

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on August 28, 2018 at 7:45 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Andrea Anderson
Corinne N. Bolduc
Dave Maughan
Doug Peterson
Jordan Savage

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

City Employees Present:

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

The purpose of the Work Session was to receive public comments; hear a request to be on the agenda from Brad Phippen regarding traffic control measures at 1950 S. Allison Way; discuss the Regional Park Concept Plan presented by JUB Engineers; discuss the website redesign project and potential award of contract; discuss potential ordinance amendments relating to Syracuse Cemetery maintenance; discuss the financing and schedule for the City's culinary water tank project; discuss proposed amendments to the wage scale for Fiscal Year 2018-2019; discuss proposed budget amendments for the Fiscal Year budget ending June 30, 2019; continue the biennial review for City Administration; receive public comments; and discuss future agenda items/hear Council announcements.

****THE AUDIO RECORDING FOR THIS MEETING FAILED. THE MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS THAT OCCURRED DURING THE MEETING.****

Public comments

There were no public comments.

Request to be on the agenda: Brad Phippen regarding traffic control measures at 1950 S. Allison Way.

A staff memo from the Public Works Director explained a citizen has raised concerns with a modification that was made to traffic control at the intersection of 1950 South Allison Way. A four-way stop controlled intersection was changed to a two-way stop control in July 2018. The resident is requesting the intersection be changed back to a four-way stop. An evaluation of the traffic control devices along 1950 South (also known as Tivoli Way) was performed. It was determined by traffic volumes and accident data research that the intersection at 1950 South Allison Way no longer warrants the need for a four-way stop. The engineering criteria is established in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, which is the national standard adopted by the Federal Highway Administration as well as the Utah Administrative Code. A technical memorandum report was compiled with data to support the decision. Recommendations included the following:

1. Install a four-way stop at the intersection of 1230 West Tivoli Way (Traffic control for the new subdivision).
2. Change the four-way stop at 1950 South Allison Way to a two way stop, allowing east/west traffic to free flow without stopping.
3. Install signs under the stop signs that will remain at the intersection of 1950 South Allison Way, that read: "Cross traffic does not stop". (MUTCD 2C.59)
4. Install a "Slow Children at Play" sign for westbound traffic approaching the 1525 West intersection.
5. During the first week after the changes, have a police presence to patrol both intersections to help drivers become aware of the changes.

All of the recommendations were carried out. The resident expressed his concern for safety of children that walk in that area. He was informed of the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program and filed a Citizen Action Request without submitting an application fee. The resident submitted a petition from 21 households in the neighborhood requesting the four-way stop be replaced. The resident was invited to city council work session to express concerns.

A few of the evaluation considerations:

Keller Crossing received final approval on September 8, 2015. This approval made the final connection of 1475 West. The road was in construction during July 2016. Once the road was paved, it had concrete jersey barriers placed to prevent traffic from entering the construction area. The barriers remained in place through the winter and removed in the spring of 2017 to allow traffic. This road connection reduced traffic volumes at 1525 West.

The change to a two-way stop balanced the stop control distance along Tivoli Way between stop signs:

- 1200 feet from 1000 West to 1230 West;
- 1050 feet from 1230 West to 1475 West; and
- 1250 feet from 1475 West to 1675 West.

The two existing concrete waterways at 1525 West slow eastbound and westbound traffic down through that intersection. This should minimize the risk of vehicles speeding through the intersection.

The intersection at 1525 West is an intersection of two local roads. The roadway carrying the lowest volume of traffic should be controlled (MUTCD 2B.04). In this case, leaving the two stop signs at the northbound and southbound approaches to the intersection are necessary. A four-way stop at that intersection does not meet the criteria to warrant the need (MUTCD 2B.07). This is due to reduced traffic volumes because of the change in traffic patterns resulting from the connection of 1475 West through Keller Crossing, and connection of 1950 South through Tivoli Gardens.

Mr. Whiteley reviewed the staff memo and provided additional information regarding traffic counts that have been conducted at the intersection since the start of the new school year; the additional traffic counts also indicated that the four-way stop sign is no longer warranted.

Mr. Phippen was given the opportunity to address the Council; he expressed his concerns about the process followed by the City to determine that the four-way stop was no longer warranted and noted that he and other residents in the neighborhood are willing to pay for a replacement sign to be purchased and re-installed at the intersection. He emphasized his concerns about the safety of children living in the neighborhood and walking to and from school and requested that the sign be replaced.

There was high level discussion among the Council and staff regarding the MUTCD standards relied upon to determine that the four-way stop was no longer warranted, the length of the traffic count study, and other conditions on the road that contributed to the decision to remove the four-way stop. The Mayor communicated to Mr. Phippen that the Council will take the recommendations of the neighborhood and staff under advisement as they work towards making a decision on the matter a future date.

Regional Park concept plan presentation by JUB Engineers.

A staff memo from the Parks and Recreation Director explained Greg Graves, Project Manager and Jenna McRory, Landscape Architect, for the regional park design project for JUB Engineers, have been working with the regional park task force on a conceptual design. Greg and Jenna will present to the Council the latest drafted plan, and the cost estimate. The regional park task force is seeking a decision from the council on whether this draft is the preferred alternative, and for any final edits to the draft. Based on the cost estimate, are there any modifications that will need to be made prior to proceeding with the Community Outreach effort.

Project Manager Graves and Landscape Architect McRory, JUB Representatives, used the aid of a PowerPoint presentation to provide an overview of the updates to the latest draft plan for the Regional Park, highlighting the changes that have been made to the Plan since the Council's last review and discussion of the project.

Discuss website redesign project and award of contract.

A staff memo from the City Manager explained the City published a request for proposals (RFP) for website development and maintenance services and received eight proposals. The website advisory task force, consisting of Mayor Gailey, Councilmembers Maughan and Savage, City Manager Bovero, Administrative Services Director Marshall, and resident/Information Technologies (IT) Professional Matt Jones, met and evaluated the proposals and narrowed the field to four vendors. The task force then interviewed the four vendors. After the interviews, two of the vendors were selected as finalists. The two vendors provided a demonstration of their respective web systems and proposals. After deliberation and

evaluation of the various details of the proposal, the task force was somewhat undecided on the award of the contract. The Task Force would like to consult with the Council prior to voting on the award of the contract.

Final Pricing Comparisons			
	<u>Vision</u>		<u>Civic Plus - Engage</u>
Year 1	\$ 29,540.00		\$ 24,999.00
Year 2	\$ 7,900.00		\$ 3,575.00
Year 3	\$ 8,295.00		\$ 3,575.00
Year 4	\$ 8,710.00		\$ 3,754.00
Year 5	\$ 9,145.00		\$ 3,754.00
Total Cost	\$ 63,590.00		\$ 39,657.00

The approved budget for this project (first year cost) is \$35,000. Staff would like for the Council to discuss and compare the two final proposals in preparation for a vote to award the contract for the project.

Mr. Bovero reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the work done by the task force and their inability to reach a decision regarding the contractor that should be awarded the project. There was a focus on the different products provided by both Vision and Civic Plus; Councilmember Maughan expressed his concern that the Civic Plus price may increase in the coming years if it becomes necessary to purchase additional components to provide certain City services via the website. Councilmember Savage indicated that those that may be the case, the increased cost will not equal the total bid price offered by Vision. Councilmember Maughan indicated he can support either vendor, but wanted to be sure the Council understood some of the justification for the difference in the two bid amounts. The Council ultimately concluded to select Civic Plus and indicated they would formally vote to award the contract to that firm during their special business meeting later this evening.

Discuss potential ordinance amendments relating to Cemetery maintenance.

A staff memo from the City Attorney explained the Council heard comments and concerns with existing regulations and practices related to the Cemetery during its work session on July 31. Since that time, the Mayor, Cemetery Sexton, Parks & Rec Director, and Parks Superintendent met and discussed potential changes to accommodate many of the concerns raised, while retaining the City’s ability to maintain the grounds in a timely and effective fashion.

This report summarizes the changes in the ordinance that are being proposed.

The memo requested prioritization of Section 4.30.120(H) – related to family monuments and individual markers. Ms. Holt spoke to the Council on July 31 regarding her mother-in-law, who was interred earlier this year and for whom the Sexton denied the placement of an individual marker on her position, upon which a family monument also sits. If the Council is in agreement that this provision should be changed, then the Sexton will authorize the placement prior to the official adoption of the ordinance, in order to facilitate a timelier resolution of the issue.

4.30.010 - Definitions:

- “Cemetery Office”: Due to the office being moved, and the only reference to the office being removed by a subsequent deletion, we removed definition.
- “Decorations” was defined in the section previously – this moves it here with a few additions
- “Flat Markers” are distinct from “Markers” which may be 12” tall. Flat markers must be placed so that it does not rise above ground level.
- “Length” and “Width” had to be delineated for future use. Width runs East-West, while Length runs North-South.

4.30.040 – Duties of Cemetery Sexton

– Included reminder that as a City facility, any planting may be removed by city officials at any time, including unauthorized plantings of trees, shrubs, or other plants on graves.

Also included parameters as to when decorations and displays will be removed – either as indicated by code (on mowing day and specific dates), or if there are safety concerns – sharp/broken objects, etc.

4.30.050 - Sale of Burial Rights

- Transfer fees called out for refund requests from purchasers
- Provides one example of when the Sexton will re-assign a grave to another unoccupied position
- Provides for reduced rate for current residents (or those who were residents at time of death) – one does not lose residency for moving into a health care facility like a nursing or assisted living facility, under definition of “resident”
- Prohibits half-size or reduced-size positions. These positions leave awkward half-size positions that are usually sandwiched between family members. Most half-positions are unusable, due to the restriction on placing a monument on the Eastern half of the position.

4.30.060 - Transfer of Burial Rights

- Updated to reflect current practice – original certificate is often not in possession of city or transferor

4.30.070 – Interments

- Includes assessment of weekend fees for services that go past 2:00 pm on Friday – By Friday afternoon, staff have worked their full 40 hours and the city must pay overtime if they exceed their 40. Those conducting services are often (understandably) not as concerned about the time that they arrive or end their graveside services.
- Due to intensive maintenance work and preparation for Memorial Day services, it is proposed that interments not be permitted on the Thursday, Friday, or Saturday preceding Memorial Day.
- Allows mortuaries to be billed for grave openings after the fact, so long as they actually pay the invoices
- Monuments sometimes must be moved in order to fit the vault and coffin in the position, particularly when they are being buried two deep or on a double-headstone position. This clarifies that the City will not open the grave until the mortuary or other responsible person moves the monument or marker.
- Maximum number of individuals per position is 2

4.30.090 Abandonment

- Abandoned unnecessary and excessive use of word “said” as said use of said word does not advance said interests of said City in maintaining said Cemetery.

4.30.120 Monuments and Markers.

- Introduction of permit concept for monument placement. Repeated problems have been reported of monument companies placing monuments without advance notice – sometimes resulting in them being improperly placed (such as overlapping onto neighboring positions) or improperly installed – insufficient mow strip or foundation.
- Temporary markers from mortuaries do not require a permit
- Table identifies the maximum dimensions of monuments and markers
- Ban on Triple headstones (monuments spanning three positions)
- Require text to be placed on East and West, so that all monuments and markers are basically in line with each other (facilitating mowing)
- Patches of vegetation, like small patches of grass underneath a hollow monument, are prohibited, due to difficulty in keeping that vegetation alive and properly trimmed
- Monuments/markers that are placed on incorrect positions shall be removed by the company or individual that placed them
- Family monuments, along with flat markers for individual graves near the family marker, are expressly permitted. They must be placed on the west side of the position, like all other monuments (for mowing purposes). One additional flat marker may be placed on a position to identify the location of an individual associated with that family. If a family purchases one or more positions that will be used exclusively for a family marker, then that marker can extend into the position further. If they are planning on burying someone on the position with a family marker, then there are some size restrictions, but they can install both the family monument and flat marker.
- Temporary markers are permissible for up to six months and cannot exceed the size of a monument. Decoration regulations are the same for graves marked with temporary markers.
- Monument companies shall be fined \$200 if they violate the chapter. They will also be required to move improperly placed monuments/markers or reimburse the City for the City’s costs in moving the monument. Companies with multiple violations or unpaid fines may be banned from placing any markers or monuments in the City, subject to an appeal that would be heard by the City Council.

4.30.130 Decoration of Graves

- Permanent vase material and placement
- Year-round decoration restrictions:
 - o No higher than 3 feet tall (facilitating irrigation)

- Not allowed to encroach onto others' positions
- Mowing season restrictions:
 - No glass, porcelain or fragile decorations, due to danger of broken glass or porcelain, or the breaking of such objects with landscaping maintenance equipment.
 - Decorations on monuments or markers are permitted, but may not overhang and interfere with mowing
 - Decorations may be placed on mow strip with understanding that at the beginning of any mow day, the city will remove and discard the decorations. We will not be placing anything in bins
 - No decorations on the grave outside of the mow strip and monument.
 - No additional notice needed, officials will discard anything left in the cemetery (aside from monument/marker decorations) on each mowing day
- Recent interments have an extra week of leaving decorations in place, unless they become withered or begin littering the cemetery (due to wind or other factors)
- All decorations, regardless of where they are placed, will be removed on the dates in subsection (E).

4.30.150 Penalty

All violations are now Infractions, because we don't ever foresee the need to send someone to jail for violating our cemetery regulations.

Mr. Roberts reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion about the changes included in the ordinance document; the changes are intended to reflect input received from the Council regarding this matter, but additional changes will likely be needed now that the Council has had the opportunity to participate in a site visit to the cemetery. The Council indicated they were supportive of the changes to Section 4.30.120(H) related to family monuments and individual markers and they authorized the Section to work with Ms. Holt to address and resolve the concerns she raised to the Council on July 31. They concluded to continue their review of the document at their next work session meeting in preparation for acting on a formal ordinance adjusting the regulations during their October 9 business meeting.

Discuss financing and schedule for culinary water tank project.

A staff memo from the Administrative Services Director provided the following information about the City's water tank project:

- **Water Tank Funding**
 - Estimated Cost: \$5,383,000
 - Not enough money in utility fund or impact fund to pay for water tank.
 - Bonding is our only option if we want to build the tank now.
 - Target is to pay off bond before the next tank is needed.
 - Need for future water tank estimated between 2027 & 2030.
 - Recommend a maximum of 10-year bond with goal to pay off in 7 years.
 - 10 Year Payment - \$648,000 per year
 - 7 Year Payment - \$880,000 per year
 - Would be paid out of culinary impact and culinary operating funds.
- **Water Tank Estimated Timeline:**
 - Met with Clearfield City council for approval of land use - work session on August 14th.
 - Clearfield will vote for approval on next business meeting – September 2018.
 - Fall 2018 - Purchase land and complete due diligence process.
 - April 2019 - Finish design and engineering – 6-9 months.
 - April or May 2019 – Competitive Bid for construction of water tank
 - May 2019 – Competitive Bid for financing – i.e. Water Bond
 - Summer 2019 – commence construction of water tank
 - 18–24-month completion time.
 - Should be completed by end of 2020 or spring of 2021.

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo and facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the estimated timeline of the project and the project costs. There was a focus on various financing options for the project, but the Council concluded to move forward with the project as outlined in the staff memo, which included purchase of the land at Freeport Center and continued design and engineering of the project. Mr. Marshall indicated City Administration is hopeful the design can be

completed by next spring in order to proceed with the bidding process in the summer of 2019. If this schedule is possible, the project could be completed in late 2020 or early 2021.

Discuss proposed amendments to wage scale for Fiscal Year 2018-2019

A staff memo from the Administrative Services Director explained all recommended changes to the wage scale are highlighted in red. City Administration proposes to eliminate the custodian position since a facilities maintenance technician was approved in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 budget and replaces the custodian duties and responsibilities. The Staff Accountant position has also been added based upon prior City Council discussion. The benchmark data is attached separate of this agenda item. No other changes have been proposed with this wage scale update.

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo.

Discuss proposed budget amendments for the Fiscal Year budget ending June 30, 2019.

A staff memo from the Administrative Services Director explained in this budget opening, City Administration is proposing new line items and updates to approved projects as follows:

- o Carryover – 1500 West Land Drain to Jensen Pond - \$115,000
- o Carryover – 2700 South Storm Drain Outfall - \$300,000
- o Carryover – Bluff & Gentile Roundabout project - \$219,000
- o Carryover – 1200 South Expansion – south side of road - \$100,000
- o Carryover – Upsize Water lines – 2000 W – 3000S to 3350S - \$100,000
- o Carryover – Melanie Lane Project - \$475,000
- o Carryover – Design 3-million-gallon water tank - \$175,000
- o Carryover – Ranchettes Project - \$930,000
- o Carryover – 2000 West Waterline project – SR108 - \$301,500
- o Revised project – 2019 Surface Treatments – increase from \$300,000 to \$825,000. This is carryover of unspent funds in FY2018.

Changes to **operational budgets:**

General Fund – major changes

- o \$20,000 - increase in passport revenue.
- o \$8,000 – increase in interest income revenue.
- o \$13,843 – allocation of surplus balance.
- o \$41,843 – increase in part-time wages for new passport and staff accountant positions.

All Other Funds – Significant Changes

- o Increase of \$40,000 for Storm Water Impact Plan Update.
- o Increase Capital Fund by \$288,380 for SCBA’s, Liquor Enforcement Vehicle, Fire Engine, and Parks Mower. Removed AFG Grant expense for Structural PPE because we were not awarded the grant.

Mr. Marshall reviewed his staff memo and facilitated brief discussion among the Council regarding various projects for which budget adjustments are recommended. He noted that an action item will be included on the September 11 business meeting to allow the Council to consider approval of the budget opening.

Continuation of City Administration Biennial Review

A staff memo from the City Manager explained that per City policy, the City will examine the market changes in compensation for each position every four years. It has been decided that the market review will be conducted on one department at a time. This review includes Administration, City Recorder, and Legal departments. As part of the review, the City will examine and compare the wage scales of benchmark cities for each position.

Per City policy, the discussion will be focused on the appropriate action needed to ensure the City’s compensation rate remains competitive with benchmark cities so that quality employees are retained in the Legal Department.

ADMINISTRATION DEPT.

The market review shows the following changes in wage scales (changes are approximates):

- City Manager: +6.7%
- Admin. Services Director: -0.5%

- Utility Billing Supervisor: +8.9%
- HR Specialist: +12.4%
- Utility Billing Clerk +12.4%
- IT Technician +4.0%
- Administrative Assistant +6.5%
- Admin Asst. – Mail Clerk +3.1%
- Intern +0.0%

Based on the market changes, an equivalent adjustment in wages would result in a **\$43,018.61** change to the budget. This change would not take effect until July 1, 2019.

COURTS & RECORDS

The market review shows the following changes in wage scales (changes are approximates):

- City Recorder: +7.3%
- Court Clerk Supervisor: +20.4%
- Admin Professional: +7.3%
- Court Clerk 1: +10.8%
- Passport Agent/Dep Recorder +7.8%

Based on the market changes, an equivalent adjustment in wages would result in a **\$25,996.41** change to the budget. This change would not take effect until July 1, 2019.

For the Passport Agent/Deputy Recorder position, the decision was made to go outside of the City’s benchmark cities group to include a more comparable position from Sandy City. Sandy employs a part time passport technician, while all other cities only have full time positions associated with their passport application processing services.

LEGAL DEPT.

The market review shows the following changes in wage scales (changes are approximate):

- City Attorney +11.0%
- Victim Advocate +8.9%

Based on the market changes, an equivalent adjustment in wages would result in a **\$15,873** change to the budget. This change would not take effect until July 1, 2019.

Mr. Bovero reviewed the documentation provided to the Council regarding the benchmarking data for each of the divisions of City Administration encompassed within this biennial review. He facilitated discussion among the Council regarding the City’s Recruitment and Retention Policy, which provides an outline of the benchmarking process the City’s Human Resources employees are to follow to determine wage adjustments for respective employees. Councilmember Maughan expressed concern about the amount of the increases recommended and indicated that it is difficult for the Council to consider these types of increases for all Departments of the City. Mr. Bovero acknowledged the concerns expressed, but noted that City Administration is simply following the policies enacted by the City Council, which have been followed for other Departments that have already completed their biennial reviews. He also discussed the costs associated with employee turnover and indicated they are much higher than the costs to compensate employees in accordance with the Recruitment and Retention Policy. The Council communicated their understanding that the wage increases would not go into effect until the adoption of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-2020 budget and they will have time to review and discuss the proposed changes further throughout the upcoming budget development process.

Public comments

There were no public comments.

Discussion of future agenda items/Council announcements

Due to the late hour of the meeting, this item was not discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

City Council Work Session
August 28, 2018

Mike Gailey
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, MMC
City Recorder

Date approved: October 9, 2018