

City of Taylorsville
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Minutes

Wednesday, July 7, 2010
Council Chambers
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd., Room No. 140
Taylorsville, Utah 84118

BRIEFING SESSION

Attendance:

Mayor Russ Wall

Council Members:

Council Chairman Morris Pratt
Vice-Chairman Jerry Rechtenbach
Council Member Dama Barbour
Council Member Bud Catlin
Council Member Larry Johnson

City Staff:

John Inch Morgan, City Administrator
John Brems, City Attorney
Cheryl Peacock Cottle, City Recorder
Jessica Springer, Council Coordinator
Mark McGrath, Community Development Director
John Taylor, City Engineer
Scott Harrington, Chief of Finance
Donald Adams, Grants Manager
Robin Kishiyama, Human Resource Manager

Others: Steven Roe, Chris Kishiyama,

BRIEFING SESSION

1. Review Administrative Report

Chairman Morris Pratt conducted the Briefing Session, which convened at 6:02 p.m. City Recorder Cheryl Peacock Cottle conducted a Roll Call, wherein all Council Members were present.

Chairman Pratt called for questions on the Administrative Report. Council Member Rechtenbach inquired about the timeline for completion of the pedestrian skywalks and also the 6200 Continuous Flow Intersection (CFI). City Engineer John Taylor stated that completion of the

pedestrian bridges is scheduled for August 25th. He indicated that the CFI at 6200 South should be finished by the end of September.

2. Review Agenda

The agenda for the City Council Meeting was reviewed. Chairman Pratt stated that he has invited Steven Roe to speak during the Citizen Comment period. Mayor Wall relayed his intention to report on Taylorsville Dayzz.

3. Adjourn

The Briefing Session was adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING

Attendance:

Mayor Russ Wall

Council Members:

Council Chairman Morris Pratt
Vice-Chairman Jerry Rechtenbach
Council Member Dama Barbour
Council Member Bud Catlin
Council Member Larry Johnson

City Staff:

John Inch Morgan, City Administrator
John Brems, City Attorney
Mark McGrath, Community Development Director
Del Craig, Chief of Police
Cheryl Peacock Cottle, City Recorder
Jessica Springer, Council Coordinator
John Taylor, City Engineer
Scott Harrington, Chief of Finance
Keith Snarr, Economic Development Director
Patricia Kimbrough, Executive Assistant
Tessa Kohl, Victim Advocate
Robin Kishiyama, Human Resource Manager
Lyle Hansen, Public Works Inspector
Jean Ashby, Administrative Assistant
Patrick Tomasino, Building Official
Mickey Pahl, Code Enforcement Officer
Gerry Orr, Senior Orr
Michael Meldrum, Senior Planner
Wayne Dial, Assistant Police Chief
Lisa Schwartz, Emergency Response Coordinator

Citizens: Anthony Garcia, Kelsey Rowley, Todd Sutton, Steven Roe, Chris Kishiyama, Tom Haroldsen, Jay Ziolkowski, Gordon Wolf, Darwin Cottle, John Gidney, Haley Palfreyman, Kimberley Houk, Daniel Salmon, Teresa Wilding, Maria Magallanes, Andy Ho, Holly Aun, Kaye May, Aldoy Black, Jon Fidler, Matthew Cunningham, Ken Acker, Stephen Dark, David Wilde

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARY MATTERS

18:31:34 Chairman Morris Pratt called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance. City Recorder Cheryl Peacock Cottle conducted a Roll Call, wherein all Council Members were present.

1.1 Pledge of Allegiance – Opening Ceremonies – *Anthony Garcia, Youth Council*

18:32:13 Youth Council Member Anthony Garcia directed the Pledge of Allegiance.

1.2 Reverence – *Kelsey Rowley, Youth Council (Opening Ceremonies For July 21, 2010 to be arranged by Council Member Barbour)*

18:32:20 Youth Council Member Kelsey Rowley offered the Reverence.

1.3 Citizen Comments

18:32:48 Chairman Morris Pratt reviewed the Citizen Comment Procedures for the audience. He then called for any citizen comments.

18:34:40 Chairman Pratt invited Steven Roe to address the Council. Mr. Roe distributed printed material to the City Council for review regarding *Benefits of Restorative Justice*.

18:35:19 Steven Roe described success he experienced through the Taylorsville Municipal Court. He stated that he currently works as a paralegal. He referenced chastisement that the Taylorsville Court has received recently. He said that Judge Michael Kwan and his Court programs are responsible for helping him turn his life around. Mr. Roe cited comparisons between the effectiveness of the Taylorsville Court and the West Valley City Court. He relayed that statistics indicate Taylorsville maintains a lower crime rate than West Valley. He praised the Taylorsville Court for its valuable/unique programs and its effectiveness with rehabilitation efforts. He said that if the Taylorsville Court were to be closed, it would be a major loss to the state and the community at large.

18:40:40 Chairman Pratt thanked Mr. Roe for sharing his success story and noted that the City has renewed its commitment to support Judge Kwan in his administration of the Taylorsville Court.

18:42:11 Mr. Roe addressed questions from the Council regarding his experience in the Taylorsville Court and described positive associations with Judge Michael Kwan, Taylorsville Police Officers, and the Fiddler Family. He cited his concerns with Probationary Services.

18:45:49 There were no additional citizen comments, and Chairman Pratt closed the citizen comment period.

1.4 Mayor's Report

18:45:54 Mayor Russ Wall recognized volunteers and members of the Taylorsville Dayzz Committee for their hard work in making the event so successful. He relayed that he has received many compliments regarding Taylorsville Dayzz.

18:47:33 Chairman Pratt shared the appreciation of the City Council for efforts made with Taylorsville Dayzz, as well. Council Member Rechtenbach thanked the Taylorsville City Youth Council and Council Coordinator Jessica Springer for their help at Taylorsville Dayzz.

2. APPOINTMENTS

There were no appointments.

3. REPORTS

3.1 Youth Council – *Maria Magallanes, Youth Council Chair*

18:48:42 Youth Council Chair Maria Magallanes reported on recent activities and upcoming events for the Taylorsville Youth Council. She described Youth Council participation in the Taylorsville Dayzz event/parade. She cited an upcoming Yard Sale being sponsored by the Youth Council that is scheduled for August 28, 2010 at 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at Taylorsville City Hall.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

4.1 Minutes – RCCM 06-02-10 & CCWS 06-09-10 & RCCM 06-16-10 & SCCM 06-21-10

18:49:16 Council Member Bud Catlin **MOVED** to adopt the Consent Agenda. Council Member Jerry Rechtenbach **SECONDED** the motion. Chairman Pratt called for discussion on the motion. There being none, he called for a roll call vote. The vote was as follows: Barbour-yes, Pratt-yes, Rechtenbach-yes, Johnson-yes, and Catlin-yes. **All City Council members voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.**

18:49:42 Chairman Pratt commended City Recorder Cheryl Peacock Cottle for her work in preparing several sets of minutes from lengthy meetings.

5. PLANNING MATTERS

There were no planning matters.

6. FINANCIAL MATTERS

6.1 **Public Hearing – 6:30 p.m. – To Receive Public Comment on the Compensation Offered to Elected Officials, Statutory Officers, Appointive Officers, and Employees**

18:50:02 Chairman Pratt said he has just recently learned that there is an impression that the City Council is going to increase their own wages. He stated that such a proposal is not even on the table and is not being considered. Chairman Pratt said that if paperwork indicates an increase for the Council, it is an error.

18:51:14 Chairman Pratt opened the public hearing on this matter and called for citizen comments.

18:51:46 Todd Sutton, of the Utah Public Employees Association (UPEA), distributed a handout to the Council and City Recorder and described it as an excerpt from the Taylorsville Personnel Management Act. He stated that he has been struggling to determine where it is codified in ordinance. Chairman Pratt clarified that the excerpt is from the City's Personnel Policy. Mr. Sutton said that the policy referenced directly affects how salary and compensation is managed. He referenced Page 51 of the policy and read the section under 6. Reclassification – C, as follows: "If the Mayor reclassifies a position to a lower level, the incumbent's salary shall remain the same. If the incumbent's salary exceeds the maximum of the new range, or provided the individual meets longevity status criteria, the longevity scale maximum, the incumbent is

ineligible to receive a salary increase until the salary range or longevity scale increases to incorporate the incumbent's pay rate." Mr. Sutton said that this policy reflects that the City has allowed for compensation outside the ranges. He stated that in years past the Council and the Mayor's office have negotiated salaries of employees in good faith, but those have now been rolled back. He observed that this action was done not as an exercise in repairing a breach of ordinance but as an act to actually punish employees for earning salaries that the Council does not deem necessary. Mr. Sutton said that this action strikes at the morale of employees and is opening up the City for questions from the public on issues of fairness. He said that the policy outlines how questions in salary ranges should be handled.

18:53:21 Chairman Pratt said that a policy cannot override an ordinance. He expressed that the Council is not purposely trying to hurt anyone. He cited situations where certain positions were paid over and above the grade. He said some were done so by mistake and some were intentional.

18:53:46 Mr. Sutton observed that, although there is some question about how ranges were applied, there is now no recourse for employees to address their concerns with actions they consider unfair. He asked the Council to address that concern because City employee perception is sour right now.

18:54:43 Teresa Wilding said that she is under the impression that the Council's current wage is \$13,000 and that an increase to \$20,000 is being considered for this year. She expressed concern about an excessive increase for the Council when other costs are being cut.

18:55:35 Chairman Pratt cited the misperception and explained that in the original Ordinance 06-32, Council Members were assigned to a grade 6 on the schedule which has been followed on the current documentation. He made clarification that the actual salary for elected officials' compensation is set by separate ordinance. He stated that it is not true that Council Members will receive a \$7,000 increase.

18:56:18 Council Member Catlin said that he served on the City Council for 12 years and has only seen one increase for Council Members during that time period.

18:56:53 Ms. Wilding expressed comments that were away from the microphone, but barely audible, regarding the importance of fairness in dealing with employee salaries.

18:57:13 Lisa Schwartz asked for clarification on the proposed salary range for Council Members. She said that according to her information documenting current council compensation, the assigned grade should be 2 rather than 6.

18:59:46 Chairman Pratt said the original ordinance listed it as a grade 6 and it was carried over from that.

18:57:43 Ms. Schwartz inquired whether Exhibits A & B of the proposed ordinance were prepared by Chairman Pratt, and he confirmed that they were just proposals as a starting place for discussion.

18:57:59 Ms. Schwartz asked why a Council increase is being proposed if it is not up for consideration.

18:58:20 Chairman Pratt reiterated that no Council raises are being approved. He said that if the exhibits are approved as outlined, there would be an increase. He stated that such action will not happen.

18:58:34 Ms. Schwartz inquired whether the Council plans to modify the exhibits to the proposed ordinance so that the Council is not awarded a Grade 6 salary. Chairman Pratt affirmed that was the case. He said if compensation is left at a Grade 6, it will be capped for the Council in order to align with the current ordinance regarding compensation for elected officials.

18:59:21 Ms. Schwartz gave her opinion that, given the budget discussions that have taken place over the past several months, an increase to Council compensation would be inappropriate. Chairman Pratt agreed. Council Member Johnson said that he also agrees an increase would be inappropriate.

18:59:57 John Fiddler noted that Mayor Russ Wall receives \$83,000 per year in compensation. He suggested that any cuts should be made from the top down in order to show good faith and help increase morale.

19:00:48 Chairman Pratt noted that the budget has already been passed and salary adjustments for various positions are now being considered during this meeting.

19:01:27 There were no further citizen comments, and Chairman Pratt declared the public hearing closed.

6.1.1 Ordinance No. 10-21 – Amending the Compensation Offered to Elected Officials, Statutory Officers, Appointive Officers, and Employees – *John Inch Morgan*

19:01:39 City Administrator John Inch Morgan said that this ordinance is a result of the budget that was approved on June 21, 2010 and the decision by the Council to roll salaries back to be in line with Ordinance 06-32.

19:02:49 Chairman Pratt stated that the City Administrator has prepared several options for salary ranges and grades for employee positions, and those recommendations are up for consideration. Mr. Pratt said that, after discussing those options with Council Members, he did not feel completely comfortable with Administration's recommendations and has prepared an additional proposal.

19:03:06 Council Member Catlin said that he did not understand his own motion when moving to approve the budget and roll back salaries. He said the intent of the motion was to look at salaries of 10-13 employees who had been paid more than the pay grade allowed and consider compensation for those particular positions. He said he was shocked at seeing a complete overhaul of the compensation plan. Mr. Catlin noted that salaries have been frozen by resolution and his motion was to pass the budget resolution, consider those 10 or 11 positions and if approved, pay those individuals retroactive to July 1, 2010. He said the entire pay plan is not on the table, but only certain positions.

19:04:39 Mr. Morgan explained that he has prepared a number of different alternatives for Council consideration. He said that every position is listed because a number of additional positions have been added since the adoption of Ordinances 06-32 and 07-21. He said those new positions have only been approved by the Council through budget ordinances and have not been codified by any other ordinance. Mr. Morgan noted that most, if not all, positions are listed exactly as they were when the CBIZ Study was adopted in Ordinance 06-32. He stated his intent to ensure that everyone is included when an ordinance is passed that sets the ranges for all City employees.

19:07:37 Chairman Pratt called for review of his proposed Exhibit A. Mr. Morgan noted that 4 or 5 positions were not included in Exhibit A. Discussion was held regarding whether the Police Chief and Assistant Chief should be included on Exhibit A or placed on a police matrix to be adopted. Corrections to Exhibit A were noted regarding the code enforcement officer position, certain police administrative positions and elected officials.

19:08:21 Mayor Wall clarified that no corresponding pay grade is listed for elected officials in Ordinance 06-32, but it was, in fact, left blank. Mr. Morgan explained that in 2007 the decision was made to not assign grades to any elected officials, but rather set that compensation by separate ordinance.

19:10:00 Chairman Pratt suggested either removing the grade for the Council entirely on Exhibit A or noting that compensation for elected officials is set by ordinance.

19:10:45 Council Member Catlin stated that he is uncomfortable with several things, including FTE's that were not shown on the original ordinance. He suggested that the ordinance should have been updated to reflect new positions.

19:11:08 Mr. Morgan noted that the new positions were outlined in budget ordinances.

19:20:43 Mr. Catlin said that the budget ordinance does not cancel another ordinance regarding pay grades.

19:11:15 Mr. Morgan said that Mr. Catlin's perspective reflects a difference of legal opinion. He reiterated that every time Administration suggested that a new position be approved, a grade was issued through ordinance and policy, as assigned by himself and the Human Resource Manager.

19:11:34 Mr. Catlin said that policy does not trump an ordinance.

19:11:35 Mr. Morgan responded that policy does set the process for grading employees.

19:11:41 Mr. Catlin noted a difference in legal opinions, but said his information is that until an ordinance is rescinded, it applies and cannot be ignored.

19:11:32 Mayor Wall inquired which budget is now being addressed in that case, since the 1996 budget ordinance was never rescinded. Mayor Wall said that Administration is unclear which budget they are working on and suggested they must be working on the 1996 budget if Mr. Catlin's philosophy is applied as the ordinance that set that budget was never rescinded.

19:12:29 Mr. Catlin said he believes the 2010-2011 budget is being considered and discussion has resulted as a result.

19:13:02 Chairman Pratt called for review of Exhibit A and proposed that positions for elected officials be eliminated from that exhibit, as they are set by separate ordinance. Mr. Morgan recommended placing the Police Chief, Assistant Chief, and Code Enforcement Officer positions on a separate police schedule. He recommended bringing back another ordinance to codify the step plan for the Police Department and with the inclusion of the referenced positions.

19:13:55 Inaudible discussion was held away from the microphones regarding certain positions that should be reflected on Exhibit A. It was determined that a Judicial Assistant needs to be added to Exhibit A with an assignment to Grade 6, in order to be consistent with the budget. Mr. Morgan described the difference between a Judicial Assistant and a Judicial Services Representative.

19:16:41 Chairman Pratt reviewed the recommended changes to his Exhibit A, as follows: remove the Mayor and City Council and add a Judicial Assistant as a Grade 6.

19:16:59 Chairman Pratt addressed Mr. Catlin's earlier comments and said that since the original ordinance was passed that outlined positions, there have been a number of positions added and

authorized by the Council. He indicated that he has researched the pay grades for those positions and was comfortable with adding them to the exhibit he prepared.

19:18:30 Council Member Johnson asked for clarification on why compensation is currently being addressed since it was previously frozen. Mr. Pratt explained that the Council is now setting pay grades with positions that already exist, in order to make the ordinance consistent with the budget document.

19:18:51 Chairman Pratt noted that on his proposed exhibit he has made some adjustments that are not consistent with recommendations made by Administration. He suggested that a motion be made to pass Exhibit A, if the Council is comfortable with his proposed changes.

19:19:29 Mayor Wall stated that there are three or four positions being negatively impacted on Chairman Pratt's proposed Exhibit A. He informed the Council that there have already been several grievances filed in relation to those positions. He cited the Administration's difficulty in dealing with those grievances since the first point of appeal is the City Administrator, who obviously will not have an adversarial role with the appellant. The Mayor explained that Mr. Morgan, as City Administrator, is required to hear the grievance first, then the second step is to take the grievance before an Administrative Law Judge. The Mayor said that since the City Attorney agrees with Administration on this issue, it would also be difficult for him to take an adversarial role with appellants. He cited a need to evaluate how the appeal process will be handled for any individuals who are not brought back up to previous salaries/grades.

19:20:32 Chairman Pratt stated that the appeal process is an administrative function. Mayor Wall agreed that it will be handled by administration, but stated his desire to advise the Council that loose ends will not be resolved by adopting Exhibit A.

19:20:44 Chairman Pratt called for any recommendation by the Mayor.

19:20:45 Mayor Wall stated that Administration has already provided its recommendations. He relayed Administration's position that all of the raises in pay, salary, and grade ranges were justifiable and appropriate.

19:21:05 Council Member Johnson called for explanation on the process for awarding employee raises. He cited figures where certain employees have gone to 17% over the maximum set in Ordinance 06-32.

19:21:30 Mayor Wall said that two raises were given as pay adjustments when he gave up his Administrative Assistant. He said that when merit increases are awarded, it is following evaluations that are conducted by supervisors. He noted that all employees are evaluated through the same process. The Mayor explained that supervisors make annual recommendations,

along with a work plan for the following year; supervisor recommendations then go before the City Administrator for his review and approval; and then the change is forwarded to the Human Resource Manager. Mayor Wall said that pay grade ranges would have been adjusted by the City Administrator after a sufficient change in job description to justify a pay grade adjustment and following discussion with the Mayor. He stated that sometimes there are situations where employees appeal a pay grade they are assigned and a case is made for change wherein the City Administrator may make an adjustment.

19:23:29 Mayor Wall affirmed that there were two cases where parties involved in making adjustments were not aware of the maximums allowed in the CBIZ Study. He said he has no reason to believe that anyone was purposely deceitful, but rather that mistakes were made in those instances when regular merit increases brought two employees over the range maximum.

19:24:23 Mr. Johnson inquired about a specific employee who was given a \$2.00 an hour increase. Mayor Wall explained that Administration made a decision in that situation to change the job description for that employee and change their pay grade accordingly.

19:24:44 Chairman Pratt asked Mr. Morgan to confirm that Administration submitted its separate recommendations to the Council with Ordinance 10-21. Mr. Pratt noted that the Council has two versions to consider regarding pay grades assigned to certain positions.

19:26:00 Chairman Pratt called for direction from City Attorney John Brems. Mr. Brems said that a motion should be made that includes certain elements of the attachments and specifies changes for consideration by the Council.

19:26:29 Chairman Pratt directed Council Members to specify which exhibit they are recommending when a motion is made regarding Ordinance 10-21.

19:26:40 Discussion was held regarding the differing exhibits presented for consideration by Chairman Pratt and by Mr. Morgan.

19:28:44 Mr. Morgan explained that CBIZ updates were previously provided to the Council that have updated the salary ranges. He confirmed that the color-coded Exhibit he included in the packet, however, does not upgrade salary ranges, but actually reflects the ranges that were adopted in 2006.

19:29:46 Council Member Barbour stated that she was unsure which charts are being presented.

19:30:27 Inaudible discussion was held away from the microphones, as confusion was expressed over which exhibits are to be considered and included with the subject ordinance.

19:32:19 Mr. Morgan explained that grade ranges within the two options, as provided in the Council Packet, are the same except for Grade 11.

19:33:30 Council Member Barbour requested five hard copies of both proposals, so that everyone is looking at the same documents.

19:33:18 Mr. Brems noted that Exhibit B, as proposed by Chairman Pratt, is identical to Administration's color version, except for one grade.

19:33:08 Council Member Dama Barbour **MOVED** to call a brief recess while proper documents are assembled. Council Member Rechtenbach referenced an e-mail sent to the Council by Mr. Morgan on June 22, 2010. Council Member Catlin **SECONDED** the motion to recess the meeting. All Council Members voted in favor and the motion passed.

19:34:17 The City Council Meeting was recessed at 7:34 p.m.

19:57:04 The City Council Meeting reconvened at 7:57 p.m.

19:57:18 Chairman Pratt stated that the City Recorder distributed hard copies of Administration's proposed schedule to the City Council during the recess.

20:04:59 It was affirmed that Administration's proposed schedule restores all employee salaries back as they existed prior to June 21, 2010. Mayor Wall and Mr. Morgan confirmed that no employee raises are being proposed in Administration's schedule.

19:57:38 Council Member Pratt verified that his proposal does not restore all salaries.

19:57:53 Chairman Pratt cited grades in Administration's schedule for the Community Development Director and the Economic Development Director that differ from Ordinance 06-32.

19:58:57 Council Member Recthenbach asked the Mayor and City Administrator to review their salary proposals and provide justification with the recommendations they are presenting.

20:00:00 Positions were reviewed as follows:

- Justice Court Judge remains at a Grade 18.
- City Administrator/Treasurer remains at a Grade 17.
- Police Chief and Assistant Chief will be removed and placed on the police matrix.
- Community Development Director and Economic Director should have been highlighted at a Grade 16, although the current salaries will not change. The Mayor explained that

the Community Development Director received additional supervisory responsibilities when the contract was ended with Sunrise Engineering.

20:02:21 Council Member Johnson indicated that employees in the private sector frequently take on extra little responsibilities without any increase.

20:02:53 Mayor Wall said he does not consider an assignment to supervise three additional employees a minor change in duties.

20:03:10 Mr. Morgan noted that a job reclassification does not guarantee a pay increase, although it may allow an employee to earn more in the future through merit increases. He said that when reclassifications are implemented, positions and responsibilities are being evaluated and not necessarily individuals. He gave his opinion that the type of responsibilities assigned merited a reclassification in the case of the Community Development Director. Mr. Morgan reiterated that the reclassification did not result in a pay increase.

20:04:31 Council Member Barbour stated that her number one objective at tonight's meeting is to restore salaries.

20:05:30 Mayor Wall described negotiations that were discussed in a Closed Session with the City Council at the time the Economic Development Director was hired that resulted in reclassifying that position to a Grade 16.

20:05:58 Review of positions and recommended salaries, continued as follows:

- Building Official recommended to be changed to a Grade 14 to allow salary to be restored.
- Chief Financial Officer position did not previously exist and is classified as a Grade 14.
- City Recorder position has not changed.
- Senior City Planner should have been highlighted and moved to a Grade 13 to allow salary to be restored. The Mayor noted that the Senior City Planner has taken on additional responsibilities.

20:07:37 Chairman Pratt expressed frustration that four positions were not highlighted in Administration's document.

20:08:00 Review of positions and recommended salaries, continued as follows:

- Executive Assistant/Contract Manager/Mayor Administrator is a new position with a different job description and a pay grade change to 12.

- Executive Assistant/Grants Manager is a hybrid position that was created. The Mayor stated that most of this employee's responsibility is to obtain grants and assist the mayor with political work and lobbying efforts. It was noted that this position should be a Grade 13.
- Public Works Inspector used to be contracted with Sunrise Engineering. Chairman Pratt noted that this position existed in the original ordinance as a Grade 11. Mayor Wall said that position would be revisited.
- Senior Accountant – no changes.
- Building Inspector is a Grade 11. The Mayor explained the difference between the
- Building Inspector position and the Building Official position, who has supervisory responsibilities.
- City Planner – no changes.
- Clerk of the Court is a Title Change
- Code Enforcement Official will be moved to the Police Matrix.
- Human Resource Manager accepted additional responsibilities as the Mayor's Executive Assistant. Mr. Morgan explained that this is also a title change that goes along with professional certificates that have been received and additional responsibilities added as a Human Resource Manager.

20:11:38 Chairman Pratt inquired as to the primary responsibility of the Human Resource Manager position. Mr. Morgan said it is to manage all of the personnel documents, benefits, and oversee payroll. Council Member Barbour asked whether the Grade 11 would cover the position to bring that salary whole. Mayor Wall indicated that a Grade 11 would be required to bring the salary whole.

20:12:23 Mr. Johnson asked for more specifics as to job responsibilities for the Human Resource Manager and why the grade has been increased. Mr. Morgan explained that the position has grown from a clerical-type position to a managerial-type position. He stated that additional responsibilities were also taken on when the Mayor gave up his Executive Assistant position, i.e. correspondence, calendaring, etc.

20:13:02 Mayor Wall explained that when he first became Mayor, some human resource tasks were being handled by an outside contractor, but are now done in-house. He said that the individual in the position when the CBIZ study was done did not carry any certifications, but mainly had responsibility solely for payroll.

20:13:49 Council Member Johnson asked for confirmation that the Human Resource Manager position has being upgraded from a 9 to a Grade 11, and it was given.

20:13:59 Review of positions and recommended salaries, continued as follows:

- Administrative Assistant to the Police Chief remains the same.
- City Council Assistant remains the same.
- Community Development Administrative Assistant was increased on an appeal to the City Administrator to examine job duties that were similar to other positions where agendas and minutes are prepared. Mr. Morgan said that equity with other positions required a reclassification. He said that he believes the previous desk audit was done in error.
- Court Financial Compliance Supervisor is a title change and the grades remain the same.
- GIS Technician, Physical Facilities Coordinator, and Building Inspection Coordinator are all new positions that have been implemented since Ordinance 06-32. Mr. Morgan indicated that these grades were assigned based on market place comparisons and workload comparisons within the city. He noted that these positions have been reflected in the budget ordinance each year since they were implemented.
- Business License Clerk remains the same.
- Judicial Services Manager is a Title Change.
- Records Manager in the Police Department remains the same.
- Accounting Clerk is a new position that was created when the storm drain fee was adopted. Mr. Morgan explained that accounting clerical duties were assigned to this position.
- Economic Development Administrative Assistant and Events/Volunteer Coordinator positions remain the same at a Grade 8.
- Judicial Case Manager is a Title Change.
- The Victim Advocate is a Grade increase to an 8. Mr. Morgan noted that this position should have been highlighted.
- Emergency Coordinator Specialist is a new position that has been added.
- Judicial Services Representative 2 is a title change.
- Police Department Office Assistant, Receptionist/Records Specialist in the Police Department, Receptionist/Cashier, and Senior Van Driver all remain the same.
- The Code Enforcement Clerk is a part-time position that was added.
- The Court File Clerk and Court Financial Compliance Liaison are title changes.
- Police Department Intern is a part-time position that remains at a Grade 6.
- Judicial Assistant and Judicial Services Representative 1 are title changes at a Grade 6.
- Museum Caretaker has not changed at a Grade 6.
- Physical Facilities Workers are new janitorial positions that were added since 2006.
- Public Workers Laborers are positions that were added during the most recent budget.

20:17:45 Mr. Morgan apologized for not highlighting some positions, but said the intent of the document was to provide compensation information.

20:17:57 Mr. Morgan said that the only change needed to the document provided by Administration is the Grade 13 for the Mayor's Assistant/Grants Manager position in order to keep the salary whole. It was noted that the Police Chief, Assistant Police Chief, and Code Enforcement Officer will be removed and placed on the police matrix, but civilian jobs within the Police Department will remain on Administration's schedule.

20:19:50 Council Member Barbour inquired about the Public Works Inspector position and Mr. Morgan confirmed that the grade change was to make the salary whole.

20:19:35 Chairman Pratt recapped the changes made to the Administration's document, as follows: Police Chief, Assistant Police Chief, and Code Enforcement Officer have been moved to the police department matrix, and the Grants Manger has changed to a grade 13. He confirmed that the rest of the document remains the same.

20:20:06 Chairman Pratt noted that there is now clearer understanding on the two proposals. He called for further discussion from the Council or a motion on the Ordinance.

20:20:27 Inaudible conversation was held away from the microphones.

20:20:38 Chairman Pratt asked that the motion maker state which proposal is to be included with the ordinance. He asked that the Administration's proposal be called Exhibit 1 in its entirety and Chairman Pratt's proposal is known as Exhibits A & B combined.

20:21:52 Council Member Barbour called for confirmation that Exhibit 1 is the Administration's proposal that makes salaries whole and Exhibits A & B together changes grades and does not restore salaries to what they were before. Chairman Pratt affirmed that this assessment is correct.

20:22:23 Council Member Rechtenbach noted that the grade and salary for the Economic Development Director is a contractual agreement that was agreed to by the Council. He said that if Exhibit A is upheld as is, the position will be misclassified as a Grade 15. Chairman Pratt said that Exhibit B increases the Grade 15 maximum and accomplishes the same thing.

20:23:12 Council Member Rechtenbach asked that documents be scanned in the same direction in the future. He asked for further clarification on the Economic Development Director position. He noted that a Grade 16 is needed to meet the contractual obligation with this individual.

20:24:03 Chairman Pratt explained that he changed the range to \$105,565 because in the original CBIZ proposal there was a maximum of that amount for a Grade 15, which keeps the position whole.

20:25:36 Council Member Rechtenbach inquired whether the Grade 15 complies with the contractual obligation. Mayor Wall responded in the affirmative.

20:26:16 Council Member Dama Barbour **MOVED** to adopt Ordinance 10-21, using Exhibit 1 - with two changes with two changes that the Community Development Director and the Economic Development Director go to Grade 15. She stated that her intent with this motion is that all salaries be made whole. Mayor Wall inquired whether Ms. Barbour's motion also includes the change suggested earlier to the Executive Assistant/Grants Manager position and the three deletions of the Police Chief, the Assistant Police Chief, and the Code Enforcement Officer. Council Member Barbour restated her motion to include Exhibit A with the following changes: Community Development Director and Economic Development Director go to a Grade 15, Executive Assistant/Grants Manager goes to a Grade 13, and Police Chief, the Assistant Police Chief, and the Code Enforcement Officer are deleted from the document. Council Member Jerry Rechtenbach **SECONDED** the motion. Chairman Pratt called for discussion on the motion. Council Member Barbour restated that her intent with this motion is to make salaries whole. City Attorney John Brems inquired whether the Ordinance is to be made retroactive to July 1, 2010. Ms. Barbour affirmed that making the ordinance retroactive to July 1, 2010 is her intent. Mayor Wall noted that the ranges have not been changed on Administration's exhibits and the Economic Development Director position would have to remain at a Grade 16 to keep that salary commitment whole. Council Member Barbour amended her motion accordingly and Council Member Rechtenbach asked for clarification. Mayor Wall explained that the motion is being made regarding Administration's Exhibit 1. Mr. Rechtenbach reaffirmed his second. Chairman Pratt restated the motion and called for a roll-call vote. The vote was as follows: Barbour-yes, Pratt-no, Rechtenbach-yes, Johnson-no, and Catlin-no. **All City Council members voted and the motion failed with a 3 to 2 vote.**

20:31:47 Council Member Larry Johnson **MOVED** to adopt Ordinance No. 10-21 – Amending the Compensation Offered to Elected Officials, Statutory Officers, Appointive Officers, and Employees, using Exhibits A & B, with changing of the City Council Members from a Grade 6 to a Grade 2. **The motion died for lack of a second.**

20:32:53 Chairman Pratt noted that neither of the two proposals has been accepted by the majority of the City Council. He called for any alternative motion.

20:34:04 Chairman Pratt **MOVED** to continue with the rest of the meeting agenda and revisit Item 6.1 after the remainder of the meeting. Council Member Johnson **SECONDED** the motion. Chairman Pratt called for discussion on the motion. Council Member Rechtenbach asked what might change when Item 6.1 is revisited. He suggested that an alternate motion be made by those who voted against both of the previous motions. There being no further discussion, Chairman Pratt called for a vote. A verbal vote was taken that was unclear. The City Recorder requested a roll-call vote and Chairman Pratt called for such. The vote was as follows:

Barbour-no, Pratt-yes, Rechtenbach-no, Johnson-yes, and Catlin-yes. **All Council Members voted and the motion passed with a 3 to 2 vote.**

6.2 Ordinance No. 10-22 – Amending Section 2.48.070 of the City of Taylorsville Code of Ordinances with Respect to Fees Charged by the Police Department -- John Brems and Chief Del Craig

20:36:45 City Attorney John Brems presented the subject ordinance and stated that this is a request from the Police Department to modify the fee schedule in order to reflect costs for GRAMA requests.

20:37:31 Police Chief Del Craig gave clarification on fees charged in the Police Department for records. He explained that a CAR Team Report is an extensive report for a major accident, containing photos.

20:37:55 Council Member Catlin asked if the proposed fee schedule actually reflects costs. Chief Craig affirmed that it does.

20:38:41 Council Member Catlin stated that he would like to see actual costs for public records.

20:39:27 Council Member Bud Catlin **MOVED** to adopt Ordinance No. 10-22 – Amending Section 2.48.070 of the City of Taylorsville Code of Ordinances with Respect to Fees Charged by the Police Department. Council Member Jerry Rechtenbach **SECONDED** the motion. Chairman Pratt called for discussion on the motion. There being none, he called for a roll call vote. The vote was as follows: Barbour-yes, Pratt-yes, Rechtenbach-yes, Johnson-yes, and Catlin-yes. **All City Council members voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.**

7. OTHER MATTERS

7.1 Resolution No. 10-23 – Approving an Interlocal Agreement Regarding the Creation and Operation of the Valley Police Alliance between Cottonwood Heights City, Draper City, Midvale City, Murray City, Granite Police, Salt Lake City, Sandy City, South Jordan City, South Salt Lake City, City of Taylorsville, Unified Police Department, Utah Transit Authority, West Jordan City and West Valley City – John Inch Morgan

20:40:43 City Administrator John Inch Morgan stated that this agreement was before the Council in April of 2010 and at that time it was recommended that it be brought back once the Unified Fire Department had signed it. Mr. Morgan reported that the UPD has now signed on and so it is being presented to the Council once again for consideration. Mayor Wall gave clarification on services that are contracted with UPD.

20:42:03 Chief Del Craig gave a brief summary of the large document presented and said that it is basically an agreement to consolidate with other agencies to ensure lower costs.

20:43:09 City Attorney John Brems agreed with Chief Craig's summarization.

20:43:20 Council Member Dama Barbour **MOVED** to adopt Resolution No. 10-23 – Approving an Interlocal Agreement Regarding the Creation and Operation of the Valley Police Alliance between Cottonwood Heights City, Draper City, Midvale City, Murray City, Granite Police, Salt Lake City, Sandy City, South Jordan City, South Salt Lake City, City of Taylorsville, Unified Police Department, Utah Transit Authority, West Jordan City and West Valley City. Council part Morris Pratt **SECONDED** the motion. Chairman Pratt called for discussion on the motion. There being none, he called for a roll call vote. The vote was as follows: Barbour-yes, Pratt-yes, Rechtenbach-yes, Johnson-yes, and Catlin-yes. **All City Council members voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.**

20:44:14 Chairman Pratt directed the Council back to Agenda Item 6.1.1

**6.1.1 Continuation of: Ordinance No. 10-21 – Amending the Compensation Offered to Elected Officials, Statutory Officers, Appointive Officers, and Employees –
*John Inch Morgan***

20:44:21 Chairman Pratt explained how and why he drafted his recommendations for this Ordinance. He called for confirmation from Mayor Wall and City Administrator John Inch Morgan that under his recommendations, there are three positions that will not be restored to what they were previously. Mr. Morgan confirmed that the three positions that fall short of their previous wages are the Building Official, the Senior Planner, and the Public Works Inspector. He also noted that the Grade 9 suggested for the Human Resource Manager does not meet the City's contractual obligation. Chairman Pratt stated that he modified that position from a Grade 8 to a Grade 9, and although that does not meet the grade contracted for, it does restore the previous wage.

20:45:49 Mayor Wall stated his concern over changing the grade for the Human Resource Position, as a contractual agreement was made between that employee and Administration for the grade increase. He stated that, as Mayor, he believes he had authority to enter into that contract and implement that grade change. He cited a potential problem with a grievance.

20:46:12 Chairman Pratt noted the Mayor's concern.

20:46:38 Chairman Pratt stated that the City employees great people and that in preparing his proposal he did not look at individuals, but rather made comparisons with positions listed on the public salaries website. He said that he compared all four positions that are being impacted with

similar positions on the website and that is how he arrived at his proposal. He noted problems with the website in a lack of standardization in titles.

20:48:16 Mayor Wall said that a lack of standardization in titles is the root of the compensation problem. He said that job positions, titles, and pay grades are all subjective. He said there must be a process and someone with authority to determine what someone is actually worth within a reasonable range. The Mayor said that Administration has tried to do that. He said that bringing subjectivity into the public form is problematic because, although City Council Members do a great job in their legislative roles, they are not in a position to make a subjective decision regarding employee compensation. He said such decisions have already been done by supervisors who work with them everyday. Mayor Wall said that the Council has made a decision to set compensation in stone through use of an ordinance. He stated that he is not sure how the Council plans to repeal all the past ordinances, but said that issue can be considered at another time. He suggested that if the Council makes a subjective decision and overrides a subjective decision by another branch of government, there may be many problems.

20:49:40 Council Member Rechtenbach stated that he is not sure the public salary website is really relevant to what is being done in Taylorsville. He asked Chairman Pratt whether he compared all City positions on the website. Chairman Pratt indicated that he only compared the positions referenced. Council Member Rechtenbach said that the rationale for comparing only select positions to those on the public website is not applicable. He said that he is concerned about singling out certain positions for comparison, rather than looking at employees as a whole.

20:51:21 Chairman Pratt clarified that he looked at comparisons for all of the positions that had salaries/grades set back.

20:51:38 Council Member Barbour relayed that she has spent a lot of time on the Public Salary Website and did comparisons with four different cities with populations similar to Taylorsville, i.e. Layton, Murray, Bountiful, and St. George. She observed that many different titles are used and that makes it difficult to compare job duties and responsibilities. Ms. Barbour stated that Taylorsville employees have been asked to take on more with less which does blur the situation and makes it difficult to compare with other cities. She said that if comparisons are done, all positions should be compared because some are really out of line, in the other direction, i.e. Mayor, City Manager, etc. Council Member Barbour said her intent at this meeting is to try and bring all employees/positions whole and then give further consideration in the future.

20:54:12 Council Member Johnson referenced the salaries that were rolled back and stated reasons that he considers Exhibit A fair. He relayed that he has difficulty seeing a position jump by two grades. Council Member Johnson stated that the ordinance was violated by going over the maximum and that the bottom line amount of \$29,221.00 is the public's money. He stated

that this process was mismanaged and that people who were overpaid are still getting raises. He proposed that the Ordinance be adopted using Exhibits A and B.

20:55:47 Chairman Pratt stated his understanding that Council Members Rechtenbach and Barbour do not agree or approve of his comparison process, but said his intent was to simply state how he reached amounts on his proposal. He cited his frustration with trying to do something in a fair way. He agreed with Council Member Johnson that the ordinance was violated and that the Council has now come a long way.

20:56:26 Mayor Wall expressed his frustration with the term "mismanagement" and the phrase "ordinances violated." He suggested that if the City Council believes the law was broken, it should pursue it in that case instead of re-stating it at every meeting. He asked what specific criminal activity is being alleged. The Mayor asked Mr. Johnson what he specifically considers to have been mismanaged.

20:57:12 Council Member Johnson cited no fault of employees who took raises, but said someone should have known where the maximum ranges were. He stated that the Mayor and the City Administrator should have been aware of overpayments that began in 2008.

20:57:38 Mayor Wall agreed that the department director should have known, the City Administrator should have known, the Human Resource person should have known, the Mayor should have known, and the City Council should have known. He asked who should go to jail and said that if allegations of crimes being committed are continually made, then the City Council should follow through and file charges. He indicated that he is tired of hearing about it and reading about it in newspapers. Mayor Wall said that the issue should not be made a political one if it is legal problem.

20:58:26 Council Member Johnson recalled that the Mayor had admitted to a violation and said that was what he was referring to.

20:58:53 Mayor Wall clarified that he has admitted that statute requires that a salient change should be pointed out in a budget narrative. He said that the problem lies in the definition of the word "salient," and he does not consider the changes made to be salient.

20:58:29 Mayor Wall said that if five attorneys are hired, there would be five different opinions on the meaning of salient changes. He reiterated that if Council Members are going to keep saying that crimes have been committed, then they have a legal and moral obligation to pursue the matter. The Mayor said that he welcomes that direction if the Council desires, but believes it will cost a lot of money and be for naught.

20:59:21 Council Member Barbour reiterated her intent to make salaries whole and inquired whether that can be done by moving the Human Resource position by only one grade instead of two.

20:59:59 Mayor Wall explained that the 06-32 grade for the Human Resource position was a 9, but to match the current agreement that the city has with that employee, the grade needs to be an 11.

21:00:23 Mr. Morgan clarified that a Grade 10 would meet the current pay, but explained that both the pay and a Grade Change to an 11 were articulated in the City's agreement with the employee.

21:00:44 Mayor Wall said that there would still be damage to the employee by changing back to a Grade 10 because it restricts that employee's ability to expand if and when merit increases are awarded in the future. He explained that reducing the grade places the ceiling for that position at a lower amount than what was agreed upon in a written communication with the Mayor.

21:01:17 Chairman Pratt called for an alternate motion on Ordinance 06-32.

21:01:28 Council Member Catlin asked for clarification on changing the Human Resource position to a Grade 10. Mayor Wall said that a Grade 10 would allow the City to remain in compliance as far as pay, but there is a written agreement between the Mayor and that employee that the Human Resource position would be moved to a Grade 11. He suggested there will still be cause for a grievance.

21:01:27 Council Member Catlin said that because salaries are currently frozen for this budget year, that means there is no chance for an increase, the grade does not impact the agreement, and the employee is left whole. He stated that he is not comfortable with pay grades and would like time to work on them in the coming year. Mr. Catlin suggested that if Exhibit A is adopted with the changes discussed it would not have a negative effect on the employee.

21:03:51 Mayor Wall said that a "negative effect" may be in the eyes of the beholder. He stated that if he were in the referenced employee's position, he would say that the employee's capacity to earn more in their current position is being diminished, after a promise was given for a certain pay grade.

21:03:27 Council Member Barbour suggested that perhaps every employee has been placed in that position with a wage freeze. The Mayor said that if the economy picks up to the point that the Council wants to give every employee a raise, the Human Resource Manager would be prohibited in how much of a raise she could receive because she would be at the range ceiling, due to a grade roll-back.

21:06:05 Mayor Wall said the question could potentially be whether the employee trusts the City Council and the Administration to restore the grade when the economy gets better. He said that, while he cannot speak for that employee, he would personally be uncomfortable with that trust given the dialogue of the last few months.

21:09:35 Council Member Barbour cited a desire to keep grades consistent.

21:05:31 Inaudible conversation was held between Council Members, away from microphones, during the audible portion of discussion.

21:05:38 Mayor Wall reiterated his concern that there is a written agreement in place with this individual. He voiced his assumption that the person who signed the contract had the authority to do so. He suggested that the question be turned around and asked why is it problematic to leave the position at a Grade 11 if there is a salary freeze.

21:05:59 Council Member Barbour said it wouldn't hurt to move everyone up one grade if there is a salary freeze.

21:06:15 Mayor Wall cited thoughtful consideration given by Administration in awarding increases and stated that such increases were appropriate based on job performance and evaluations. He said Administration hasn't jumped up all employee salaries "willy nilly," but rather there is a method in the administrative process. He said that because there is a written agreement in place with the Human Resource Manager, a special consideration is presented.

21:06:57 Council Member Catlin inquired about the impact of Exhibit A on the other three positions referenced, i.e. Building Official, Senior Planner, and Building Official.

21:07:01 Chairman Pratt clarified that for those three positions the grades and salaries remain the same as the original Ordinance 06-32.

21:07:24 Chairman Pratt inquired about the Grade 12 assigned to the Public Works Inspector. Mr. Morgan agreed that the salary range is erroneously listed as a Grade 11 for the Public Works Inspector, but should be the Grade 12 range. Mr. Pratt clarified that his proposal lists the Public Works Inspector as a Grade 11 and Administration's proposal lists that position at a Grade 12, with a Grade 11 salary range. He relayed the Administration's intent to make the salary range a Grade 12 for the Public Works Inspector.

21:09:09 Inaudible conversations were conducted by Council Members at this time, away from the microphones.

21:09:05 Council Member Barbour inquired how many positions have employment contracts in place. Mayor Wall said that three employees have written agreements as to pay and pay grade, and the remaining employees have signed off with a supervisor and the City Administrator for a pay increase. He said that depending on the definition of a contract, the situation is problematic because a branch of government that has administrative duties and is designated to implement wage increases according to the City's Employment Policy has signed off on increases and then the legislative branch of government is stepping in to change that amount. He said that such action by the legislative branch may be considered a violation of a contract.

21:10:25 Chairman Pratt stated his point that he believes, based on legal advice the Council received, the ordinance is in effect. He said if Ordinance 06-32 is in effect, then the Administration entered into a contract that is contrary to an ordinance.

21:10:57 Mayor Wall described a point of disagreement between the two branches of government in that the Council believes that Ordinance 06-32 is the reigning ordinance and the Administration believes it is not.

21:11:11 Mayor Wall said that the purpose in presenting the subject ordinance tonight was to avoid dragging out the disagreement between branches of government and accumulating excessive attorney expenses. The Mayor said he would rather give monies to the employees than to attorneys.

21:12:20 Inaudible conversations were conducted by Council Members at this time, away from the microphones.

21:11:22 Council Member Barbour clarified that the written contracts are with the Economic Development Department Director position, the Human Resource Manager position, and the Executive Assistant to the Mayor. Mayor Wall explained that when extra duties were given to two employees after the elimination of the Mayor's Executive Assistant position, there was a need for complete understanding of job expectation. He noted that the City saved money through this change and has received what he considers a bargain in eliminating the full-time Executive Assistant position and assigning extra duties to two other employees for a slight increase in wages. The Mayor said that he signed a written memo prepared by the two employees concerned outlining their understanding of the negotiations at the time.

21:12:48 Inaudible conversations were being continued by Council Members at this time, away from the microphones.

21:10:40 Chairman Pratt inquired about any grievances that may be filed. Mayor Wall said that his recollection is that four grievances are currently filed. Upon request, City Recorder Cheryl Peacock Cottle confirmed that four grievances have been filed.

21:13:12 Chairman Pratt asked which positions grievances had been filed from.

21:13:12 Mayor Wall said that information would be better discussed in a Closed Session setting.

21:13:26 The City Attorney noted that a Closed Session has not been noticed and can only be held in an emergency or if the basis is of an urgent nature.

21:13:40 Council Member Barbour said it is relevant that grievances have been filed, but it is not relevant who has filed them or what positions they reflect. She stated the City needs to move on in order to deal with bigger concerns. She stated her realization that every dollar is important, but said in the context of the overall budget and the other work to be done, the amount in question is insignificant and the City needs to move on.

21:14:31 Council Member Barbour **MOVED** to Adopt Ordinance 10-21, using Exhibit 1, with the following changes: -- grade for Community Development Director set at 15; Grade for Human Resource Manager set at 10; the Police Chief position, the Assistant Police Chief position and the Code Enforcement Official position to be deleted from this document; and make the Executive Assistant/Grants Manager a Grade 13. She confirmed that her motion is the same as the earlier motion she made, except that the Human Resource Manager is being changed to a Grade 10. Council Member Rechtenbach **SECONDED** the motion. Council Member Barbour stated her intent to bring all salaries whole. Chairman Pratt restated the motion and it was agreed that the intent of the motion was to make the Ordinance retroactive to July 1, 2010. Mr. Pratt called for discussion. Council Member Johnson noted that this motion is closer to Exhibit A. Council Member Rechtenbach commented that his biggest concern is that the little difference left in this issue reflects a very small amount in the overall budget. He gave his opinion that it is time for the Council to compromise, pass a reasonable motion such as Council Member Barbour's, and move ahead. He said it should not be the Council's intent to penalize employees who were fairly evaluated and received fair compensation based on supervisors' determinations. He stated that the Council should honor those actions by Administration and move ahead. He reaffirmed his second of the motion. Chairman Pratt called for a roll-call vote. The vote was as follows: Barbour-yes, Pratt-no, Rechtenbach-yes, Johnson-no, and Catlin-no. **The motion failed with a 3 to 2 vote.**

21:19:36 Council Member Bud Catlin **MOVED** for the approval of Ordinance 10-21, using Exhibit A. He asked for clarification to confirm that he is correct in thinking that such action leaves everyone with the same salary. Council Members Barbour and Rechtenbach indicated that was not correct. Ms. Barbour noted that her previous motion did do such. Mr. Catlin confirmed that his motion includes approval using both Exhibits A & B, with a modification to Exhibit A to delete elected officials from the document. Council Member Johnson **SECONDED** the motion. Chairman Pratt called for discussion on the motion. He suggested adding a Judicial

Assistant to the position list at a Grade 6. Mr. Catlin amended his motion to include the Judicial Assistant at Grade 6. Mr. Johnson reaffirmed his second. Council Member Barbour clarified her understanding that this motion does not make the salaries whole. Chairman Pratt affirmed that to be correct. Council Member Rechtenbach inquired whether it was the intent of Mr. Catlin's motion to single out the three people whose salaries will not be made whole. Mr. Catlin relayed his recall that the Mayor said that those were made in error. Mr. Morgan and Mayor Wall clarified that two were in error. There being no further discussion, Chairman Pratt called for a roll-call vote. The vote was as follows: Barbour-no, Pratt-yes, Rechtenbach-no, Johnson-yes, and Catlin-yes. **All City Council members voted and the motion passed with a 3 to 2 vote.**

NEW ITEMS FOR SUBSEQUENT CONSIDERATION (No Action)

21:24:25 Chairman Pratt asked City Administrator John Inch Morgan to provide a matrix on Police Department compensation for Council consideration at the City Council Meeting scheduled for July 21, 2010. Mr. Morgan agreed to do so and confirmed that there are no changes in police salary ranges. He indicated that the only changes to the police matrix will be addition of the three aforementioned positions.

8. NOTICE OF FUTURE PUBLIC MEETINGS (NEXT MEETING)

21:25:00

- 9.1 **City Council Work Session – Wednesday, July 14, 2010 – 6:00 p.m.**
- 9.2 **City Council Briefing Session – Wednesday, July 21, 2010 – 6:00 p.m.**
- 9.3 **City Council Meeting – Wednesday, July 21, 2010 – 6:30 p.m.**
- 9.4 **City Council Briefing Session – Wednesday, August 4, 2010 – 6:00 p.m.**
- 9.5 **City Council Meeting – Wednesday, August 4, 2010 – 6:30 p.m.**

9. CALENDAR OF UPCOMING EVENTS

21:26:04

- 10.1 **Crime Prevention Night – Thursday, July 29, 2010 – 7:00 p.m. – Taylorsville City Council Chambers – The program will be presented by the Taylorsville Police Department and will feature information about texting, fraud/identity theft, internet bullying, and social websites. Contact Donna Pittman, Public Safety Committee Chair at 801-968-6640.**
- 10.2 **General CERT Meeting – Thursday, August 19, 2010 – 7:00 p.m. – Taylorsville City Council Chambers – Anyone who has had CERT (Community Emergency Response Team) training and would like to become involved in our local program is invited to attend. The meetings consist of mini-refreshers on different aspects of CERT. The meetings will be held the third Thursday of each month in the Council Chambers, except for July and December. For more information contact Lisa Schwartz at 801-955-2092.**

- 10.3 Community Yard Sale – Saturday, August 28, 2010 – 8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. – Hosted by the Taylorsville Youth Council, reserve your spot today. Spaces are \$20 for a parking spot size area. Contact Jessica at 801-963-5400 or jspringer@taylorsvilleut.gov for more information.**

10. ADJOURNMENT

21:26:12 Council Member Bud Catlin **MOVED** to adjourn the City Council Meeting. Council Member Larry Johnson **SECONDED** the motion. Chairman Pratt called for discussion. There being none, he called for a vote. The vote was as follows: Barbour-yes, Pratt-yes, Rechtenbach-yes, Johnson-yes, and Catlin-yes. **All City Council members voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:26 p.m.



Cheryl Peacock Cottle, City Recorder

Minutes approved: CC 07-21-10

Minutes Prepared by: Cheryl Peacock Cottle, City Recorder