repay the debt, the City Council may consider increasing the City’s monthly Park Maintenance fee by \$1.73 to \$2.30 per household per month. An additional option would be to use general fund surplus, revenue from the sale of a City-owned cell tower, and surplus money to make a down payment of \$875,000 on the facility. This would reduce the burden on utility customers to anywhere between \$0.72 and \$1.30 per month.

The memo then discussed the utility rate changes incorporated in the draft budget proposal as follows:

Rate Change	Utility Fund	Description
\$2.00	Garbage Fund	Increase of \$2.00 per black can per month to help fund bond for new facility.
\$0.35	Culinary Fund	Weber Basin Water proposed increase.
\$0.70	Culinary Fund	Hire a new full-time employee to help with maintenance of culinary system.
\$0.20	Secondary Fund	Increase on price of water shares from irrigation companies.
\$0.70	Secondary Fund	Hire a new full-time employee to help with maintenance of secondary system.
\$0.72	Parks Maint. Fund	Potential increase to fund a new park maintenance facility.
\$4.67	Total estimated increase in utility funds for FY2020	

Finally, the memo concluded by referencing Administration’s need for Council direction regarding the prioritization of the City’s use of Recreation, Arts, Parks (RAP) tax revenues. Administration has developed a tentative five-year plan for City parks and would like the Council to rank the projects in the plan and consider whether additional capital projects or goals should be added to the plan. The tentative five-year plan is as follows:

Project	Parks Maintenance Fee 1740	General/Capital 804070	Impact Fee 124070	RAP Tax 114845	Project Total	Priority (Fiscal Year)
FY2020						
Parks Maintenance Facility	X				\$1,500,000.00	FY2020
Founders Park West Parking Lot	X	\$80,000.00		\$70,000.00	\$150,000.00	FY2020
Linda Vista Central Controller (Irrigation)	\$22,000.00	X			\$20,000.00	FY2020
Cemetery Parking Lot Surface Treatment (Overlay)		X			\$103,000.00	FY2020
Trailside Park Parking Lot Surface Treatment (Seal)	\$3,000.00	X			\$3,000.00	FY2020
Legacy Park Parking Lot Surface Treatment (Seal)	\$2,200.00	X			\$2,200.00	FY2020
Founders Park East Pavillion		X		\$80,000.00	\$80,000.00	FY2020
Jensen Park Pump #1 Rebuild (Irrigation)	\$15,000.00	X			\$15,000.00	FY2020
Centennial Park Parking Lot Overlay	\$15,000.00	X		X	\$15,000.00	FY2020
Bluffridge Park Pavillion		X	\$80,000.00	X	\$80,000.00	FY2020
FY2021						
Legacy Park Playground Replacement	X	X		\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	FY2021
Stoker Park Tennis Court Renovation		\$70,000.00		\$50,000.00	\$120,000.00	FY2021
Legacy Park Central Controller (Irrigation)	\$20,000.00	X			\$20,000.00	FY2021
Jensen Park Pump #2 Rebuild (Irrigation)	\$15,000.00	X			\$15,000.00	FY2021
Founders Park East Parking Lot Surface Treatment (Seal)	\$26,000.00	X			\$26,000.00	FY2021
FY2022						
Founders Park Playground Replacement	X	X		\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00	FY2022
Fremont Park Playground Replacement	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00		\$50,000.00	\$100,000.00	FY2022
Fremont Park Parking Lot Surface Treatment (Seal)	\$4,600.00	X			\$4,600.00	FY2022
Linda Vista Parking Lot Surface Treatment (Seal)	\$3,400.00	X			\$3,400.00	FY2022
Fremont Park Central Controller (Irrigation)	\$20,000.00	X			\$20,000.00	FY2022
Signage @ Parks		?			?	FY2022
FY2023						
Canterbury Park Playground Replacement	\$25,000.00	X		\$75,000.00	\$100,000.00	FY2023
Canterbury Park Central Controller (Irrigation)	\$20,000.00	X			\$20,000.00	FY2023
Bluffridge Park Parking Lot Surface Treatment (Seal)	\$3,800.00	X			\$3,800.00	FY2023
Replace Backstops @ Founders Park (Field 1@2)	X	\$50,000.00		X	\$50,000.00	FY2023
FY2024						
Replace Restroom(s) @ Founders Park	X	\$20,000.00		\$180,000.00	\$200,000.00	FY2024
Stoker Park Parking Lot Renovation	\$35,000.00	X		\$45,000.00	\$80,000.00	FY2024
Stoker Park Central Controller (Irrigation)	\$15,000.00	X			\$15,000.00	FY2024

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo, after which Mr. Bovero facilitated discussion among the Council regarding increased costs associated with purchasing software for the City's Museum and funding a curator position at that facility and concluded to utilize RAP tax revenues to fund these needs.

Mr. Marshall facilitated discussion about the funding options included in the staff memo for the construction of a Parks Maintenance Facility. The Council expressed hesitation about selling any cell-tower owned by the City as the towers provide annual revenue by way of lease payments. They also expressed concern about increasing the Parks Maintenance monthly fee given that they are considering increases to other utility fees for users, which could total approximately \$6.00 per month if all fee increases are approved, including the potential Parks Maintenance fee increase. Philosophical discussion regarding the potential sale of a cell-tower continued along with consideration of adjusting the scope of the Parks Maintenance Facility construction project in order to reduce costs; the Council directed Administration to develop a formal funding proposal that includes some components of each funding option that have been discussed tonight.

Mr. Marshall then facilitated review of the draft five-year plan for City parks. There was a brief focus on the pavilion project planned for Bluff Ridge Park and Councilmember Maughan indicated that he was contacted by the Community Council for Bluff Ridge Elementary as that group is opposed to the project. The Council indicated they are comfortable delaying that project, though Parks and Recreation Director Robinson noted that the pavilion project is in line with the level of service that has been defined for City parks. Councilmember Bingham indicated she is willing to reach out to the Community Council as she is the City Council's assigned liaison to that body. Mayor Gailey indicated that a final decision on that line item should be delayed until after Councilmember Bingham is able to get clarification on the issue. Mr. Bovero continued the review of the draft five-year plan and the Council suggested removing a few projects from the list in order to preserve the money that would otherwise be allocated to them and redirect it to the Parks Maintenance Facility project; these project eliminations resulted in an increase of \$100,000 of funding available for the Facility.

Mayor Gailey determined to delay the discussion regarding utility rates until the May 14 meeting.

Public comments

Ralph Vaughan stated that no other municipality in Davis County has an ordinance that has a correlation between a lot size and the number of vehicles associated with a home-based business that can be parked on the lot. Additionally, no other city permits employees for a home-based business that do not live in the home; an employee cannot come to a home-based business and pick up a vehicle to drive to an offsite location. All other cities do have an ordinance that limits the owner of a food truck or trailer to one vehicle and trailer per home. He referenced one particular business in Syracuse City that does have a license for their food truck, but does not have a license for their second business of a commercial kitchen, which is on site and offers services to other food trucks that come to the home to replenish the food sold from their trucks. The business does have a license from the Davis County Health Department, but no City business license that would have required a fire inspection of the property. Mr. Vaughan then referenced the Council's discussion about the potential to sell a cell-phone tower to generate revenue for the Parks Maintenance Facility project; he noted that if the decision is made to sell a tower, the City may soon have an option to replace that tower by locating a new one on the City's culinary water tank that will be built in the coming year.

Discussion of future agenda items/Council announcements

Review adjustments to City Council meeting agendas and staff reports: Mayor Gailey summarized his decision to adjust the City Council meeting agendas; this adjustment includes including a statement with each agenda item that will indicate which Councilmember will lead discussion of that item. The intent of this adjustment is to provide for more effective use of time spent in City Council meetings. The change will go into effect at the next business meeting scheduled for May 14. He added he would also like for the Council to allow staff members to complete their presentation of their respective items that are being discussed during a meeting before interrupting or beginning discussion of the item.

There was then a brief discussion among the Council regarding future agenda items or Council business.

The meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

City Council Work Session
April 23, 2019

Mayor

City Recorder

Date approved: June 11, 2019

Minutes of the Special meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on April 23, 2019 at 9:33 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Lisa W. Bingham
Corinne N. Bolduc (via electronic means)
Dave Maughan
Doug Peterson
Jordan Savage

Mayor Mike Gailey
City Manager Brody Bovero (via electronic means)
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:
City Attorney Paul Roberts
Public Works Director Robert Whiteley
Parks and Recreation Director Kresta Robinson
Community and Economic Development Director Noah Steele

1. Meeting Called to Order.

Mayor Gailey called the meeting to order at 9:33 p.m. as a special meeting, with notice of time, place, and agenda provided 24 hours in advance to the newspaper and each Councilmember.

2. Approval of minutes.

The following minutes were reviewed by the City Council: Business Meeting of March 12, 2019, Special Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Meeting of March 12, 2019, and Work Session of March 12, 2019.

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

3. 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).

COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO CONVENE IN A 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 PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OR REAL PROPERTY AND PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION. COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

The closed session began at 9:34 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:11 p.m.

At 10:11 P.M. COUNCILMEMBER SAVAGE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER PETERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Mike Gailey
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: June 11, 2019