

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on February 26, 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
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 proposed 2019 Interlocal Agreement for animal control services; discuss possible incentive package for Antelope Business Park; discuss proposal to amend policy relating to financial hardship waivers for ambulance billing; follow-up discussion regarding Storm Drain Impact Fee Facility Plan and Impact Fee Analysis; discuss City branding efforts; discuss the following Planning items: 1.) Final Plat, Criddle Farms North Phase 2, located at approximately 4050 W. 920 S., 2.) Proposed zone change for property located at approximately 1088 W. 350 S., Industrial to Business Park, 3.) proposed amendment to the General Plan Map, Residential (R-1) to Planned Residential Development (PRD), located approximately 2921 S. Bluff Road, 4.) Proposed amendment to the General Plan Map, General Commercial (GC) to Planned Residential Development (PRD), located approximately Banbury Drive and 1700 South, 5.) proposed amendment to Section 10.75 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to Planned Residential Development (PRD) zoning, 6.) discussion of potential creation of a Mixed-Use Development Zone, 7.) review of Section 10.60 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to R-1 Residential Zone, specific to cluster zoning; receive annual training: Open and Public Meetings Act, Municipal Officers Ethics Act, roles of elected officials; discuss proposal to execute agreement with Davis County Clerk/Auditor's Office for administration of 2019 Syracuse City Municipal Election; conduct the Biennial Review of Community and Economic Development (CED) Department; hear public comments; and discuss future agenda items/Council announcements.

Councilmember Bingham led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance, after which Councilmember Maughan offered a thought and an invocation.

Public comments

Terry Palmer stated he was involved in a recent conversation with a property owner in the City about potentially purchasing his property; he discovered that the individual had been offered a much larger amount of money than he felt the property was worth and when he inquired as to the basis for the offer, the individual told him that the other prospective buyer had indicated that if he could assemble a five acre parcel of property he would be able to build townhomes on the property. Mr. Palmer noted the property he is referring to is located in an R-1 residential zone so he is unsure there is any validity to what the property owner was saying, but he is concerned about potential adjustments to the Planned Residential Development (PRD) zone – specific to minimum acreage required for a PRD project – and the manner in which those adjustments could result in increased density in the City's single-family residential neighborhoods. He stated that actions were taken in the past to eliminate the option for high density developments in areas of the City and he is concerned about those actions being reversed.

Chris Frazier stated he has also heard of the potential changes to the PRD zoning designation and the potential for that zone to be applied to property located near his home. He spent a number of years on the City's Planning Commission several years ago and he has a clear understanding of the purpose of the General Plan and zoning map; it seems that the City continues to lose properties that were designated for retail or commercial uses along main thoroughfares in the City and that loss could result in a significant property tax increase for residents. He indicated Syracuse does not appear to be business

friendly and that is why retail businesses are not moving here. The Council is now considering taking another property on Antelope Drive that has been designated for general commercial use and allowing the construction of a PRD development; this will result in an increase in traffic on Banbury Drive and the intersection of Banbury Drive and Antelope Drive will become more dangerous. He stated his greatest concern is the consideration of eliminating general commercial property to allow for townhome construction.

Christy Frazier stated that she attended the most recent Planning Commission meeting to participate in discussions regarding the PRD zoning designation and assigning that zone to property on Antelope Drive, which abuts her property; she was very insulted by a comment made by the Chairman about the fact that the decision would be “as easy as a coin toss under the table”. She stated she did not find that comment funny as this is a very serious issue to the residents of the Banbury Drive neighborhoods and to the other property owner, Erik Craythorn. She added that she has conducted her own informal traffic study on 1500 South and Banbury Drive during the heavy commute period in the morning; from 8:25 a.m. to 8:55 p.m., there were a total of 91 cars. She indicated 63 of them were residential and 28 associated with the nearby school. Traffic in the afternoon was also very heavy and these traffic levels are even greater when there is a special event occurring at the school or in the nearby park. She asked that the City require a traffic study on Banbury Drive to determine the potential traffic impact associated with this type of project. She communicated some conditions that are unique to Banbury Drive and invited Councilmembers to drive it during heavy traffic times to become familiar with it.

Review proposed 2019 Interlocal Agreement for animal control services.

A staff memo from the Police Chief Atkin explained this is an amendment to the Interlocal Agreement signed in 2016, which authorizes the County to provide animal control services within Syracuse City, including enforcement of the City’s animal control ordinances. Animal Control costs are billed based on a calendar year schedule; costs are broken down and paid monthly. This amendment replaces Exhibit A from the original agreement. Animal Control is funded from the following sources:

- Davis County general fund
- Cities within the interlocal agreement
- Fines, fees, and other collections by Davis County Animal Control
- Donations

Contract Cities are responsible for 50% of the projected expenses, after subtracting the revenue received by the County from licenses, fees, etc. Syracuse City’s obligation is based on the City’s proportion of animal control calls for services, compared with all calls for service county-wide. Wild and nuisance animals are billed separately at \$25.75 per call. A 5-year capital projects fund has been established at \$562,000 and will be funded 50% by the cities. The City’s obligation is, again, calculated based on the proportional calls for service versus the entire County. An advisory committee has been established to advise the County on budgetary issues. The committee is made up of two members from the County and two city managers. The term of the original agreement is through December 31, 2020; either party may terminate the agreement and each party holds the other party harmless and indemnifies the other party. The 2019 Calendar year contract amount for the City is:

- Usage Rate-Based Cost: \$74,786.30
- Wild Life Calls: \$2,600.75
- Capital Project Fund: \$4,402.98
- **Total: \$81,790.03**

This represents a 21.4% increase over last year.

Chief Atkin reviewed his memo and introduced Davis County Animal Control Manager Rhett Nicks. Mr. Nicks discussed the proposed increase with the Council and answered their questions regarding the reasons for the increase. The total increase is approximately 17 percent higher than the previous contract amount and there are three main reasons for this increase: the number of calls, capital projects/equipment purchases divided among all users, and wildlife resources. He reported that the Animal Control division of the County is understaffed, and his facilities are inadequate; he is considering staffing increases and capital improvements to address these issues and those expenses will impact the costs charged to all users.

High level discussion centered on the types of calls for service to which an Animal Control officer responds and any opportunity for Davis County to charge complainants or animal owners who are responsible for a nuisance call. Councilmember Bingham stated she would like for the City to communicate to the residents the manner in which certain calls to animal control impact the City’s budget for the service; repetitive calls or those that are defined as ‘abusive’ in nature can

be problematic. The Council also discussed the opportunity to consider a special service district for animal control services, but concluded that it is necessary to approve the proposed contract at this time to ensure there is no disruption in animal control services. Mayor Gailey stated that he is happy to talk with the Davis County Council of Governments (COG) about other options for addressing animal control. Mr. Nicks stated that the next COG meeting will be held at the animal shelter facility to give COG members and opportunity to tour that facility and gain an understanding of its deteriorating condition.

City Manager Bovero added that there are already discussions underway at the County Commission level regarding the County assuming total responsibility for animal control, which would likely result in a tax increase for residents as the costs for the service would no longer be shared among the cities in Davis County.

****Mayor Gailey adjusted the agenda to move item 'd', discussion of incentive package for Antelope Business Park, below all planning items on the agenda.****

Discuss proposal to amend policy relating to financial hardship waivers for ambulance billing.

A staff memo the Fire Chief Byington explained the City's current policy regarding ambulance billing allows an individual to request a reduction in their ambulance bill amount after meeting criteria based upon a calculation of the requestors verified income, household size, and the Federal Poverty Guideline. Fire Department Administration recommends amendments to the current policy that would authorize denial of requests for ambulance bill reduction for individuals with verified income of greater than 300 percent of the Federal Poverty Guideline.

Chief Byington reviewed the staff memo and facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the process an individual must follow in order to request a hardship waiver; the Council ultimately concluded to support the recommendation, but indicated they would prefer to lower the threshold to 250 percent of the Federal Poverty Guideline in order to ease the financial burden of the City in events where hardship waivers are requested.

Follow-up discussion regarding Storm Drain Impact Fee Facility Plan and Impact Fee Analysis.

A staff memo from Public Works Director explained that during the February 12, 2019 City Council business meeting, the Council and staff discussed proposed adjustments to the City's storm water impact fee rates. The Council had a question about whether we should charge a different storm water impact fee based upon the type of zoning or charge one combined fee. Based on the memo from Zion's Bank and further review of the IFFP, all zones are required to detain storm water at the same flow rate. Zones with greater impervious surface may need to construct larger facilities to handle larger storm flows, but since this is built on site, it is not an impact upon the City's receiving storm collection system. Regardless of zone type, all storm discharges from properties are restricted to the same storm flow rate.

Mr. Whiteley reviewed his staff memo and discussion of the matter centered on the opportunity of reducing storm water rates for agricultural properties in order to incentivize farming and other rural activities in the City.

Councilmember Savage stated he is concerned that the proposed fees are second highest behind Orem City when compared to benchmark cities. He stated he would like for fees to cover costs, but he is concerned about the impact that high rates could have on development. Mr. Whiteley stated that most development left to occur in the City will be of properties along the 'fringe' areas of the City and larger pipes are needed in those development areas to facilitate the flow of storm water. Councilmember Maughan stated one reason he is comfortable with the proposed rate is that it is charged only to new development, which means that existing residents do not bear the burden of providing necessary infrastructure to new developments. General discussion among the Council centered on the purpose and basis of impact fees, after which Mr. Whiteley emphasized that agricultural properties will not be burdened with storm water impact fees until such time that the zoning of the property is changed to facilitate development or if a new structure is being built upon the property.

Planning item: Final Plat, Criddle Farms North Phase 2, located at approximately 4050 W. 920 S.

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

Location:	4050 West 920 South
Current Zoning:	R-3
General Plan:	R-3

Total Subdivision Area: 9.582 Acres
Number of Lots: 29

The applicant has requested approval of a twenty-nine-lot subdivision as an addition to the existing Criddle Farms development. This phase will complete the Criddle Historical Park property creation and be the first part of Criddle Farms to utilize utilities outlined in an interlocal agreement between Syracuse and West Point. Because of this agreement, West Point has also reviewed the plans and staff provided comments to the applicant. There are some unresolved comments that have been received by West Point, therefore, staff recommends the application be approved, with the condition that all outstanding staff comments be addressed prior to construction.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and the Council offered their support for the application; Mayor Gailey directed staff to place approval of the application on the consent agenda for the next City Council business meeting.

Planning item: Proposed amendment to the General Plan Map, Residential (R-1) to Planned Residential Development (PRD), located approximately 2921 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 2/19/19. 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. The Council participated in philosophical discussion regarding the proposed use of the subject property and whether higher density land use is appropriate for the area; there was a focus on the Planning Commission's recommendation to deny the change and the feedback the Planning Commission and City Council has received from residents living in the area of the subject property.

Mayor Gailey invited input from the applicant, Mike Bastian. Mr. Bastian stated that he is seeking direction from the Council regarding what is acceptable to the City relative to the planning for the subject property. He indicated he feels his proposed project is harmonious with existing development in the area and he would be willing to enter into a development agreement with the City to limit the number of units in a PRD project that could be constructed there. Mr. Steele noted that the Council has the ability to view the concept plan for the project before taking final action on the PRD land use designation. The Council discussed the most appropriate manner in which to consider proposed amendments to the City's PRD zoning designation as well as any applications for PRD zoning and ultimately concluded to delay action on Mr. Bastian's application until a final decision is made regarding the PRD zone and when the City has a final recommendation from the Vision 2050

group and the Planning Commission regarding the future vision for development of the City. Mr. Bastian stated that he has done a great amount of high-quality work in Syracuse City and surrounding communities and he asked that the Council rely upon that past experience and understand that he will do the same for this project. Councilmember Maughan stated that the Council cannot do that because doing so would be setting a precedent for other developers to make the same argument. Mr. Bastian stated that he is simply frustrated because the PRD zone is the only zone that seems to make sense for the property given the existing development surrounding the property as well as the properties proximity to the route for the future West Davis Corridor extension.

Continued discussion centered on the potential to consider a development agreement for any project to be constructed on the property, with a focus on the terms to be included in such an agreement that would limit density and design standards. Mr. Steele stated that if the Council chooses to place an action item on a business meeting agenda regarding this application and action is taken to deny, the applicant cannot reapply for at least six months. Councilmember Maughan stated the applicant would be able to apply for a different zone. Mr. Bastian stated that no other zone makes sense for the subject property; PRD zoning provides for development that would match existing development on all sides of the subject property. Councilmember Savage stated that he heard the Vision 2050 recommendation before taking any action to approve or deny the application.

Planning item: Proposed amendment to the General Plan Map, General Commercial (GC) to Planned Residential Development (PRD), located at approximately Banbury Drive and 1700 South.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained Erik Craythorn with Q-2 LLC has requested to amend the General Plan and Zoning Map from General Commercial (GC) to Planned Residential Development (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 General Commercial. The applicant has expressed a desire to build townhomes on the property which is not allowed within the General Commercial Zone, but is an allowed use in the PRD zone. The property is located adjacent to approximately seven acres of additional land also owned by the applicant and general planned PRD. The applicant desires to combine all of the properties into one project. During a previous general plan amendment request for the property, approximately 200' of commercial zoning was left along the frontage of Antelope Drive, however, the applicant is claiming that he has been unsuccessful in attracting a commercial buyer for the frontage property. On February 5th, a public hearing was held during the Planning Commission meeting. Many comments were received on the request by the neighbors. Concerns over traffic on Banbury and access to Antelope were expressed. Other comments included a desire for sufficient landscape buffering and compatible building heights between the new development and existing homes. The Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the applicant's proposal for development of the subject property; there was a focus on access to the property from both Banbury Drive and Antelope Drive and density of the project as well as the best use of property fronting Antelope Drive, which is bordered by commercial uses on both sides. Councilmember Peterson stated that he feels the western corner of the property may be better suited for commercial office development than townhome development. Several Councilmembers agreed and City Attorney Roberts noted staff can approach the applicant to communicate those concerns to determine if he is willing to adjust his application according to that direction. Councilmember Maughan stated he would vote to deny the application until that kind of change is made by the applicant.

Planning item: Proposed zone change for property located at approximately 1088 W. 350 S., Industrial to Business Park.

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

Location:	1088 W. 350 S. (West of the 7-11 on Highway 193)
Current Zoning:	Industrial
Proposed Zoning:	Business Park
General Plan:	Business Park
Total Area:	20 Acres

The City is acting as the applicant requesting amendment to the current zoning map from Industrial to Business Park. This will bring the zoning into conformance with the general plan map designation. The Business Park zone is more of a 'light industrial' use and features a slightly different list of permitted uses than the industrial zone. The existing two buildings are in conformance with the Business Park zone. The ordinance language for both zones is included as reference. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the matter on 2/19/19. The property owner expressed opposition to the change as there are plans to develop the property as storage units which are a permitted use in the Industrial Zone but not the Business Park Zone. The Commission voted to recommend not changing the zoning map to Business Park Zone. The vote was unanimous six to zero.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the appropriate use of the subject property and the impact the determined use could have on the timeframe of development of the area. City Manager Bovero added that City Administration has had a few meetings with the property owner, and they have a pending sales agreement for nine acres of the property that is contingent upon the buyer being able to build storage units there.

Phil Cook, Real Estate Appraiser for the project, and Michael Wright, Giza Development, approached the Council to discuss the details of the project that is being proposed. The Business Park zoning is desired because it provides a wider range of development opportunities for which there is currently a greater market demand.

The Council engaged in philosophical discussion regarding the proposed land use, with a focus on architectural and design standards that could be imposed on the property owner to ensure a quality development at the site. Mr. Wright presented a concept plan for the project to illustrate the quality of the buildings to be constructed; Councilmember Maughan stated he would not be opposed to such a development.

Councilmember Savage stated that he would prefer to maintain the Industrial zoning designation for the property, but consider an amendment to the industrial zone text to allow for the type of development the applicant is seeking. He added that he would also like to consider a maximum acreage size for a storage unit development.

The Council communicated their desire to be business friendly; thus, they are willing to consider the proposed project and an adjustment to the development to provide for quality development. This led to general discussion about the economic benefit the City could realize from various types of development projects that could occur on the property, with the Council ultimately concluding to direct staff to work with the land owner to negotiate a development agreement that would provide for the current zoning to be maintained and for the desired land use to be facilitated under that zoning.

Discuss possible incentive package for Antelope Business Park.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained The Antelope Business Park is located on the north half of the Syracuse SR-193 project area. The business park has built 2 out of 4 planned buildings. They are experiencing difficulty in leasing their existing tenant spaces in the two completed buildings. A discussion is desired to discuss if the RDA board is interested in offering incentives for the project and or future tenants of the project. No specific incentive package is up for consideration at this time, but if there is support from the board, it is anticipated that there will be requests submitted in the near future.

The Syracuse SR-193 EDA is 73.5-acre property tax collection area created to 'facilitate economic development and create jobs in a premium quality business park that has excellent roadway access and rail access.' The time frame for tax increment collection is 15 years. It was activated in 2014 and will expire in 2028. The 2017 taxable value of the area was 34 million. The project has not generated the anticipated incremental tax revenues as to date. The Agency is authorized to receive 80% of the generated property taxes with the taxing entities receiving 20% until the project expires. At that point, the taxing entities will resume receiving the full 100% property tax. The city also has three other project areas, Town Center RDA, Syracuse 750 West RDA, and Antelope Drive CDA.

With the goal of assisting in filling the two existing building's vacancies, please find below a proposed incentive structure. Once spaces are leased up, the interior of the building is improved with tenant improvements, thus increasing the value of the buildings. Also, a full building attracts additional investment and signals to lenders that the borrower will be able to pay on loan payments. This would essentially be a 'subsidized' lease agreement. Based off construction costs and land value, the current advertised lease rate for the two buildings is .65 per square foot (PSF) in the warehouse and 1.10 PSF in the office. There is roughly 50,000 remaining square feet that needs to be leased up. A competitive lease rate is about 50 cents per square foot on warehouse. Multiplying $50,000 \times .15 = 7,500$ per month $\times 12$ months is roughly 90,000 per year. Most leases are five to 10 years and \$90,000 per year for five years is \$450,000. If this is approved by the RDA Board, it is information that could be advertised on the project flyer up front, attracting additional traffic. It is proposed that there be a gradient of incentive based on jobs, so if a company has less than 10 employees, they wouldn't qualify for the full .15 incentive, but rather a .10 PSF incentive. There could also be a consideration for increased customer traffic.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and he and City Manager Bovero facilitated a discussion among the Council regarding the appropriate incentive structure that could be offered to the property owner. The Council supported the proposed structure and advised staff to work with the project owner to determine his level of comfortability in preparation for an action item at the March 12 business meeting.

Planning item: Proposed amendment to Section 10.75 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to Planned Residential Development (PRD) zoning.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the City has received an application from developer Mike Bastian to amend the text of Syracuse City Code Section 10.75 - Planned Residential Development. The Planning Commission (PC) has completed a very detailed review of the ordinance. This issue was discussed over several meetings dating back to July of 2018.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding staff's desired direction; staff would like for the Council to determine whether to approve the amendments as currently written, continue working to amend the language, table the application, or vote to deny the application. Throughout the discussion, there was a focus on owner-occupancy versus rental properties allowed in a PRD; maximum density and the option of a stepped up density for different acreage sizes or the location of the property (i.e., if a property is located on a minor arterial road, density could be eight units per acre and if a property is located on a major arterial road, density could be 10 units per acre); the requirement to meet multiple conditions in order to achieve higher density than six units per acre. The Council concluded to support stepped up density of six, nine, or 12 units per acre based upon property location and the ability of the applicant to meet conditions of each of the density categories. The Council then discussed the density of existing projects in the City to gain a clear understanding of how projects that would fit in the three stepped density categories would look.

Discussion then moved to the total number of attached units allowed in individual units in a PRD project as well as minimum acreage required for a PRD project. The Council concluded to allow a maximum of six attached units in a PRD project. Following philosophical debate regarding the minimum acreage requirement, four Councilmembers concluded to support 4.5 acres.

Planning item: Discussion of potential creation of a Mixed-Use Development Zone.

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

Planning item: Review of Section 10.60 of the Syracuse City Code pertaining to R-1 Residential Zone, specific to cluster zoning.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained the purpose of this agenda item is to discuss whether the council desires to change R-1 Cluster from a major conditional use permit to a freestanding zone.

Mr. Steele reviewed the staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding their desires for adjustments to the City's zoning ordinance to create an independent zone to allow for clustering independent of R-1 zoning. The Council reached consensus to refer the item to the Planning Commission to develop a proposal regarding the creation of an independent zone providing for cluster zoning independent of R-1.

Annual training: Open and Public Meetings Act, Municipal Officers Ethics Act, roles of elected officials.

City Attorney Roberts used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide the Council with annually required training regarding the State of Utah Open and Public Meetings Act (OPMA) and Municipal Officers Ethics Act.

The meeting recessed briefly at 9:06 p.m. and reconvened at 9:10 p.m.

Discuss proposal to execute agreement with Davis County Clerk/Auditor's Office for administration of 2019 Syracuse City Municipal Election.

A memo from the City Recorder explained work is underway between the City Recorder's Office and the Davis County Clerk/Auditor's Office to prepare for the 2019 Municipal Election. For the Council's consideration is an agreement between Syracuse City and Davis County that specifies the services that will be provided by the County and the duties that will be handled by the City Recorder. Davis County has asked that the contract be acted upon by the end of March in order for them to proceed with planning for the number of cities that they will be assisting. Administration is seeking authorization to place an action item on the March 12 agenda for approval of the agreement. The City and County will jointly administer a By-Mail Election. The County will provide a by mail ballot to all active registered voters and will also tabulate all ballots that are returned. Voters will have the option of dropping their ballot at City Hall or other drop boxes located throughout the County rather than paying return postage. Additionally, one polling location will be provided for in-person voting on Election Day.

City Recorder Brown reviewed her staff memo. The Council indicated support for the agreement and Mayor Gailey directed staff to include an action item on the next business meeting agenda to authorize execution of the agreement.

Biennial Review of Community and Economic Development (CED) Department.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that pursuant to the adopted Recruitment and Retention Policy the City Council is conducting the biennial review of the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department. The policy states: "The primary purpose of the in-depth review is to discuss the operations, issues, overall direction of the department, and the goals of the City Council. The biennial in-depth review will also be a time to discuss any wage abnormalities or other special adjustments that the administration feels is needed." The memo concluded this department will also undergo the quadrennial market review as outlined in the policy. That review will take place in March.

Mr. Bovero introduced the agenda item, after which CED Director Steele reviewed a PowerPoint presentation to facilitate the biennial review of the operations of his Department. Following his presentation, discussion points among Mr. Steele and the Council centered on staffing levels and possible reallocation of resources within the Department; vital economic development opportunities; optional incentives for business recruitment; professional certifications available to Mr. Steele and his staff members;

Discuss City branding efforts.

A staff memo from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department explained The Council has requested a discussion regarding branding efforts that would be appropriate for the City to pursue.

Mr. Steele presented a news article regarding the topic of 'Place Branding', which informed discussion among the Council regarding traditional branding practices and the success rates of branding work completed in-house when compared to similar work performed by an independent consultant. There was a focus on a slogan and logo for the City and the importance of signage advertising a visitor's presence in Syracuse City, which led to philosophical discussion about pursuing thematic businesses that align with the City's brand and slogan. Mayor Gailey suggested it may be possible to build upon the work being done by the Vision 2050 group to develop a brand for the City that mirrors the feedback the City will have received regarding the residents' desires for business and housing uses in the community.

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.

The meeting adjourned at 10:01 p.m.

Mike Gailey
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: April 9, 2019