



48 City Engineer for review and approval; as far as he knows, the City Engineer was satisfied with  
49 the work that had been completed and he felt he had met his obligation defined in the agreement.  
50 He stated that Mr. Chandler is no longer employed with the City and Mayor Taylor has gotten  
51 involved and has questioned whether this is something the City should be participating in. He  
52 stated he researched the issue to determine why the City wanted the water line installed initially  
53 and he found in the January 11, 2014 minutes that there is an obligation to provide water  
54 pressure to the area; there has been an instance in the past where the City did not loop the water  
55 system and there was not adequate flow for fire pressure. He stated it is his understanding the  
56 water pressure in The Cove is adequate and the City wanted to connect that system to the system  
57 below to provide the proper water looping; there was also a plan to install a pressure regulator  
58 valve (PRV) to allow the City to regulate more pressure for people below where his property will  
59 eventually be subdivided. He noted the project would have been advantageous to the City and  
60 residents in the area. He concluded that he is trying to find out the City's intention relative to the  
61 agreement so he knows how to proceed. He stated it would be too bad if the City decided against  
62 fulfilling its obligation in the agreement because the water line is needed to address marginal  
63 water pressures in the area.  
64

### 65 **3. DISCUSSION ON 3775 N WATERLINE PROJECT**

66  
67 Mayor Taylor noted that he provided the Council with a summary of the issue and it is very  
68 similar to the information provided by Mr. Nanny during his public comments. He stated Mr.  
69 Nanny and the other landowners have done nothing wrong and the water line was not their idea  
70 to begin with. He noted the agreement was made due to a set of circumstances that he does not  
71 fully agree with. He noted the Fire Marshal determined there was inadequate pressure for a  
72 subdivision at the top of 500 East unless each home was built with their own fire sprinkler  
73 system and the developer of that project moved forward undertaking that requirement. However,  
74 the sprinkler requirement was quite cumbersome and the developer was not able to sell the lots  
75 for the price he needed and, therefore, no homes have been constructed in that development. He  
76 stated he feels those types of things are the responsibility of the developer and it is not up to the  
77 City to install sewer and water infrastructure for a new subdivision; the improvements are  
78 ultimately decided to the City. He stated this is the same information that should be given to any  
79 developer when seeking to subdivide their property. He stated, however, that was not the case in  
80 Mr. Nanny's situation and the former City Manager entered into discussions regarding the  
81 possibility of looping the water line from The Cove to bring water through the south end of Mr.  
82 Nanny's and other properties. The water loop would also provide water on 500 East and solve  
83 the fire flow problem for the developer in that area as well. He noted when the City Manager  
84 talked to the property owners they talked about the manner in which the water line should be  
85 installed and the property owners have spent approximately \$7,500 on the engineering work for  
86 the project with the intent for the City to continue to pay the same amount that the original loop  
87 project would have cost, which was \$106,000, with the developer paying any amount over  
88 \$106,000 to complete the more complex water line construction to install the full water  
89 infrastructure system. He stated that when this issue was brought to his attention it was only  
90 mentioned as the loop project; neither he nor the Council have been approached about the more  
91 complex project that later took shape, which was installing the water line with the assistance of  
92 two development groups. He stated he met with Mr. Nanny and other property owners after the  
93 City Manager's departure and let them know that he had major concerns about the project based

94 on the fact that this is something that the City has never been involved in in the past. He noted  
95 the City Engineer agreed and had the same concerns about using private taxpayer dollars to  
96 participate in a private development. He stated the impetus being the project is not a taxpayer  
97 responsibility to begin with and that was the fire flow issues; if a subdivision lacks adequate  
98 pressure for fire flow, it is the developer's responsibility to install adequate pipes or wait until  
99 neighboring subdivisions are developed with adequate infrastructure to connect to. He noted  
100 there are many properties in the City that are undevelopable due to the cost to connect to utility  
101 infrastructure and the City has never participated in a project to facilitate private residential  
102 development by installing such infrastructure. He reiterated the participation that the City had  
103 been committed to by the former City Manager was not legitimate and he feels it would set a bad  
104 precedent for the City to become involved in such a project especially when other developers  
105 have been required to install their own infrastructure. He emphasized that this project was not  
106 the idea of Mr. Nanny or the property owners and he is not trying to cast any dispersion upon  
107 them; nonetheless, \$106,000 of tax dollars should not be spent on the project and could be used  
108 for much better uses in the City, such as the drilling of a new well. He concluded the Fire  
109 Marshal has since removed the fire flow finding from the 500 East subdivision and the need for  
110 the water loop project no longer exists. He stated the group of developers for the 3775 North  
111 subdivision have paid for engineering work for their development and they were encouraged to  
112 do so by a member of City staff; they have incurred expenses and spent a lot of time and the  
113 decision now is how the City will proceed. He clarified that the City Council originally  
114 approved a budget of \$106,000 for the water loop project, but never had any discussions about  
115 participating in the more complex project for the development and he summarized the options  
116 before the Council at this time: first is to continue with the project and make an agreement with  
117 the developers; second is to not continue with the project and compensate the developers for  
118 their engineering costs as a good faith effort; third is to do nothing; or fourth is to assist in  
119 financing the installation of the lines to ultimately be paid back by way of a payback agreement.  
120 He noted the City Attorney has recommended against entering into the payback agreement, but  
121 he is comfortable with the City reimbursing the property owners for the engineering costs they  
122 have spent on the project. He noted he does not feel the City should participate in the project,  
123 which only serves to solve a private development problem.

124  
125 Council Member Satterthwaite stated that it sounds to him like the City made a mistake. Council  
126 Member Bailey noted that in the past the City has performed other water line looping projects  
127 where there was inadequate water flow. Mayor Taylor stated that is correct, but he is not aware  
128 of another project that is similar to the project at hand. There was a brief general discussion  
129 regarding the purpose of past looping projects, with Council Member Satterthwaite noting he is  
130 hesitant to set a precedent relative to this type of situation. Council Member Stoker agreed and  
131 noted she does not feel the residents would appreciate the City spending taxpayer dollars to fund  
132 a private development. She agreed the City has made a mistake and she does not feel the  
133 Council should agree to take on the project in any shape or form. Council Member Bailey  
134 agreed and noted the discussion should only center on whether the Council is comfortable paying  
135 the engineering costs that were incurred because of misdirection by City staff. Council Member  
136 Swanson stated he feels the City should pay for the engineering costs. Mayor Taylor agreed  
137 because he does not feel the property owners would have come together and paid for the  
138 engineering work without some incentive from the City. Mr. Nanny stated that is correct. He  
139 added the subdivision will not be able to proceed until other properties are subdivided and utility

140 connections are more readily available. A discussion regarding various developments in the area  
141 of the subject property ensued with input from Mr. Nanny and Brant Law. Mayor Taylor  
142 concluded this is a very difficult situation.

143  
144 Council Member Urry stated he understands the ethical reason for the City to pay for the  
145 engineering fees, but on the other hand he looks at the money as an investment for the property  
146 owners. He stated he has made investments in the past where he lost more than \$7,500 based on  
147 advice from someone else and no one ever made him whole. Mr. Nanny stated that he thought  
148 he had an agreement with the City; if that agreement had not been in place he would not have  
149 spent \$7,500 for engineering services. He stated in talking to the City Manager he thought he  
150 was talking with someone who had control and decision making authority. Mayor Taylor added  
151 that the City Engineer also sent an email to Mr. Nanny's engineer, after being directed by the  
152 City Manager, indicating that the City was committed to the project. He noted the City Attorney  
153 that is not legally binding because the Council is the only body that can making binding  
154 decisions for the City, but there were written commitments from City staff that led Mr. Nanny  
155 and the other property owners to undertake the engineering costs. There was a general  
156 discussion regarding procedural issues in the City that prohibit City staff from making binding  
157 decisions, with Mayor Taylor noting it is necessary for the Council to adopt policies or make  
158 procedural changes to ensure similar situations do not occur in the future. Council Member Urry  
159 stated that the Council should have received all information regarding the project before a  
160 decision was made; there was a breakdown in communication between the City Manager and the  
161 City Council and the City Manager may have misrepresented the scope and intent of the project.

162  
163 The Council debated the options available to them for addressing the issue, with a focus on  
164 whether the results of the engineering work will be valuable to Mr. Nanny and the other property  
165 owners in the future, with Council Member Bailey proposing that the City reimburse the  
166 property owners 50 percent of the engineering costs that have been spent as a result of advice or  
167 a commitment from a City employee. Council Member Swanson stated he is comfortable with  
168 that proposal. Council Members Stoker and Urry objected to the recommendation and Mayor  
169 Taylor concluded it would be most appropriate to gather more information about the issue and  
170 add an action item to the next business meeting agenda for the Council to take a formal action.  
171 He thanked the Council and property owners for their input this evening.

172  
173 The Council then had a brief discussion regarding the potential procedural changes that should  
174 be made to ensure that situations like this do not occur in the future. Council Member Bailey  
175 noted that he appreciates the way Mayor Taylor had dealt with issues such as this one in a very  
176 frank and direct manner. Council Member Urry agreed and noted this is an example of why the  
177 Council needs to do their homework regarding each budget they are asked to consider. Council  
178 Member Bailey agreed, but noted it is also important for the Council to be able to trust those  
179 employees that are responsible for the day-to-day operations of the City. There was also a brief  
180 discussion regarding other projects that have been approved in the City in poor judgment, with  
181 Mayor Taylor noting the most important thing to him is that taxpayers understand they will not  
182 be 'on the hook' to help developer make a profit.

183  
184  
185

186 **2. DISCUSSION ON EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION**

187  
188 Acting City Manager Bryan Steele reviewed a chart identifying the fiscal impact of providing a  
189 certain percentage increase to employees in a given year. He used the example of a three-percent  
190 increase and noted that would have a fiscal impact of \$102,000 per year. Mayor Taylor noted he  
191 and Mr. Steele are not expecting the Council to make any decisions regarding compensation  
192 tonight and this discussion is just meant as an intro to salary discussions for the upcoming budget  
193 cycle. Council Member Bailey inquired as to the employee benefits that are tied directly to  
194 salary. Mr. Steele stated they include FICA, URS, and the 401K match provided by the City.  
195 There was a brief discussion regarding retirement contribution rates, with Mr. Steele noting there  
196 are tier one, tier two, and public safety employee categories with the Utah Retirement System  
197 and he reviewed the contribution percentages made for each employment category. Mr. Steele  
198 then reviewed the available fund balances in the City budget and noted that sales tax revenues  
199 are up five percent over the amount budgeted. Council Member Bailey inquired as to the current  
200 fund balance percentage. Mr. Steele answered it is 17 percent of general fund revenues.

201  
202 A memo from Mayor Taylor summarized several ideas or suggestions for improving employee  
203 compensation policies or benefit packages. Staff and all Department Heads have participated in  
204 meetings to discuss these issues.

205  
206 Bottom Line Up Front (BLUF): We have had three good discussions with our Department Heads  
207 about salaries and employee compensation. Everyone has provided input and thoughts. We have  
208 sifted through a variety of concepts and ideas together, and have 4 primary options for  
209 addressing the salaries. The options are not necessarily mutually-exclusive, and some can be  
210 done in cooperation with one another. Ultimately the staff and I will recommend that we  
211 implement the “second half” of the already-programmed salary increases now instead of new  
212 salary increases and adjustments for reasons explained below. We also recommend taking a  
213 longer-term look at the best salary incentive program for our employees moving forward, as part  
214 of the next budget process.

215  
216 Format for Work Session: We will be presenting all of the ideas below for discussion, as well as  
217 welcoming any ideas from the Council. All Dept. Heads will be present and will offer their  
218 advice and input. Throughout the meeting, we will be looking for your guidance about what to  
219 do with salaries in the near-term, and also what concepts you want us to refine further and bring  
220 to you during the budget process next year for a more comprehensive approach to salaries,  
221 employee benefits, morale, etc.

222  
223 **Primary Options for Addressing Salary Needs**

224 **1. Develop New Salary Recommendations Based on an Updated Salary Survey**

225 Concept: Develop a new list of salary recommendations for each employee in each department.  
226 We started with this concept first, but realized without an updated salary survey, we were kind of  
227 making it up as we went along. To really be effective and objective this process needs to be  
228 underpinned by a recent and relevant salary survey, and the data used by the original committee  
229 is now more than 2 years old. Annette has begun the process of doing a new salary survey, but  
230 this will take 1-2 months to finish. Our Dept. Heads feel it will be better to conduct a new salary  
231 survey and use that periodically to adjust salaries as a more long-term solution.

232 **2. Implement Planned “Second Half” of Salary Increases Sooner**

233 Concept: Implement the second portion of the already-programmed salary increases sooner.  
234 Upon further review, this option is our top recommendation. These salary increases are already  
235 programmed and planned. The Dept. Heads like that there is no possibility of internal politics or  
236 intra-department competition, because these salary increases are already set and were determined  
237 against an objective standard (the original Compensation Committee report). Therefore, it makes  
238 sense to do the second half of the previously recommended salary amounts sooner and we would  
239 like to ask you to consider implementing these salary increase on January 1, 2015. The impact to  
240 the budget will be about \$125,000 (\$96,000 General Fund, \$29,000 from Enterprise Funds).

241  
242 **3. Develop a Career Progression Plan**

243 Concept: Create a plan for career progression through our departments, so that employees who  
244 reach certain career milestones can be rewarded with salary increases. This is especially  
245 important for our departments where employees can stay in the same position for long periods of  
246 time. Their only possibility for raises right now, is either the Council to approve money for raises  
247 or for a COLA to be passed by the City Council. Our Dept. Heads would like to see a program  
248 that incentivizes employee performance and educational achievement. Here is an example of  
249 how such a career progression program could work (these are just example numbers—not a real

250 proposal): Position: Utility Worker I

251 2.5% raise for earning the Water II or Sewer II certificates

252 2.5% raise for earning Water III certificate

253 2% raise for completing a Bachelor’s Degree

254 2.5% longevity raise after 5 years of service

255  
256 The basic idea would be to offer a career and salary progression opportunity for employees who  
257 will be in their positions for some time. Often our employees end up staying in the same position  
258 while waiting a promotion opportunity, and currently the only way for them to get a salary  
259 increase is for the Council to pass salary increases or COLA. This type of program would give  
260 these employees some more ownership in their own career and would give them an opportunity  
261 to earn salary increases through their own good performance and effort. The increases would last  
262 until they earned a promotion, after which they would be placed on the salary range of that new  
263 position and the previous increases would no longer apply. They could then earn the new  
264 increases associated with their new position to boost their new salary.

265 Our Dept. Heads like this type of program a lot, and we would like to bring a more formal plan  
266 before the Council that addresses this option or Option #4 below as part of the budget process  
267 early next year.

268  
269 **4. Develop a Program for Performance-Based Evaluations & Merit Raises**

270 Concept: Make a pool of funds available to each department during the budget process for merit  
271 raises to deserving employees.

272 Currently we do not have a formal program for merit raises. In the past this has simply been  
273 based on the budget and what the Council approved. Then the program was implemented in  
274 different departments as per the Dept. Head. As the economy improves, the Dept. Heads would  
275 like to see us be able to get back to offering merit raises. This gave the Dept. Heads the  
276 opportunity to review their employees’ performance, and incentivize the performance and reward  
277 those with positive reviews.

278 Obviously if we implemented something like #3 above, we would not need to focus as much on  
279 #4. But merit raises should be part of our program whenever fiscally possible.

280

### 281 **Employee Morale/Recognition Ideas**

282 These are some ideas we have discussed as ways to recognize our employees and build high  
283 morale. Some ideas from Councilmembers and some from our Dept. Heads. They are in no  
284 particular order.

285 1. Employee Compliment Program: A program where citizens are encouraged to report on  
286 positive employee interactions. The employee and the citizen would receive a small incentive,  
287 such as movie tickets.

288 2. Employee Suggestion Program: A program wherein employees who give suggestions for  
289 improving efficiency, saving money, etc. receive a small incentive (such as a gift card). 3.  
290 Introduce Employees to City Council: Regularly introduce employees to the City Council during  
291 meetings. Perhaps when they are first hired, and upon receiving promotions or other career  
292 milestones.

293 4. Employee Spotlight in Newsletter: Spotlight an employee in the newsletter periodically to put  
294 a face on our public employees.

295 5. Lagoon Day (or similar): The city used to offer a lagoon day or similar social/fun event for  
296 employees and their families.

297 6. End of Year Bonus: The city used to offer a Christmas Bonus to employees

298

### 299 **Other Employee Benefit Ideas**

300 These are other ideas we brainstormed for helping to improve working conditions and employee  
301 morale. These ideas are in no particular order, and will be topics for discussion during the Work  
302 Session. We would like to get guidance of which ideas the Council would be willing to consider,  
303 and we will develop them further.

304 1. 401k contribution: The City used to match up to 6% employee contributions. This was  
305 discontinued a few years ago.

306 2. Alternate Work Schedules: Other cities use alternate work schedules as a “no-cost” employee  
307 benefit. Our Dept. Heads believe that we could maintain proper coverage while offering 10 or 9  
308 hour workdays (with an associated day off every week or every other week, respectively).

309 3. Contributions to HSA accounts: The City could contribute to these accounts as a benefit for  
310 employees who use them. We did a “one-time” contribution to these accounts when we launched  
311 the HSA as an option, but there is not a plan for contributing to them going forward.

312 4. Education Benefits: The City could introduce a program to assist with trade school or college  
313 tuition, in exchange for a contract to stay working with the city for a set period of time after  
314 graduation. We have done this in the past, based on Council approval, but there is not really a  
315 formal program in place.

316

317 Mayor Taylor reviewed his memo. There was a brief discussion regarding the difference  
318 between merit pay increases and cost of living adjustments (COLAs). Council Member Swanson  
319 stated he feels that some of the suggestions mirror pay policies used in the private sector. He  
320 added that for pay progression he would like that employees be required to contribute a certain  
321 number of years or some sort of commitment to the City if they receive a training opportunity  
322 that makes them more valuable to the City or another city. Mayor Taylor noted the City pays for  
323 certain opportunities and there may not be a legal problem with requiring some sort of

324 commitment from an employee who leaves after receiving certain training. Council Member  
325 Swanson stated he would be interested in considering a non-compete clause for employees where  
326 an employee would not be able to work for another city for a certain period of time after severing  
327 their relationship with North Ogden City. Mayor Taylor stated he can ask City Attorney Call to  
328 research that option. There was a general discussion about a career progression plan, with a  
329 continued focus on requiring employees to commit to work for the City for a certain period of  
330 time after receiving training that contributed to a certification. Council Member Swanson  
331 suggested that pay increases for certifications not be given to employees for up to six months  
332 after receiving a certification to ensure that they can apply the newly gained knowledge to their  
333 job. Public Works Director Giles stated he would be comfortable with that.

334  
335 Police Chief Warren stated he is hesitant to implement a non-compete clause or require an  
336 officer to make a commitment to the City after receiving a new certification because officers  
337 must already spend a significant amount of money to become POST certified in order to be  
338 considered for hire by a police department. He added that when his officers receive certain  
339 certifications qualifying them to move from one range to another within the pay scale, he would  
340 like for them to receive the entry pay of the new range or a five percent increase, whichever is  
341 higher. He stated his focus is on attracting and keeping quality officers. The Council discussed  
342 the ability to implement different pay progression policies for each department. City Recorder  
343 Spendlove stated that is an option, but she wants to ensure that when the Council decides to give  
344 merit increases the same percentage amount should be available to each department and the  
345 Department Head will decide how to divide the percentages among their employees. She stated  
346 there should never be a circumstance where one department gets money for merit raises while  
347 others do not.

348  
349 Council Member Urry stated that it is his understanding that there are two departments in the  
350 City that are ‘hemorrhaging’ because they continue to lose employees and he thought those  
351 departments were going to recommend a solution for addressing compensation issues for their  
352 departments. He stated that he did not think this was going to be a salary discussion for all  
353 employees, but a discussion specific to those departments to stop the problem. Building Official  
354 Kerr stated he feels the biggest issue is employee morale and if the morale in the City were  
355 better, many employees that have received job offers from other entities would have chosen to  
356 stay rather than leave. Mayor Taylor stated that one thing that contributes to the low morale is  
357 that many employees know that if they left their employment with the City, the person hired to  
358 replace them would start out making more money than them due to the way the City’s pay scales  
359 are structured. He stated employees know that the City has conducted a salary survey to  
360 determine appropriate salary scales, but they have not been implemented. He noted his  
361 recommendation is that the funding set aside to move all employees to their entry level wage at a  
362 minimum be spent now and employees receive the appropriate pay now; the cost to implement  
363 that would be \$62,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year. He stated the action would raise  
364 morale and the next step could be to consider a career progression plan in conjunction with the  
365 development of the next fiscal year budget.

366  
367 Council Member Bailey asked Mayor Taylor if he is proposing funding for merit increases and  
368 career progression increases each year. Council Member Swanson asked what would happen in  
369 a year where an employee is eligible for a merit raise and a career progression raise. There was a



370 general discussion regarding employee compensation funding, with Mayor Taylor indicating  
371 more discussion is necessary and the most important thing to him at this point in time is that each  
372 employee be brought to at least the entry level wage in their scale. Council Member  
373 Satterthwaite stated that he wants North Ogden City to be known as an employer that pays their  
374 employees fairly and has created a system where people want to stay and be a part of. Chief  
375 Warren stated that right now the opposite is true; the City has trained its employees to be the  
376 stars for other agencies because it has refused to compensate employees fairly. He stated he  
377 feels a significant salary survey needs to be conducted and the results implemented within the  
378 next six months. He noted the pay increase being recommended right now will help the morale  
379 in his department, but it will not solve all the problems. There was a brief discussion regarding  
380 the criteria used for the City's last salary survey, after which Council Member Bailey shared his  
381 three main concerns regarding the City's compensation plan: first is that there is little  
382 opportunity for growth in North Ogden because there are so few positions and higher paid  
383 positions do not open very frequently; second is that turnover is essential for an organization the  
384 size of North Ogden and it is not possible to keep everyone all the time; third is that it is  
385 necessary to set aside a block of funding to operate the City's departments and carefully consider  
386 all proposed pay increases to avoid inflating the operating budget to an unreasonable level that is  
387 no longer in the market. He stated he recognizes the need to make structural changes in order to  
388 retain employees and the low morale in the City is not based solely upon compensation; it is  
389 important to address all issues contributing to low morale rather than thinking that money will  
390 solve every problems.

391  
392 Council Member Urry stated that employees need to be aware of the amount of money that the  
393 City contributes to employees' retirement packages and other benefits. Mayor Taylor stated that  
394 employees are aware of those things and are appreciative of them, but it is still important to  
395 compensate them fairly based on the market. Council Member Stoker added that the Council  
396 asked the Department Heads to work together to create a proposal for an improved compensation  
397 plan; they have done that and their recommendation is reasonable and yet the Council is arguing  
398 with them. She acknowledged it will not be possible to approve every recommendation made  
399 regarding compensation and it will not be possible to retain every employee, but she wants to get  
400 to a point where people are not leaving the City because they are underappreciated or underpaid  
401 or no chance for advancement. She stated she feels the second half of the pay raise should be  
402 implemented now and she would be supportive of additional increases in the crucial areas of the  
403 City. She stated she is in favor of discussing the other options listed in the memo during future  
404 budget meetings. The Council discussed Council Member Stoker's proposal with the  
405 Department Heads, with a focus on pay compression within the pay scales due to the fact that  
406 employees have not been allowed to move through their wage scale.

407  
408 Council Member Bailey asked if there is some flexibility associated with the second portion of  
409 the pay increase approved at the beginning of the budget year. Mr. Giles stated that his  
410 employees are expecting the same amount that he received at the first of the fiscal year and it  
411 would be difficult to change that at this point in time.

412  
413 The Council concluded to implement the second half of pay increases now and have more  
414 detailed discussions regarding the many compensation issues in upcoming meetings and  
415 throughout the budget process.

416 Parks and Recreation Director Staheli asked that the Council also give consideration to  
417 increasing the pay ranges for her part time and seasonal employees because she cannot attract  
418 good employees at the current pay. She stated she has been forced to hire SOS or temporary  
419 employees to get the work done in her department.

420  
421 Council Member Urry suggested the City hire a consultant that is a professional at doing the  
422 work at developing salary scale recommendations. Council Member Stoker stated the City can  
423 conduct a salary survey and each Department Head is an expert at knowing what they need in  
424 their own department. Council Member Bailey agreed the City has the expertise in house. He  
425 noted that one of his concerns was that the City tasked a committee with a certain task and they  
426 did something different and created a level of expectations that was far higher than the City  
427 could ever achieve financially. He stated the Department Heads and employees should have  
428 been trusted to provide information about their actual needs. Council Member Swanson agreed.  
429 Council Member Urry stated that he has asked for a spreadsheet that includes all employees in all  
430 departments and the amount of money that each Department Head feels those employees should  
431 be paid accompanied with a proposal regarding how to achieve that pay. Council Member  
432 Satterthwaite stated the discussion needs to be more than about a spreadsheet; there must be  
433 criteria defined that an employee must meet in order to get to a certain point in their pay scale.

434  
435 Council Member Swanson stated he would like to have a factual comparison of the wages for  
436 seasonal or temporary employees compared to the cost the City pays for SOS employees.

437  
438 Chief Warren then asked if the Council has given any thought to re-implementing the three  
439 percent 401K matching contribution for employees. This led Mayor Taylor to review various  
440 employee morale programs that have been referenced in his memo. Council Member Bailey  
441 asked how many employees are taking advantage of the option to have a 401K account, to which  
442 Mr. Steele answered approximately 90 percent. Mayor Taylor noted the three percent match  
443 would be less expensive than a three percent wage increase. He then focused on the option for  
444 an adjusted work schedule for City employees, with the Council concluding they are comfortable  
445 with alternate work schedules at the discretion of Department Heads as long as each department  
446 has coverage five days per week. Council Member Bailey stated he would like to discuss each  
447 benefit option in more depth during the upcoming budget discussion meetings.

448  
449 The Department Heads thanked the Council for paying attention to the compensation issues in  
450 the City. The Council concluded to take formal action on the second half of the employee pay  
451 increases at the November 18 meeting so raises can be implemented in the next pay period after  
452 the meeting. Mayor Taylor stated he may send an administrative memo to all employees with a  
453 summary of the outcome of this meeting given that all employees were very interested in the  
454 meeting.

455  
456 **4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

457  
458 There were no public comments.

459  
460  
461 **5. COUNCIL/MAYOR/STAFF COMMENTS**

462 **Council Member Bailey motioned to go into a closed meeting to discuss pending or**  
463 **reasonably imminent litigation. Council Member Satterthwaite seconded the motion.**  
464

465 **Voting on the motion:**

466  
467 **Council Member Bailey** aye  
468 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye  
469 **Council Member Stoker** aye  
470 **Council Member Swanson** aye  
471 **Council Member Urry** aye  
472

473 **The motion passed unanimously.**

474  
475 The closed session began at 9:30 p.m.

476  
477 The regular meeting reconvened at 9:59 p.m.  
478

479 **6. ADJOURNMENT**

480  
481 **Council Member Bailey motioned to adjourn. Council Member Stoker seconded the**  
482 **motion.**

483  
484 **Voting on the motion:**

485  
486 **Council Member Bailey** aye  
487 **Council Member Satterthwaite** aye  
488 **Council Member Stoker** aye  
489 **Council Member Swanson** aye  
490 **Council Member Urry** aye  
491

492 **The motion passed unanimously.**

493  
494 **The meeting adjourned at 10:01 p.m.**  
495  
496  
497

498 \_\_\_\_\_  
499 Brent Taylor, Mayor  
500

501 \_\_\_\_\_  
502 S. Annette Spendlove, MMC  
503 City Recorder  
504

505 \_\_\_\_\_  
506 Date Approved