

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on June 25, 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  
Dave Maughan  
Doug Peterson  
Jordan Savage

Mayor Mike Gailey  
City Manager Brody Bovero

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  
Deputy City Recorder Marisa Graham

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; hear a request to be on the agenda regarding Dr. Cody Hawkes' proposal to build and operate a storybook theme park in Syracuse; discuss proposed resolution approving the use of eminent domain related to a parcel of land located within the right-of-way at the intersection of Bluff Road and 1000 West; discuss the following Planning items: General Plan/Vision 2050 Recommendation from Planning Commission, review/discuss section 10.45 of Syracuse City Code – Sign and Lighting Regulations, and review/discuss Section 10.35.040 of Syracuse City Code – Home Occupation Parking Standards; discussion regarding practice and equipment storage space for Syracuse City Orchestra; continue review of draft Parks Master Plan; discuss the operating Fiscal Year 2020 budget and the City's certified tax rate; receive public comments; and discuss future agenda items/Council announcements.

Mayor Gailey led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance, after which Councilmember Maughan offered an invocation.

### **Public comments**

Eric Rice stated he is with the Ninigret Group, who has substantial holdings in the community. He referenced item e.1, the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding the General Plan and Vision 2050 document, and noted that the property owned by Ninigret at 1550 W. 300 S. is identified for development for a commercial use on the General Plan Map. He noted he sent an email to staff today, which was forwarded to the City Council, and he read the email to communicate Ninigret's position regarding this recommendation. "It is our understanding that Ninigret's nine-acre parcel west of 1550 west and south along 300 South is being proposed to be designated in the new general plan as "commercial". We request that this designation be reconsidered as we do not believe that commercial is a viable option for that parcel. We believe the most appropriate use for that particular parcel is residential given the current uses already established in the immediate area. We would propose the best use for this parcel is residential transitioning from higher density along the north toward a lower density adjacent to the existing Monterey Estates subdivision. The commercial lots necessary to meet the local demand are already provided by the Ninigret parcels which run directly adjacent to SR-193 as well as the area west of our property. While we understand that the commercial designation in the general plan may allow for higher residential density combined with commercial uses, we can't assess the reasonableness given the mixed-use ordinance has yet to be established. Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to working in cooperation with Syracuse City on this matter."

Ray Zaugg asked that he be given the opportunity to make comments about the General Plan and Vision 2050 recommendation at the time that the Council is discussing the information presented by staff. Mayor Gailey indicated the Council will have the ability to decide whether to allow such input at the point in the meeting when that item is being discussed. He noted there is also a public comment period at the end of the meeting.

### **Request to be on the agenda: Dr. Cody Hawkes' proposal to build and operate a storybook theme park in Syracuse.**

An administrative staff memo explained Dr. Hawkes made a request to be on the agenda through Councilmember Maughan do discuss the idea of building and operating a storybook park in Syracuse City. He provided the following information in support of his request: “The fundamental idea of my non-profit is to promote literacy and the arts in the community by building a park. The name of the non-profit is Storybook Hollow. <https://www.storybookhollow.org/> The idea is to build and operate a storybook theme park here in Syracuse. The park would be filled with book based attractions such as; a hobbit-style house, a Dr. Seuss type Who-Ville village, a Hundred-acre wood from Winnie the Pooh, a Polar Express-type locomotive, and many others. The centerpiece of the park will be a large storybook castle. The back side of the castle would be a stage with an adjacent outdoor amphitheater for plays, concerts, movies in the park and other events. We would invite groups from the community to come and participate. We would offer classes and workshops in the castle to promote the visual and performing arts. The park would hold story time periodically throughout the day at the different attractions reading books associated with different subjects. We would have a dinosaur area and read books about dinosaurs, and a pirate ship where pirate stories could be read. We would use profits from events held at the park to buy and deliver books into the community to under-served individuals and would also run a school assembly program to get kids excited about reading and get books into their hands. There is so much more to it than this, but I hope this kind of gives you an idea of the vision I have for the park and the mission I would like to accomplish.”

Mr. Hawkes used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide more information about his proposal. This included conceptual renderings of the storybook theme park and information about programming that could occur at the park. His ultimate goal for the park is to buy, sell, and distribute children’s books to benefit the youth in local schools. He is requesting participation from the City in the form of eight-acres of property for the actual park and two-acres for parking. He also needs a long-term lease agreement to allow for use of the property for an extended period of time, a public-private agreement for use of the facility, and publicity or marketing of the park to the community. He has formed a non-profit entity to begin fundraising for the park and he will pursue donations from private individuals and community partners. He noted a \$5 million budget would allow him to develop a suitable park, but his goal is to raise \$8 million to build the park in the form that he has imagined.

Councilmember Bingham stated she loves the idea of the park and she asked for information about other similar parks in other communities. Mr. Hawkes stated he got the idea from a community in South Dakota; he was visiting his parents there and found a facility called Storybook Island. His children loved it, but the attractions related to old-time nursery rhymes that his children were not familiar with. He would love to use modern children’s books for the foundation for the Syracuse park. He spoke with the non-profit entity that is responsible for the South Dakota Park, who told him that they raise approximately \$300,000 per year to over maintenance costs for the facility. He stated that he would likely ask that the City participate in general maintenance, such as mowing the grass and removing snow during the winter months, but the non-profit entity he has created would be responsible for maintenance of the equipment and attractions at the park. Discussion centered on opportunities for generating revenue that could be used for maintenance purposes, after which the Council ultimately concluded to explore the proposal further via the creation of a task force with participation from Councilmembers Bingham and Maughan and support from Parks and Recreation Director Robinson.

**Discuss proposed resolution approving the use of eminent domain related to a parcel of land located within the right-of-way at the intersection of Bluff Road and 1000 West.**

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the City has been working on land acquisition for the Bluff Road roundabout/widening near Gentile Road, through a federal grant administered by UDOT. UDOT requires that all parcel ownership be established in the City’s favor before construction may be authorized. Our acquisition agent has (since February) not been able to make contact with the trustee-owner of one 200-square foot parcel of property, with the listed owner of the Bessy T. Jensen Trust. A log of the acquisition agent’s attempts is attached to the packet. The Mayor has also personally attempted contact with Mr. Jensen on several occasions, with no success. Even though the property is located entirely within an established right of way, and by state law has therefore been dedicated to the public use for right-of-way purposes (*See* UCA 72-5-104), UDOT is required to have the ownership listed as the City before authorizing bids for construction. In the absence of a voluntary arrangement, the City will be forced to undertake an action in quiet title or eminent domain. Eminent domain actions are generally faster than quiet title actions in gaining occupancy of the parcel for construction purposes. The Council will be asked to conduct a public hearing on July 9, 2019, to consider a resolution authorizing the City to file the action for eminent domain, as required by state law. *See* UCA § 78B-6-504. The memo

concluded with a recommendation that any Councilmembers in contact with Mr. Jensen or his nieces encourage him to get in touch with the City's acquisition agent so that this can be resolved without court action.

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo.

**Planning items: General Plan/Vision 2050 recommendation from Planning Commission.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the General Plan and General Plan Map are advisory documents that provide general guidance on the preferred growth strategies of the city. If an application is received in the future that petitions to change the current zoning map to something shown on the general plan map, the City is not obligated to approve the change, and can make legislative decisions independently.

The Planning Commission voted four to one on June 18, 2019 to recommend approval of the attached General Plan document. This document encapsulates the majority opinions and findings of a visioning committee that met six times from January 24 to March 14 and of the Planning Commission that worked on the document from April 2 to June 18.

The memo concluded the goals of tonight's discussion are to review the Draft Vision 2050 General Plan document, provide input to staff of any desired changes to the document if any, and decide if document is ready to be forwarded to the business meeting on July 9 for adoption.

Councilmember Maughan stated there is a sense of urgency related to this agenda item and he asked that the time limit set for this item be set aside to allow for a lengthier review and discussion of the matter. Mayor Gailey stated that once the 30-minute time limit has been reached, the Council can weight in regarding whether to continue discussion tonight or in a future meeting.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo and commenced with providing an overview of the General Plan; he reviewed the process that was followed to gather input from residents and stakeholders that was used to inform the document. This group of residents and stakeholders focused on six topics: creating a sense of place, transportation, economic development, housing, agriculture and parks, and the General Plan Map. The General Plan provides a vision for the type of development – both housing and commercial – that can occur in areas of the City and that vision is illustrated on the General Plan Map; the majority of the Map is low density residential use, with high density areas located along higher traffic areas.

Mayor Gailey invited Council discussion of the Plan. Discussion focused on the appropriation location in the document for the recognition of those who participated in the visioning process; the idea of replacing the table highlighting growth in the community with a graph that includes plotted data points to illustrate growth trends; updating maps – specifically maps relating to transportation – in the document to provide accurate information; direction to include the Trails Master Plan map in the document; and relaxing the specificity relative to building architectural styles or replacing the language with general guidelines. The focus then shifted to the General Plan Map and the Council engaged in discussion and debate regarding the appropriate land use in various areas of the City; specifically, the Council discussed the vision for the agricultural property on the north end of the City near Syracuse High School and abutting State Road 193. Councilmember Maughan stated that he is concerned about offending property owners who have indicated they would like the designated use of their property to remain as agricultural into the future rather than planning for future commercial or industrial development. Councilmember Bolduc stated that same consideration should be given to all property owners in the City and she referenced Mr. Rice's previous request that Ninigret be allowed to determine the General Plan Map land use designation for the property they own. Mr. Steele agreed it is appropriate to consider property owners' desires for their property, but the intent of the General Plan and General Plan Map is to plan for the greater good of the community; the Map is a guiding document and current zoning provides control for property owners regarding the current use of their property. Councilmember Maughan stated he understands that, but property owners also have a vision for how their property should be used in the future and the City should be sensitive to that vision and property owners' desires. Philosophical discussion and debate regarding the General Plan Map continued and City Manager Bovero emphasized that the General Plan and General Plan Map are guiding documents; so long as an individual retains ownership of their property, they have complete control over how it is developed. If a property owner does not want their property to be developed for a commercial or industrial use, they likely will not sell to a developer of that type.

Councilmember Maughan stated that he would like to allow Mr. Zaugg, and any other interested resident, to speak regarding the General Plan at this time. Mayor Gailey invited public input.

Ray Zaugg referenced the list of zoning designations, including R-3, cluster, and low-density residential; he is not sure why the list includes low, medium, and high density, but the rest of the document references all residential zones throughout. The previous version of the General Plan provides square footage measurements for lots allowed in particular zones. He referenced the industrial zone and noted there are allowed uses in that zone that are not desirable for the City to

have in a research park or business park; industrial was specified to be located by itself on the edge of the City so that those undesirable uses could be located in that type of area. He stated that industrial zoning should be restricted to that area and not allowed in other locations or on properties that are more suitable for business parks or research parks. He then stated that he would like the Council to survey the entire City for their vision of the City in the year 2050; some residents participated in the steering committee for this document, but some were not very interested. Now, a lot of value is being placed on the input that was provided in the meetings of that group. The General Plan was last rewritten five years ago and the group that worked on that project spent six to nine months; they did not take the responsibility lightly and, instead, they worked with the document that was in effect at the time and made it better with changes. It appears to him that the City is not even referencing the current General Plan and, instead, started from scratch to develop a new document.

Dale Rackham stated he is a member of the Planning Commission and he voted in opposition to this document for a few reasons; he did not think R-3 should be classified as low-density and should instead be considered medium-density and he is concerned about including mixed-use zoning on the General Plan Map even though the guidelines for a mixed-use zone have not been determined. He then responded to Mr. Zaugg's question regarding why R- zones are included throughout the document, though zoning classifications were narrowed to low, medium, and high density. He stated the Planning Commission maintained the R- zones because they were told the intent of amending the document was to make it more flexible and general in nature.

Eric Rice acknowledged that decisions were made regarding the Ninigret property in the past, but Ninigret did not believe that all decisions were final and that is why they are re-approaching the City to determine if adjustments can be made. There was conversation in the past among the Council that gave Ninigret the indication that there may be an opportunity to adjust the future use of the property based upon development that has occurred in the initial phases of the development. He stated Ninigret is not asking to change the use of the entire commercial area along State Road 193; rather, they are specifically asking about the nine-acres of property across the street from the Syracuse Arts Academy North school. This would be a great buffer between lower density residential and retail/commercial uses along State Road 193. If this is not allowed, the City will be left with Monterey Estates directly abutting commercial uses. He stated that he believes the General Plan is a guiding document, but Ninigret truly feels the nine-acre parcel is an appropriate area for a transitional residential use.

Public Works Director Whiteley then discussed some of the commercial zoning designations included on the Map; they appear to be completely isolated with no other commercial use nearby. He pointed out the locations for consideration by the Council.

There being no additional persons appearing to be heard, Mayor Gailey suspended discussion of this issue and indicated that the public input provided will be taken under advisement.

### **Planning items: review/discussion of Section 10.45 of Syracuse City Code – Sign and Lighting regulations.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained this agenda item was requested by the City Council; the memo referenced the existing sign ordinance as well as information summarizing the sign and lighting ordinances in effect in other municipalities. The goals of the discussion are to discuss how the existing sign ordinance has been applied to people desiring to place signs on public property, formulate opinions and decide whether the sign ordinance should be amended, and determine if the sign ordinance should be referred to Planning Commission for consideration of amendment.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council about appropriate signage regulations to be applied to any sign placed in the public right-of-way – specifically, the park strip abutting residential properties. The discussion centered on the City's enforcement actions regarding signs of different types, including political signs, yard sale signs, or temporary signs advertising special events. Councilmember Peterson indicated he is not supportive of amending the sign ordinance to allow signs in park-strips, but if the intent of this discussion was to consider whether to allow AccuColor to increase their signage capacity at City Hall by placing a sign in the park strip, he would be comfortable carving out an exception to the ordinance to allow for that to occur. Councilmember Savage agreed and noted he does not want to be aggressive regarding monitoring special event signs or garage sale signs, so long as they are truly temporary in nature and are not in place for more than 24 or 48 hours. City Attorney Roberts stated that a time restriction can be included in the ordinance, but it cannot be applied to certain sign types; it must apply to any type of temporary sign. Philosophical discussion and debate continued among the Council and they ultimately concluded they are not interested in pursuing comprehensive amendments to the sign ordinance, but they are willing to consider an amendment that would allow businesses to more clearly advertise to potential customers. Councilmember Maughan stated he is concerned about the

restrictions on political signs; it is not troublesome to allow a supporter of a political issue to place a small wire-framed sign in a park strip for a short period of a couple of weeks. In the past, the City has removed signs of this type and the person that placed them was not familiar with the ordinance and did not know why their sign was removed. Councilmember Bolduc stated she is concerned about allowing businesses or political candidates to place signs in the park strip. Additionally, candidates who are distributing their political signs should be responsible for educating people who are placing their signs. Councilmember Maughan stated that seems too harsh and a person who has their sign removed may not know to contact the City to collect it. He added he does not think it is good for business to be too restrictive regarding signage. He added he believes that any person who maintains the park strip adjacent to their property should be allowed to give permission for a sign to be placed there. Councilmember Peterson stated that while he agrees with some of the points made, he does not support an amendment to the sign ordinance to allow signs in the park strip. Councilmembers Bolduc and Bingham agreed. Councilmember Savage stated that he still feels that an adjustment to allow yard sale or special event signs to be in the park strip for 24 to 48 hours would be appropriate. Councilmember Bingham stated that she does feel that all businesses should have greater flexibility to advertise their location. Mayor Gailey asked that staff evaluate the feedback that has been provided by the Council and determine if any such amendment to the ordinance would be legal; their findings can be presented to the Council at a future date. Mr. Steele reiterated the point made earlier by Mr. Roberts that any sign regulation must apply to all types of temporary signs with not differentiation regarding the content of the sign. This led to continued discussion regarding the implications of an amendment that would allow temporary signs in the park strip, with Councilmembers Peterson, Bolduc, and Bingham reiterating their stance that they were opposed to amending the ordinance for temporary signs on public property.

### **Planning items: review/discussion of Section 10.35.040 of Syracuse City Code – Home Occupation Parking Standards.**

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained last fall, the City received a complaint about truck parking at a local home occupation. Staff reviewed the issue and found they were in violation of the ordinance. The City's current ordinance limits home occupations to one large truck. After reviewing the issue, City Council directed Planning Commission to provide a recommendation on the subject. Planning Commission recommended to not amend the ordinance because they felt that home occupations with multiple large trucks would be more appropriately located in a commercial or industrial space. The memo referenced a truck weight guide, after which it concluded the goals of this discussion are to facilitate Council review of the proposed text amendment, provide input to staff regarding any desired changes, and decide if amendment is ready to be placed on July 9 business meeting for vote.

Mr. Steele reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding options available to them regarding regulating parking associated with home occupations. The Council indicated they are supportive of the optional text amendment, but indicated that it would not be harmonious with the issue that has been referred to the Planning Commission regarding the number of employees allowed at a home-based business. They concluded to wait until final action has been taken on that matter before adjusting parking standards for home occupations.

### **Discussion regarding practice and equipment storage space for Syracuse City Orchestra.**

An administrative staff memo explained Councilmember Maughan asked for time on a work session agenda to discuss this issue; his email summarizing his concern is included below:

“All,

I have to report that this week we have encountered a serious challenge to the Arts Council. We were notified the first of the month that the Davis County School district will no longer allow use of Band Rooms to public groups which includes the Syracuse City Orchestra. For several years they have been rehearsing at West Point Jr High, with performances at Syracuse High. West Point Jr. had been lending their percussion equipment as Syracuse High refused to allow the use of their equipment for performance at Syracuse High. Each of the last 3 years a generous donation was made to West Point Jr. for the sharing of percussion equipment. I am told that will be missed but not an option in the future. The Arts Council is preparing fund raisers that could pay for timpani, but we haven't established a place to keep them?

I believe the city orchestra is an asset to the community. They have become better and better over 6 years. They have sponsorships from Walmart that has paid for all their music the last few years. Syracuse High auditorium is still rentable for concerts, but we need to find a place for them to practice. They have

rehearsed at the community center in the past, but we have expanded the use of the community center over the past few years on weeknights.

The room we held the 2050 vision meetings in would be a good space, but I don't know if there are concerns allowing access to part of the police station. It does appear that section can be isolated. They rehearsed a few times at the building at Jensen, but the acoustics in that room are terrible. They are open to all options. The school district said they may be able to rent a cafetorium, but they would not be able to schedule regular rehearsals as priority goes to the individual school which is understandable.

I would like the council to consider options and see if we can't find them a space for rehearsals here in Syracuse. It would be best if there was a small closet in that space to store 3 timpani drums. I don't want to see the momentum of this developing community asset die. We have a Jazz Band and Choir that already meet in the Community center (they are smaller).

Can we discuss and hopefully find a solution for this on a future agenda? This is not immediate, as they take the summer off and will begin again in the fall."

Councilmember Maughan summarized his request and the Council discussed optional locations in the City that would be suitable for the orchestra to store their equipment and practice. The focus on locations narrowed to the training room in the Police Station and this led to discussion regarding accessibility and security for both the orchestra and the rest of the space at the Police Station. Chief Atkin asked for the opportunity to discuss the matter with his staff and with the City's Information Technology (IT) professionals to determine that appropriate security is an option. Mayor Gailey stated that staff can report back to the Council in the future once that information is available.

### **Continued review of drafts Parks Master Plan.**

A staff memo from the City Manager and Parks and Recreation Director indicated that the following updates have been made to the Parks Master Plan document in accordance with the feedback provided by the Council during their last review of this issue:

- The text for trail descriptions was simplified and formatted to flow better with the document structure.
- The stated goal of 4.95 acres of parkland per 1,000 population was clarified to refer to City-owned parks only.
- Maps were completed and provided to the Council for review.
- The text for Private/Restricted Recreation Areas and Facilities was corrected to reflect the current calculation.
- Walking distance analysis was completed.
- An analysis summary was provided for goals five through eight.
- The section on growth and future development was revised.
- A Trail access and crossing map was included.

Ms. Robinson reviewed the staff memo and she and Mr. Bovero facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the updated Plan document. Throughout this discussion, there was a focus on the goal of acres of parkland in relation to the City's population, with the Council concluding to increase the 4.95 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents to 5.5 acres per 1,000 residents; and the content of appendices "a" and "b". The Council offered their support for placing this item on the consent calendar for the July 9, 2019 business meeting.

*\*\*the meeting recessed at 8:15 p.m. and reconvened at 8:20 p.m.\*\**

### **Budget discussion.**

***Additional discussion of operating budget as approved:*** A staff memo from the Administrative Services Director referenced benchmark information requested by the City Council relative to pay scales for Mayors and City Councilmembers in other cities. The Council was invited to submit their budget concerns or feedback to Administration prior to publication of the packet for this meeting. The memo summarized the feedback provided by Councilmember Maughan as follows:

- One thing I would like to see is on the pay assessment for city council and Mayor, can we throw out the lowest and the highest
- Salaries make up a major part of the city budget. Jordan has asked that we discuss the city council members stipend, which is almost the lowest among all listed city councils. A very valid discussion. To move to the 60 percent, we would be nearly doubling the stipend of the council members. If that is our

standard, why will we be hesitant to make that change (yet I for one am). The reason above all is sustainability. We fight an ever-difficult challenge of maintaining the 60% of market standard, and not facing reduced service level to our citizens. My number one discussion I think the council needs to have is how do we sustain our level of service, NOT just to get through the coming year, but as a sustainable 5, 10, 20 year plan. I have consistently watched us pinch ever tighter like squeezing the last drop of water from a caucus (it feels that uncomfortable). I don't promote this discussion because I am concerned with paying any member of the staff at the 60% but because I don't know how we deliver to our citizens with this ever pinching tighter and tighter mentality. I want to avoid what happened 3 years ago in Kaysville (learn from our neighbors) and raised taxes nearly double to meet citizen expectations. I feel like we have paved over this conversation with a band aid year after year without a real plan to raise the level of service rather than just get by. I think our citizens don't want to pay more, but they clearly think the buck stretches much farther.

Discussion: How do we pay for the level of service expected going forward? (I am uncomfortable continuing to kick this can down the road one year at a time. We need a long-term sustainable business plan, that goes beyond asking staff to propose penny pinching measures alone. Over three years, I am getting concerned that we are running out of pennies.)

Possible solutions: New revenue streams and where they may come from. Alternatives to taxes and fees. Tax management and control plan. Diminish expectations. Growth services plan. Other?

- Every year I ask for an IT evergreen plan. With the speed of technological development successful businesses have a five-year capital plan for IT so that they never face a huge unexpected impact. We have done this for many other areas of the city, but this is one that we have yet to provide to the city council. Without planning this is going to hit one year with a huge impact that could be very difficult to manage.
- I would like to propose this question to all departments "Are there optional services that your department could provide for an extra cost?" I am just wondering if there are extra services that could be revenue generating, for the purpose of offsetting department expenses. We have traditionally been a value add mindset adding some things at no additional cost. While I applaud that, my question is are there any services that don't apply to all citizens (if it became a cost only to those using it) that could offset the cost of other services expenses? I propose this is a quick report at this meeting gathered and presented by the city manager, and if anything is appealing we could discuss possible implementation at the July work session. Again, related to providing more, but keeping individual citizen cost down.
- Road renewal discussion. I see a lot of overlay projects designed to extend the life of roads, and I agree that is important. I am concerned that we take an equal or greater portion of funding for road rehabilitation. Older roads can't be repaired forever, and the cost is much greater once they reach that stage. I am particularly concerned that roads bordering new development takes a beating that accelerates the deterioration of the road due to heavy trucks traveling subdivision roads during the time of construction. I have mentioned this, but I don't see the budget preparation to make sure address roads where 3-5 years of expected life may have been lost to major construction in an adjacent neighborhood. We owe it to our citizens not to let it get out of hand. We still have places in the city that are not acceptable and should be given priority.

Mayor Gailey offered Councilmember Maughan 25 minutes to review the four points of discussion that he provided to the Council through the meeting packet. Councilmember Maughan reviewed his summary of his budget concerns above; relating to the portion of the budget consumed by employee salaries, and the idea of developing new programs to generate additional revenue that could be used to fund operations or needs in the City. Councilmember Savage stated that one example of a new program that could generate additional revenue would be to make underutilized space at City facilities available for rent by other groups or residents. Councilmember Maughan added the space could possibly be used to teach classes or providing services that only a smaller portion of the City's population may need. Councilmember Peterson stated he is supportive of discussing this idea, but it is more of a visioning issue than a budgetary issue. Councilmember Maughan agreed, but stated that he does not want to keep 'kicking the can further down the road'. He then focused on the matter of City Council compensation; Councilmember Savage reiterated the sentiment he expressed during the June 11 meeting that he feels that an increased salary may also increase interest among residents in seeking election to a public office. This led to philosophical discussion and debate regarding the proposal to increase wages and the timing of the increase if one is approved; Councilmember Peterson stated he believes the stipend for Councilmembers should correspond with the City's employee recruitment and retention policy that provides that salaries shall be set at the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile when compared to benchmark cities. Mr. Bovero indicated that Administration has discussed the idea of engaging the Council regarding long

term visioning for the City; this could include a five and ten year strategic plan that evaluates the sustainability of many of the City's programs and policies. He wondered if the matter of salaries is something that could be considered as part of that process. Mayor Gailey noted the first in a series of strategic planning meetings would be held in November. Councilmember Maughan indicated he is comfortable delaying a decision on the Council and Mayor salaries until that time.

Councilmember Maughan then discussed his concern regarding the lack of an IT capital plan; he discussed some of the concepts that could be included in this type of plan. Mr. Marshall stated that he is in the process of developing this type of plan; it is in a draft form and can be presented to the Council in the future. He added that the City sets aside \$20,000 per year to create a reserve for large IT capital expenses. Councilmember Maughan noted one thing he would like for the plan to contemplate is providing employees greater flexibility to work remotely or work from home.

Councilmember Maughan discussed his concern relating to road renewal throughout the City; he hears from citizens who are concerned about the condition of the roads that they live on. Public Works Director Whiteley discussed the current ongoing maintenance programs and funding resources for these programs. The City has developed a five-year capital plan that identifies future plans for road projects, many of which are long overdue and are being worked on now. Mr. Bovero indicated that staff can map the projects listed on the one and five-year capital plans and provide that to the Council as an illustration as the work that is underway or slated to commence in the coming years.

Mayor Gailey asked if there are additional concerns regarding any item included in or left out of the operating budget. No additional concerns were voiced.

**Certified Tax Rate:** A staff memo from the Administrative Services Director explained the City Council adopted an operating budget in preparation for a truth in taxation hearing on August 13 at 6:00 p.m. Since the Council is considering raising the tax rate above the certified tax rate, it is considered a tax increase under state law and requires a truth in taxation process. The Council will be required to hold a public hearing on to discuss the rate increase. The current tax rate for 2018 is 0.001512. The county has calculated the new certified tax rate for 2019 to be 0.001412. The property values for a single-family dwelling have increased approximately nine percent from the prior year. If the rate were held, it would generate an additional \$162,000. The council will need to decide how much money, if any, they will want to approve with this truth in taxation process. Below are priorities discussed during this last budget year that were not funded in the current operating budget:

- Park Maintenance Facility ~ 2,000,000
- EOC upgrades – phase 1 ~\$95,000
- West Davis Corridor Betterments ~ \$75,000
- City Council Wage adjustment ~ \$0 - \$24,000?
- Other Ideas from Council?

The City is required to advertise once as part of a County combined newspaper advertisement and once individually. The City will share in the cost of the combined newspaper advertisement with other entities going through the truth in taxation process. The County will oversee the combined advertisement and will send it to the newspaper in mid-July. The City will be required to advertise a second time on our own advertisement and that will be required to be sent out within seven-days of the truth in taxation hearing. A sample of the advertisement was included as an attachment to the memo.

Mr. Bovero reviewed the funding priorities discussed by Administration and the Council that were not funded in the proposed FY2020 budget; he asked that the Council provide feedback regarding their feelings about including any of these items in the budget. Mayor Gailey stated he is hopeful that the Council can reach a consensus during this meeting regarding whether to proceed with consideration of maintaining the current tax rate; that decision must be made in order to determine how to allocate the additional revenue the City would receive as a result of that action. Mr. Marshall reported the additional revenue to be generated by an action to maintain the tax rate is \$162,000. Councilmember Maughan inquired as to the total cost included in the budget for market adjustments for City employees, to which Mr. Marshall answered \$165,000. Councilmember Maughan stated that given the annual cost of increasing employee wages to compensate for increased cost of living, he feels it is appropriate to consider an annual maintenance of the property tax rate or a property tax increase. Councilmember Bolduc stated she understands that stance, but noted that she is opposed to a tax increase because City Administration presented the Council with a balanced budget without the need for increased tax revenue. Councilmember Maughan stated he is not promoting a tax increase to increase revenues with no cause; rather, the City has many needs that are going unfunded. Additionally, the City is considering going into debt to build a culinary water tank and increasing the annual property tax revenue could help to pay that debt off sooner. This led to high level philosophical discussion and debate regarding the appropriateness of proceeding with an action that will increase each resident's annual property tax. Mr. Bovero stated that given Councilmember Maughan's suggestion that maintaining the tax rate may allow for the City to pay off debt earlier than planned, staff evaluated that scenario and concluded that one year of the debt obligation could be eliminated if the

current rate were maintained; this means the City will not realize increased general fund monies until the year 2028; however, the City will be benefitted by one less year of debt service and interest payments.

Mayor Gailey polled the Council to determine their position regarding the concept of maintaining the tax rate. Councilmember Bingham stated she struggles with voting for a tax increase when the City was able to balance its budget for FY2020. Councilmember Savage stated that he feels that an action to maintain the tax rate is appropriate given inflation; the average interest rate has increased by approximately 20 percent as a result of inflation and that will only increase in future years. He stated that he feels there are other needs the City could satisfy if the tax rate were maintained; this includes being able to fund the construction of a parks maintenance facility sooner than planned, which will result in improved protection of City equipment and reduced labor costs. Councilmember Maughan reiterated his position that he feels the City should maintain the tax rate. Councilmember Bolduc reiterated her position that the City should not proceed with a tax increase given the City's ability to proceed with a balanced budget. Councilmember Peterson stated that philosophically, he agrees that the City should not be forced to advertise a tax increase when the action before the Council is simply to maintain the current tax rate. However, he also agrees with Councilmembers Bingham and Bolduc that the action may not be appropriate given that the City was able to present a balanced budget without additional tax revenue. He stated that his decision will be based on how the increased revenue would be used if the decision were made to maintain the rate; he does not agree that the revenue should be allocated to debt service in order to reduce the term of the bond. He would rather use the increased revenues to accelerate the parks maintenance facility project and possibly hire a new employee to respond to the demand associated with The Island splash pad.

Mayor Gailey stated that it his understanding that there are three in support of maintaining the tax rate and two against. He then provided his thoughts about the concept; he noted that he is eager to participate in strategic planning discussions that will also inform the City's annual budget process. He feels that the Council should consider this issue annually and make a determination much earlier in the budget year rather than at this time. He noted that some cities hold a truth in taxation hearing every year to give them the ability to evaluate whether to maintain or increase their current tax rate. He asked for Council support of evaluating this issue each year in November in order to provide Administration with clear direction regarding funding sources for the next fiscal year budget. The Council debated the Mayor's proposal, and all agreed that they do not want to hold the rate with no supporting reasoning; however, they were comfortable evaluating the tax rate early in the budget process rather than waiting until after a proposed budget has been presented to the Council. Mayor Gailey asked Mr. Bovero and Mr. Marshall to present factual numbers for the ideas discussed by the Council tonight regarding how the additional tax revenue could be allocated in the budget; this include reduced debt obligation and accelerating the parks maintenance facility project/reducing labor associated with storage of equipment in the current facility. He also asked if the Council wishes to entertain the idea of increasing the salary for elected officials. Councilmembers Bingham and Bolduc indicated they were not inclined to vote for a pay increase this year. Councilmembers Peterson and Savage indicated they were willing to consider it. Councilmember Maughan stated he is 'on the fence' and would support continued discussion to determine the appropriate timing of a pay increase for Councilmembers and the Mayor.

### **Public comments**

There were no public comments.

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

There was no additional discussion among the Council regarding future agenda items or Council business. Mayor Gailey reported on the recent Davis County Council of Governments (COG) meeting relating to fluoridation of water and laws governing medical cannabis.

The meeting adjourned at 10:33 p.m.

---

Mike Gailey  
Mayor

---

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC  
City Recorder

Date approved: July 23, 2019

Minutes of the Special meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on June 25, 2019 at 9:23 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  
Dave Maughan  
Doug Peterson  
Jordan Savage

Mayor Mike Gailey  
City Manager Brody Bovero

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  
Deputy City Recorder Marisa Graham

1. Meeting Called to Order.

Mayor Gailey called the meeting to order at 9:23 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. 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 MAUGHAN 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 PETERSON SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

The closed session began at 9:24 p.m.  
The meeting reconvened at 9:49 p.m.

At 9:49 P.M. COUNCILMEMBER BINGHAM MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN. COUNCILMEMBER MAUGHAN SECONDED THE MOTION; ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

-----  
Mike Gailey  
Mayor

-----  
Cassie Z. Brown, MMC  
City Recorder

Date approved: July 23, 2019