

SMITHFIELD CITY COUNCIL

NOVEMBER 12, 2014

The Smithfield City Council met in a regularly scheduled meeting at 96 South Main Street, Smithfield, Utah on Wednesday, November 12, 2014. The meeting began at 6:03 P.M. and Mayor Darrell G. Simmons was in the chair.

The following council members were in attendance: Dennis Watkins, Barbara Kent, Kris Monson, Jeff Barnes and Brent Buttars.

City Manager James Gass and City Recorder Justin Lewis were also in attendance.

The opening remarks were made by Kris Monson.

VISITORS: Kelly Cannon (The Herald Journal), Whitnee Lewis, Megan Kidd, Jessie Knight, Kaitlin Hall, Lindsey Marchant, Josh Von, Jeff Curtis, Glen Jay Thornley, Travis Taylor, Ian Woodward, Smithfield 12th Ward Webelos, Wade Lindley, Chantel Garza, Mattee Robinson, Andy Archibald, Kade Archibald, Darin Fristrup (UDOT), Marty Geddes, Garrett Geddes, Jeff Jackson, Mike Kidman, Esterlee Molyneux, Ron Roskelley, Spencer Gunn

APPROVAL OF THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 22, 2014 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

A motion to approve the city council meeting minutes from the October 22, 2014 city council meeting was made by Dennis, seconded by Barbara and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Watkins, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Buttars
No Vote: None

RESIDENT INPUT

Spencer Gunn came before the council to discuss concerns he has with the article in the Herald Journal regarding future purchases of vehicles for the police department. Mr. Gunn remarked he believes the Smithfield Police Department has nicer vehicles than the Cache County Sheriff's Office. The \$8,000 spent on repairs in the last year is quite minimal in Mr. Gunn's opinion. Mr. Gunn asked for clarification on the warranty on the vehicles as in the Herald Journal it stated the warranty was for 500,000 miles. Mr. Gunn stated he works for GSA and does not believe the information that was presented stating a new police car could be purchased for \$26,000 and sold two years later for \$28,000 was accurate. In Mr. Gunn's line of business he believes the used police cars will only be worth 1/3 of the purchase price when it is time to sell them.

Mayor Simmons informed those in attendance the city is just looking at possible options to replace vehicles in the future and no contracts have been signed or vehicles purchased. The discussion was for informational purposes only at the last council meeting.

Jim stated it was just an introduction to the council at the last council meeting for the council to consider as another option for the future. Other communities are doing the two year vehicle rollover program, mostly on trucks, and it is working well for them.

Mayor Simmons thanked Mr. Gunn for his thoughts and advised him the issue will be discussed again in the future when it is time to purchase new vehicles for the city.

DISCUSSION WITH A REPRESENTATIVE OF UDOT ON A SPEED STUDY CONDUCTED ON 100 NORTH FROM MAIN STREET TO 800 WEST.

Darin Fristrup the Region Traffic Operations Manager for Region 1 of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) came before the council to discuss a recent speed study that was completed on 100 North from Main Street to 400 West and from 400 West to 800 West.

Darin thanked the council for the opportunity to come back before them after having the recent speed study completed. The speed limit on 100 North or as UDOT refers to it as State Road 218 (SR218) was recently changed to 35 miles per hour from Main Street to 400 West and to 45 miles per hour from 400 West to 800 West based on the 85th percentile in the speed survey which is administered per State of Utah law. State of Utah law requires the speed limit to be within 5 miles per hour above or below the 85th percentile of the speed study.

Darin stated after reviewing the speed study and with the concern of the council the speed limit on SR218 from 400 West to 800 West had been reduced back to 40 miles per hour from 45 miles per hour. The speed limit on SR218 from Main Street to 400 West had been left at 35 miles per hour.

The first speed study from the spring of 2014 showed the 85th percentile from Main Street to 400 West to be 36 miles per hour and 37 miles per hour respectively. The new speed study with the speed limit adjusted to 35 miles per hour showed the 85th percentile to now be 39 miles per hour; an increase of 3 miles per hour but still falling within the allowable 5 miles per hour range.

Kris informed Darin she has driven SR218 several times since the last council meeting when it was discussed and she had paid attention to the signs and she believes other drivers do as well. Kris based her comment on the fact that the 85th percentile had jumped three miles per hour when the speed limit was increased from 30 miles per hour to 35 miles per hour. The road is small with no shoulder and there are constantly children playing in the area. What the speed limit sign states is what people will drive according to Kris. A higher speed limit means people will driver faster.

Kris requested a new speed study be done in the summer of 2015 when the road is used more frequently for summer activities. Darin remarked a new study can be done in the late spring or early summer.

Barbara asked for clarification of where the study showed people were driving 39 miles per hour. Darin remarked in the area from Main Street to 400 West.

Barbara asked if a new speed study was completed from 400 West to 800 West? Darin responded surveys were done in both sections. The one location from 400 West to 800 West showed the 85th percentile to be 43 miles per hour which was below the posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour. The other location showed the 85th percentile to be 49 miles per hour.

Darin also informed the council that after the previous speed study in the spring of 2014 the speed limit had not been changed west of 800 West from 55 miles per hour and the new 85th percentile showed an increase of three miles per hour between speed studies. Darin recommended a new study be done next year in that area of SR218 as well.

Barbara reminded Darin SR218 has subdivisions, Forrester Acres, a trailer park and a church on the road. The road can be very unsafe. Having the speed limit at 45 miles per hour is encouraging faster driving and 40 miles per hour would be safer. The state is not specific on how these other factors outside of the 85th percentile are included.

Barbara asked Darin for clarification on a percentage of how much these other factors such as sight distance, shoulder of the road, etc. are included in the determination of the speed on a road? Darin stated a field review is completed and engineering judgments are made at that time.

Barbara asked if there is a percentage that is taken into account in the speed determination? Darin stated there is not.

Barbara reminded Darin there is not a shoulder on the road and limited sidewalk in the area. Barbara asked what the city can do to help make sure the observational point of views are included? Darin stated the council can work with UDOT and talk about what is going on; specifically on that section of road.

Kris expressed frustration that now the speed limit is higher people are driving faster. The study needs to be redone with the old speed limit during the summer when the road is the busiest. Darin responded the first study was done with the old speed limit in place and people were driving six to seven miles per hour over the posted speed limit of 40 miles per hour. Kris asked if Darin was referring to the spring 2014 speed study? Darin stated that was correct; the March 2014 speed study. Kris remarked the road is not nearly as busy in March.

Barbara remarked a higher speed limit on the road from Main Street to 800 West is not in the best interests of the city and its residents. Maybe beyond 800 West it is fine but in the city limits the speed limit needs to be slower on SR218.

Barbara asked if the speed limit can be posted based on the other considerations of the road and not just the 85th percentile? Darin stated it could help using the lower number of the 85th percentile but the speed limit must be five miles per hour above or below the 85th percentile per State of Utah law.

Kris requested another speed study to be completed in the summer of 2015. Darin stated another one could be done next summer but it is a random selection process on the dates of the study and no specific date could be guaranteed.

Barbara asked Darin if the speed limit from Main Street to 400 West could be lowered back to 30 miles per hour until the next speed study is completed in the summer of 2015? Darin said he would review the area and see if it is possible.

Barbara remarked people will drive faster when they see a higher speed limit posted. Darin remarked that studies show raising the speed limit five miles per hour does not mean people will automatically drive five miles per hour faster. In this case the speed limit only changed three miles per hour and not five. The original speed study showed people were going six to seven miles per hour faster than the posted speed limit.

Barbara informed Darin she has discussed the issue with several people residing in the area and most of them did not realize the speed limit had changed. Darin responded that is because people are already driving the speed they think is reasonable.

Barbara asked for the speed limit to be reduced back to 30 miles per hour and stated it might be needed by the council to go to local legislators and let them know that more consideration needs to be given to the observation factors than just the 85th percentile. Darin stated that people driving at 36 and 37 miles per hour when the speed limit is posted at 30 miles per hour has nothing to do with UDOT and it is just a fact they are driving at that speed already.

Barbara stated both speed limit areas should be reduced five miles per hour. Jim remarked the speed limit from 400 West to 800 West was previously 40 miles per hour and had been reduced back to 40 miles per hour.

Kris asked Barbara is she was asking for the 40 miles per hour from 400 West to 800 West be reduced to 35 miles per hour? Barbara stated that was correct as there are apartments, a trailer park and lots of multi-family units in that area as well as a school. Darin remarked that studies show even when an area shows significant growth people still drive a reasonable speed and that is why the 85th percentile is used.

Barbara asked what it would take to reduce the speed limit to 35 miles per hour from 400 West to 800 West? Darin stated the 85th percentile would have to be between 35 and 40 miles per hour.

Jim asked for clarification on how long a speed study lasts? Twenty four hours? Forty eight hours? Darin said normally the counters are used in sections for four to five hours each but they could be used in certain places for two or three days if needed. The law dictates where, when and how long the study is done in a certain area.

Barbara asked if bicyclists are counted in the study? Darin said only if manually monitored and entered.

Jeff asked Darin for the speed study results going east and west separately? Darin remarked for the current study it just did an average and did not separate the directions. Jeff remarked that people coming in from the west are already going 55 miles per hour and will take a greater distance to decrease their speed where going from Main Street to the west people are already driving at a slower rate of speed.

Brent informed Darin another struggle is that all of the city owned streets are 25 miles per hour and this road is significantly higher.

Mayor Simmons remarked a big concern of the council is they felt they should have been involved in this process and they were not and even Darin acknowledged that at the October council meeting. Mayor Simmons asked Darin if the council can be more involved and have better dialogue with UDOT in the future? Darin agreed it is needed and necessary. Darin also stated that is another reason he asked to come back before the council so soon after the recent speed study was completed; to show that UDOT wants to work with city.

Mayor Simmons asked why the study was done in the spring? Darin remarked all state owned roads have a speed study done every three to five years. A lower speed limit does not mean people will drive slower.

Mayor Simmons asked if any speed studies are done with a patrol officer on the road being monitored? Darin stated that is one reason the speed studies are done randomly is so the numbers are not artificial in the study.

Darin gave an example of 1000 West in Logan and while a speed study was being done the Logan Police Department monitored the road more closely and the 85th percentile still did not change.

Mayor Simmons remarked the council wants to abide by the law but feels the human element needs to be given more credibility than the 85th percentile.

Glen Jay Thornley apologized to Darin for being so harsh on him at the last council meeting and thanked the council for their efforts in continuing to review this situation.

Glen Jay reminded Darin the governor is spending money on advertising and asking the State of Utah residents to help be part of the "Zero Fatalities" program but at the same time UDOT is increasing the speed limit and causing the area to be more dangerous.

Mayor Simmons thanked Darin for coming before the council and asked him for continued cooperation in the future as the area is reviewed.

CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST BY TRAVIS TAYLOR, AGENT FOR SMITHFIELD RIDGES, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF PHASE 8 (10 LOTS) OF THE FINAL PLAN FOR SMITHFIELD RIDGES PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 600 SOUTH 1085 EAST. ZONED R-1-12 (P.U.D.) COMBINED SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL/PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY ZONE.

Travis Taylor, agent for Smithfield Ridges, came before the council to discuss Phase 8 of the Smithfield Ridges subdivision.

Travis informed the council that Phase 8 is the next phase of the project. The next phase requires 600 South to be extended up to the next intersection to the east. Phase 8 consists of ten lots and is in accordance with the current overall plan the council has previously approved; according to Travis.

Jim remarked the new road will be 65 to 72 feet wide and all of the lots meet the 10,000 square foot minimum.

Kris asked if all of the lots would have homes on them? Travis stated that was correct.

Jim informed the council there are four new homes being built right now in the current phase and the next phase would be just to the east of these homes. Phase 8 is in compliance with the overall approved plan. City attorney Bruce Jorgensen has reviewed the plan extensively and all of the conditions have been met. The planning commission has reviewed and approved of the phase as well.

Brent asked if there will be another phase to the east of Phase 8 with narrow lots as well? Travis stated that was correct and in accordance with the overall approved plan.

Barbara asked if the new road would be a public road? Travis stated that is correct.

Mayor Simmons commented it has been a good project and Travis has been good to work with during the process.

Travis informed the council the project was started at a bad time in the economy and the original group of investors only had enough money to start the project but not to continue it. In the last six to nine months the investors have been bought out and now Smithfield Ridges, LLC is in total control of the project.

A motion to approve Phase 8, 10 lots, of the final plan for the Smithfield Ridges Planned Unit Development located at approximately 600 South 1085 East was made by Jeff, seconded by Kris and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Watkins, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Buttars

No Vote: None

APPEAL BY CHRIS BIGGS FOR THE DENIAL OF A KENNEL LICENSE BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A KENNEL PERMIT FOR FOUR (4) DOGS LOCATED AT 200 SUMMIT DRIVE. ZONED R-1-12.

Chris informed the council he had a document that he had just brought to the council meeting that he would like the council members to review.

Mayor Simmons asked how important this document was in regards to his appeal request? Chris responded it was very important. Mayor Simmons remarked the council had not had a chance to review the new document and Chris might want to consider rescheduling his request at a later time so the council would have a chance to review it. Chris remarked he obtained the information in the document from city and state code and had talked to Elliott Lawrence who works for the Office of Property Rights for the State of Utah and is the ombudsman.

Chris stated he did not want to go to court on this issue but has rights as well.

Mayor Simmons commented if the document is critical the council cannot make a good decision by just speed reading it. Mayor Simmons asked Chris if he wanted to proceed knowing the document had not been reviewed by the council or if he wanted to reschedule to a future meeting? Chris stated he wanted to move forward right now.

Chris informed the council he is trying to get a kennel license and was denied without a reason or a list of things he needed to do. The planning commission had not offered any guidance on what to fix in their denial. After reviewing the law a conditional use permit should be granted and it can have conditions attached to it Chris remarked. Chris stated he has four dogs and his property size is over 10,000 square feet and he does not have any dogs that are in the restricted breed category. The permit should not be denied. The Cache County Assessor's office shows the property to be 10,054.4 square feet.

Chris advised the council, if they were not aware, that all breed specific regulations are gone per changes in state law on January 1, 2015.

Mayor Simmons asked Chris if he had four dogs? Chris stated that was correct.

Dennis asked if all of the dogs were currently licensed? Chris remarked that two of the four are licensed.

Chris stated the council had previously told him to install a fence and so he spent \$5,000 to \$7,000 and installed a fence in trying to help out the situation. The council never gave him a to-do list of what needed to be done.

Dennis asked Chris if he had a dog run? Chris stated he does and it is located on the back side of the garage. Chris then drew a picture of the location of the dog run in relation to his home and showed the council.

Dennis and Barbara asked Chris if he knew how far the dog run was from the neighbor's fence? Chris responded he thought it was 10 to 20 feet or so.

Jim mentioned he had been to the area and the dog run is actually a fixed kennel with a dog house in it.

Barbara asked how big the dog run/kennel is? Chris stated he thought it was 10 feet by 10 feet or so.

Brent remarked city code requires a kennel to be located so many feet from the neighbor's house, property line and other requirements. Chris responded a fixed dog run is only required in the city code if a specific breed of dog is present.

Dennis informed Chris he was making a mistake by not allowing the council time to review the document he had just presented. Jeff stated in fact the document could not at all be considered since there had not been a chance to thoroughly review it. Dennis stated the document should be read by the council and researched. Mayor Simmons suggested to Chris to come back to another council meeting so all of the information could be reviewed. Chris stated that is hard for him to do as he has Tuesdays off but works from 10:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. the rest of the week. Justin remarked he would work with Chris to put him at a point in the council meeting where it would not conflict with his work schedule.

Barbara stated the city cannot vary from the city ordinance.

Brent suggested to Chris that he repair his fence before he comes back the next time. Chris responded that Jim had shown him a couple of broken posts and an area of the fence that needed to be repaired.

Brent asked how the wood planks were secured on the fence? Chris stated that originally they were held on with one inch staples but now they are held on with 1 1/4" staples or screws. They have to be tugged on hard to get them to pull off. Brent responded he had been to the area the previous day and the one plank he touched was quite loose. Jim stated he was also aware that several times golf course workers had gone over and screwed several of the planks back on the fence that had fallen off onto the golf course.

Mayor Simmons asked if the dogs need to be licensed? Jim stated it is a requirement of the city. Chris is aware of it and was reminded about it within the last couple of weeks according to Jim. Chris is also aware he cannot have more than two dogs at his location but he has not complied for over a year and is aware he cannot have more than two on the premise until the kennel license is approved.

Chris remarked he had read the city code and as long as the dogs were not on the premise more than six months per year there was not an issue. Jim stated that only applied to puppies after they were born.

Mayor Simmons asked to have Char attend the next council meeting in behalf of the planning commission. Chris remarked he wanted Frank Keepers and Animal Control Officer Denton Call in attendance as well as Frank had told him that it was not an issue to keep the dogs on the property while the process of getting a kennel license was happening. Mayor Simmons advised Chris to quit looking for loopholes in the city ordinance and to review it and comply. Jim suggested to Chris if he had any questions he is more than welcome to come in and try and get them resolved before the next council meeting.

Brent asked Chris to work with the city and be a good neighbor. Right now all of the neighbors are unhappy in talking with them about the situation. Chris responded he has been specifically told by his neighbors they don't want any dogs in that neighborhood and that is their issue. Jeff disagreed with Chris and stated their issue is not having dogs but the issue is having more than two dogs as he had visited with some of the residents of that area. Brent also mentioned to Chris if the dogs did not bark and the area did not stink of feces the neighbors would not notice the dogs.

Chris asked Brent if the dogs barked when he was up there the previous day? Brent responded that they did when they could hear him walking across the dry leaves. Chris stated the dogs are not constantly barking and he had contacted the police department and there had only been one noise complaint against him in the last year and that was in August. There were not any complaints for the dogs getting out. Brent informed Chris the neighbors might not be calling to make official complaints but they were calling the city staff and coming into the meetings to complain. Chris stated that Paul Thomas had got up and complained about the barking at the planning commission meeting but when specifically asked by a member of the planning commission when the barking occurred Paul stated it was not recent.

Chris informed the council he is not the only one in the area with dogs and other dogs in the neighborhood bark as well. There is an option to purchase shock collars that would keep the dogs from barking even when he is not home Chris informed the council.

Barbara informed Chris she had been up by his residence between 4:00 and 4:30 P.M. before the council meeting and the dogs barked at her and barked at the neighbors walking around in their yards. The fence is in a much better condition than the previous year but it is leaning and in disrepair on the east side and needs to be fixed. Chris stated the east fence is a preexisting fence and Jim had pointed out a couple of areas that need to be fixed on that section of fence.

Barbara asked if the fence had been removed from the city property? Jim stated that was correct the fence had been relocated on the south side.

Justin stated he would work with Chris to get him on the December 10th council meeting at a time that would work with his work schedule.

Jeff reminded Chris the fence does not stop the barking and smell of feces and the problem was so bad over the summer a neighbor could not enjoy his backyard because of it. Chris remarked he had video evidence of the neighbor mowing his yard and the dogs not barking. Jeff responded

they had barked at him when he was in the area and they could not even see him but they have a presence to know when people are around. Chris invited Jeff and the council to come up and see the area and they can observe the dogs do not have bark collars on them and they don't bark at the neighbors or people on the golf course.

Barbara asked Chris if someone could take two of the dogs while he applied for the kennel license? Chris stated he had done this previously and one of the dogs had died and he had done it again recently and his dog had been attacked and was now home recovering.

Barbara reminded Chris that he is only allowed to have two until he gets a permit for four. Chris remarked the two outside dogs are licensed but the two inside dogs are not registered.

Chris expressed frustration in trying to comply and continuing to be denied when the license should be granted even if it has conditions attached to it. Chris stated he had spent thousands of dollars and still did not have a kennel permit.

Kris asked the age of the dogs? Chris responded one was seven months, another 2 ½ and two were just over three years of age.

Kris asked Chris if he had replaced one of the dogs in the last year since the kennel permit was denied? Chris stated that was correct; he has one new dog since that time.

Barbara informed Chris she was very frustrated with him continuing not to comply. The ordinance states only two dogs are allowed without a kennel license and Chris continues to disobey the law. One of the dogs dies and Chris replaced the dog with another one knowing he was not complying with city ordinance. Barbara stressed to Chris he needs to work better with the city and come into compliance.

Jim reminded Chris the council and members of the staff have asked him to do certain things and yet he is continually not in compliance and has made no effort to come into compliance. Chris responded by saying the statute states the kennel permit should be granted with conditions. Jeff reminded Chris there are no guarantees in the city code a kennel license will be granted. Jim reminded Chris he was well aware he could not have four dogs at his residence and could only have two but for the last year he continued to be non-compliant with no effort to come into compliance.

AUDIT REPORT PRESENTATION BY JONES SIMKINS, LLC FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 2013 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2014.

Mike Kidman from the accounting firm of Jones Simkins, LLC reported the findings of the recent financial audit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2014.

Mike reported to the council he was happy with how the audit had been done and was happy the report was completed in November and not December. The current report issued to the council was a draft copy and the final report numbers won't change but the firm is reviewing all of the

quality control issues in the document to make sure they are correct before the final report is issued to the city and state.

Pages one through three detail the standards, controls and compliance issues that are dealt with during the course of the audit.

Mike informed the council the document titled “Management’s Discussion and Analysis” is a short version of the entire audit document with a quicker understanding of the financials in a condensed form.

The government activities and highlights section details what happened in the last fiscal year and Jim had done an excellent job in preparing the document for the audit.

Mike informed the council the audit is prepared in several different ways for different groups to review certain numbers. One way is a business type perspective and another way is a budgetary perspective.

Page 17 is a “Statement of Net Position” and the council reviewed the information.

Page 18, a “Statement of Activities” was reviewed. A negative change in Net Position means the city is not bringing in enough funds to cover the costs of running the city and a positive Net Position means the city was able to put some funds into reserve for future years. The city had a positive Net Position.

Pages 19 and 21 list all of the Special Revenue Funds and the information on each of them. All of the funds are in relative good position and being managed well.

Page 23 shows the proprietary funds; water, sewer, storm water and golf and they are all funds that are run like a business. Fees are charged to cover the costs of running the fund.

Page 24 shows more information on the proprietary funds and the main item to look at is “Operating income (loss)”. Having a negative one year is not a problem but having a negative for several years is a problem. The issue with running a negative is this means that the city is not setting aside enough funds for the future to replace buildings and big infrastructure projects and be able to pay them off at the start and therefore a loan or bond is required. Interest rates have been low for several years but will increase over time. Mike commented all of the funds are in reasonable shape. Golf is marginal but has been for a very long time.

Page 25 is a “Statement of Cash Flows” for the proprietary funds and was discussed.

Page 45 is where the “Notes to Financial Statements” start. This section shows the amount of debt paid off, any new debt that is incurred and the debt schedule for future years.

Page 51 shows changes in net position for the RDA fund, Debt Service fund, Park Impact Fee fund, Law Enforcement state liquor law fund, Class "C" Roads fund and the library expansion project.

Page 57 shows the funds based on a budgetary perspective. Mike pointed out the State Auditor is extremely interested in monitoring RDA funds and transit districts. In the past the money collected in behalf of the transit district for a city has never been shown on the financials but the state auditor now wants it included even though the city never receives the money as it is passed directly to the transit district. Budgetary controls are working and there was only a slight negative in the sewer fund.

Page 73 starts the discussion on controls and compliance. The city is lacking in certain internal controls which mainly consists of a lack of documentation. More processes need to be documented not just verbally known. Mike informed the council that almost all small municipalities are lacking in this regard as the city just does not have enough staff to handle all of the documentation requests. The city could consider hiring a consulting firm to help with these documents and processes. Overall the processes are pretty good and not bad enough to be considered a serious weakness.

Mike informed the council that transfers from fund to fund are a big topic and being monitored closely by the State Auditor's office.

Dennis asked if that was the case with loans from fund to fund as well? Mike responded not as much as transfers as long as the city has a document listing the loan amount, interest rate and repayment terms.

Dennis asked if there were any issues in doing loans from fund to fund? Mike commented there is not a problem as long as the proper procedure is followed in notifying the public as required and having a loan document in place.

Mike said the main concern in regards to transfers from the general fund and to the general fund is that it gives false numbers to the property tax rate and utility rates. Property tax rates might be subsidizing enterprise fund rates or enterprise fund rates might be subsidizing property tax rates.

Mike mentioned that Logan City and the State Auditor's Office agree to disagree on the transfers and are constantly battling over them as Logan transfers money each year from the enterprise funds. The state wants the enterprise funds to only charge the amount needed to run them not to profit off of them and transfer funds to all of the other enterprise funds or general fund.

Mike said the auditor's office is following Logan's every move to make sure they do not miss any step in the process until it changes as they don't agree with how Logan is transferring so much money on a yearly basis.

Jeff asked for clarification on the negative in the golf course of \$88,000? Is there actually depreciation on the assets? Mike mentioned where it is an enterprise fund all of the equipment

and building is depreciated on a monthly basis even if the value of the building does not change. It is a government requirement in regards to depreciation on proprietary funds.

Jeff asked for clarification on the building depreciating? Jim remarked all assets are depreciated on a straight line basis over the number of allowable years. Mike explained that all golf courses in Utah are dealing with financial issues and how to operate them financially. Jim remarked the golf course is doing everything it can to pay operation and maintenance costs and has not been able to put away money for future capital projects. Mike said the offset of not putting money away for the future is that future large projects will have to be financed entirely. Jim mentioned that is what happened with the current golf course clubhouse building.

Mayor Simmons informed Mike he hoped the city had supplied all of the necessary information in a timely manner. Mike thanked Justin and Jim for their efforts in supplying all of the information as the audit had gone smoothly and that with Justin assisting with the audit that the to-do list of the audit had decreased from previous years.

Justin thanked Mike for having employees in his staff that were very accommodating and good to work with. They are doing a job but at the same time they are reasonable in their requests and always give ample time for the information to be gathered and collected.

PUBLIC HEARING ON POSSIBLY VACATING A RIGHT-OF-WAY AREA LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CROW MOUNTAIN ROAD (600 EAST) AND UPPER CANYON ROAD.

Jim reminded the council this discussion is on the area where the road used to curve onto Upper Canyon Road from Crow Mountain Road but the curve had been removed and a new road installed when the subdivision was created.

Jim showed the council a Google Earth view from 1993 showing the old road and another view from today showing the new road.

Jeff asked if the old road had been removed? Jim stated the asphalt had been removed and it is just gravel at this time.

****The public hearing was opened at 8:02 P.M.****

There were not any comments from the public.

****The public hearing closed at 8:04 P.M.****

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON THE VACATING OF A RIGHT-OF-WAY AREA LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF CROW MOUNTAIN ROAD (600 EAST) AND UPPER CANYON ROAD.

Jim informed the council the vacating of the right-of-way is handled through creating a city ordinance.

A motion to adopt Ordinance 14-06, AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND ABANDONING APPROXIMATELY ONE HUNDREDY SEVENTY FIVE (175) FEET OF 600 EAST (CROW MOUNTAIN ROAD) RIGHT-OF-WAY AREA NEAR THE INTERSECTION WITH UPPER CANYON ROAD, was made by Kris, seconded by Dennis and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Watkins, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Buttars

No Vote: None

Jim informed the council the property would go back into the name of the owner; Jessica Tams Quinton.

DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON RESOLUTION 14-10, A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE ANNEXATION REQUEST BY JESSICA TAMS QUINTON FOR CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY UNDER PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 10-2-403 AND 10-2-405, UTAH CODE ANNOTATED, 1995, AS AMENDED FOR PARCEL NUMBERS: 08-045-0035 AND 08-045-0022.

Justin informed the council that Jessica Tams Quinton had filed a Petition for Annexation with the city for two parcels of property she owns; parcel numbers 08-045-0035 and 08-045-0022. Jessica had submitted the petition, paid the fee and submitted the plat map as well.

Justin stated he had notified the appropriate departments at the county of the request and they have thirty days to respond with any issues or concerns. After the petition is accepted, the planning commission will review the request, the request will be certified by the council, an advertisement will be published for three days over three weeks and then eventually there will be a public hearing and possible vote at that time.

Jeff asked if this property boarded the Archibald property that is being considered for a subdivision on the east side of Crow Mountain Road? Justin stated that was correct.

Barbara asked if the property fit into the master plan? Jim stated it does fall within the annexation declaration area and the property is surrounded by the city on three sides.

Mayor Simmons asked if the property would come into the city zoned A-10 (Agricultural 10 Acre)? Jim stated that was correct and then the property owner could make the request for a rezone at that time.

Jeff asked if there will be an access road to this property through the Archibald property? Jim stated the proposal from the Archibald's shows an access road but there are not any preliminary plans for the Quinton property yet. Jeff Jackson stated there would be an access road between the farthest north lot and the lot just to the south of that lot to the Quinton property.

Jim stated the petition is the first step in the annexation process.

A motion to adopt Resolution 14-10, A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE PETITION FOR ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 10-2-403 AND 10-2-405, UTAH CODE ANNOTATED, 1995, AS AMENDED, for parcels 08-045-0035 and 08-045-0022 was made by Dennis, seconded by Brent and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Watkins, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Buttars

No Vote: None

PUBLIC HEARING ON ORDINANCE 14-02, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMITHFIELD CITY ZONING REGULATIONS, TITLE 17: 17.01.070: "DEFINITIONS"; 17.12.100 "EXCEPTIONS TO HEIGHT LIMITATIONS"; 17.36.060 "PERMITTED SIGNS, PERMITS NOT REQUIRED"; AND 17.120.010 "USE ALLOWANCE MATRIX".

Jim reminded the council the proposed ordinance had been discussed at the last council meeting and was changed to adding for stealth antennas and a couple of other items. Justin informed the council per their request the dog and cat section had been removed and would be discussed at a future date. Splash Pad wording had been added as well per the request of the city council.

Jim stated that the ordinance would make it so that stealth antennas are legal, some changes to flagpole height and restrictions such as no higher than 35 feet in a residential area or 60 feet in a commercial area. As it is currently written the ordinance would allow for flagpoles over 60 feet tall but a conditional use permit would be required.

Barbara asked if the airport had control of certain height restrictions in their flyway area? Jim stated that was correct and their area covers the entire city.

Jim stated that setbacks had been added and the number of allowable flag poles on one property would be limited to three or less.

Dennis asked if the flag on top of the Smithfield Implement building would be above 60 feet? Jim stated it would not. Dennis then remarked he did not think it was necessary to include language allowing for a conditional use permit for above 60 feet as 60 feet is ample height.

Jim informed the council most power poles are 40 feet tall and the tall steel power poles are 60 feet tall. The tops of the pine trees in Central Park are over 60 feet tall as the city boom truck cannot reach the top of those trees and it extends to 60 feet.

After review by the council it was determined that allowing for flagpoles in residential areas had not been included in the ordinance.

Dennis state he had a flagpole at his home and was not sure why the residential areas were not included. Justin asked the council to make sure flagpoles are included as for many citizens and especially veterans the flag has such meaning it should be allowed.

Mayor Simmons informed the council the Macey's store flagpole is 120 feet tall.

The consensus of the council was to allow for flagpoles in residential areas as well as commercial areas.

****The public hearing was opened at 8:27 P.M.****

Esterlee Molyneux stated she felt it was appropriate for flagpoles to be allowed in residential areas as well as commercial areas.

****The public hearing was closed at 8:30 P.M.****

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON ORDINANCE 14-02.

The council asked Jim to add the residential areas to the area of the ordinance allowing for flagpoles.

****A motion to approve Ordinance 14-02, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMITHFIELD ZONING REGULATIONS, TITLE 17: 17.04.070: "DEFINITIONS"; 17.12.100: "EXCEPTIONS TO HEIGHT LIMITATIONS"; 17.36.060: PERMITTED SIGNS; "PERMITS NOT REQUIRED"; AND 17.120.010: "USE ALLOWANCE MATRIX" was made by Jeff, seconded by Kris and the vote was unanimous.****

Yes Vote: Watkins, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Buttars

No Vote: None

CHILD & FAMILY SUPPORT CENTER TO UPDATE THE CITY COUNCIL ON THE PURCHASE OF A BUILDING AT 502 SOUTH MAIN.

Esterlee Molyneux came before the council to update the council on the recent acquisition of a facility at 502 South Main by the Child and Family Support Center.

Esterlee informed the council the center was established in 1982 and is focused on family and children. A crisis nursery is available, help for people with terminal illnesses, help for those needing assistance while they have an emergency medical procedure, or help when parents just need a break from their children. Parenting education for first time parents and for families that have step children is available as well. There are also children education programs like the

“Good Touch, Bad Touch” program which has been going on for 13 years. An anger management class is available as well.

A needs assessment was done by the center showing where people are coming from that need help. Very few people are coming from the north or south end of Cache Valley they are mostly just coming from the Logan area. A plan was made to eventually have an establishment in Hyrum and Smithfield. The 10 year plan was to have a building in Smithfield. Currently, there is a 1,300 square foot building in Hyrum and right now an additional 2,100 square feet is being added onto that building.

The Smithfield building was not purchased by the center but actually donated to the center by Intermountain Health Care. The center had never received a donation of this type before or of this financial value.

The center is a non-profit organization that is always looking for ways to obtain funding. The building is in great condition and the center is considering either renting the building at this time to generate some revenue for the center or possibly renovating a portion of the building and opening it to the public. The centers programs are not a cost to those attending so it is important to obtain grants and donations to keep the center running.

The reality is that the 10 year plan is now happening after 10 short months of discussion and planning thanks to the generous donation by Intermountain Healthcare.

Jeff asked what the difference is between CAPSA and the center? Esterlee stated that a lot of people think the two are the same but they are different. CAPSA deals with domestic violence issues and offers people a place to stay to get away from abuse. The support center is into educating people and offering help and assistance through programs. The center in Logan is a child abuse center for both Cache and Rich Counties but does not shelter children at the Hyrum facility.

Esterlee informed the council that Somebody’s Attic which is a non-profit organization located in Smithfield donated over \$40,000 to the support center and to CAPSA as well last year.

Mayor Simmons asked how the council can help or what the center is asking for? Esterlee stated she just wanted the council to be aware of the donation and that in the future the building will be used by the support center for its programs.

The Hyrum building is being renovated and expanded through a grant that was received.

Jeff asked what the cost was of the flamingo flocking fundraiser that occurred on a yearly basis? Esterlee stated it is \$25.00 and the center is coming up with a new program as the name of the center is going to be changed to the Family Place in the near future. All donations for the flamingo flocking program are part of a fundraising program.

Jeff stated he was aware of an Eagle Scout project that was held at Sky View High School to raise funds for the center. Esterlee remarked over \$1,500 was raised and donated to the center by the Eagle Scout.

Esterlee remarked a group of people will be coming up to start cleaning up the Smithfield building as it is almost 4,000 square feet. Jeff asked Esterlee to get in touch with him as he had people in need of service projects and willing to help.

Esterlee mentioned she would come back before the council with an update when the center is ready to open or be renovated.

Mayor Simmons commented the growth chart, supplied by the support center, shows amazing growth. Is that a good or a bad thing Mayor Simmons asked? Esterlee responded it is good to see people participating in the programs but it is bad to see such a high number of abuse cases and Smithfield has a higher number of abuse cases than most other cities in the valley.

Jeff asked if the building needed to be remodeled? Esterlee remarked a company has come forward and is willing to help if some funding can be found as the hope is to open up some of the areas into larger rooms by removing a wall or two and there are only two toilets in the entire building so more will need to be added for the support center. No extensive remodeling will be required.

Esterlee informed the council the budget for the center is about \$800,000 per year and serves over 15,000 people per year.

CITY MANAGER REPORT

DECEMBER 26TH, FIRE DEPT EQUIP PURCHASE, DOG SURVEY, 800 SOUTH UPDATE, THREE CREEKS ROAD AGREEMENT

Jim asked the council to review one item in Ordinance 14-02 that was just passed by the council.

Jim asked the council to consider if they wanted to limit the number of flagpoles at a residence as the maximum number allowed at a business or commercial area is three. This had not been specifically addressed by the council during the discussion.

Kris stated she did not think there was a need for a cap on the number of flagpoles allowed at a residence. Brent stated he was concerned it could make a yard cluttered.

Jeff asked for clarification as currently written how many are allowed at a business? Jim stated no more than three.

Barbara asked as the ordinance is currently written there is not a maximum allowed in the ordinance in a residential area? Jim stated that was correct.

Dennis suggested removing “nonresidential” from the section discussing the number allowed and that would make it so only three are allowed per parcel in the entire city. Justin stated the intent to only have three allowed was the planning commission had concerns there may be a business that wanted to be like Harris Research/Chem-Dry on 1000 West in Logan that has a flag displayed for every country they have a franchise located in so they have at least a couple of dozen.

The consensus of the council was to limit the maximum number of allowable flagpoles per parcel in all zones to three.

A motion to amend Ordinance 14-02 by removing the word “nonresidential” from Section 17.36.060, Section F, Line 2, Part C in sentence 1 was made by Jeff, seconded by Kris and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Watkins, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Buttars

No Vote: None

Jim informed the council the paving on 800 South would occur on Tuesday, November 18th, if the weather was okay.

Jim asked the council if they would allow the city office building to be closed on Friday, December 26th as all of the office staff wanted to have the day off. The day is not listed as a paid holiday in the city personnel manual so employees would use personal time off (PTO) or Compensation Time (Comp Time) for the day but the council must approve the office to be closed.

The consensus of the council was to allow for the city office building to be closed on Friday, December 26th. Signs will be posted on the entrance doors making people aware the office will be closed on December 25th and 26th.

Jim reminded the council that the city had received an anonymous \$35,000 donation from a person with the stipulation the money be used to purchase equipment for the new fire engine. The total amount of new equipment required for the fire engine is \$40,000. The fire department wanted to reallocate \$5,000 of their current training budget to purchase the remainder of the fire truck equipment. The budget would stay the same but the training line item would decrease \$5,000 and the equipment line item would increase \$5,000 with a net effect of zero to the budget. Training in the department would not be reduced either as a grant had been received that would pay for the training costs needed by the department.

The consensus of the council was to allow for the reallocation of \$5,000 in the fire department budget for the purchase of the necessary equipment for the new fire engine.

Jim mentioned that Justin had created a survey similar to the deer survey in regards to some dog and kennel related questions and asked the council if they had an interest in sending out the

survey to the residents to gather input on dogs as dog problems and concerns are a constant at the city office.

Justin stated he included some demographic related questions about age and gender at the end of the survey just to see if all demographics of the city were being reached. Justin expressed concern that possibly the older residents who don't have an email address or check their email on a regular basis are not being included in the city sponsored surveys and these three questions would help to answer that concern.

Mayor Simmons stated he did not think there was a need for a survey on dogs. Jeff stated nothing had to be done with the survey results but they would be interesting to know and evaluate. Kris agreed it is important to have some information from the residents. Mayor Simmons remarked if he received the survey he would not fill it out. Jeff and Justin both stated they would since it is short and only takes a couple of minutes.

Mayor Simmons asked Kelly Cannon of the Herald Journal if she would take a survey on dogs sent out by the city? Kelly remarked she would take the survey. Kelly informed the council she had written an article on how overall Cache Valley is not pet friendly. There is only one dog park in the valley and most parks have banned dogs from the grounds. Kelly stated she would want her voice to be heard especially if she could do it on-line or on her cell phone or tablet.

Mayor Simmons asked Kelly what would she think if the results of the survey caused the city to be more restrictive on dogs? Kelly responded she would be at fault if she did not take the time to do the survey even if the results were different than how she voted.

Brent suggested the survey be sent out after the holidays.

Mayor Simmons remarked it is not expensive and information can be gathered from a short survey. Jim remarked that himself and Justin would revise the survey and then send to the council for approval and at a later time the survey could be sent to the residents if the council chose to do so.

Jim asked the council to review the Three Creeks Subdivision agreement. The agreement is in regards to the city taking ownership of the roads, curb and gutter and sidewalk in that subdivision. The document is around 34 pages but 29 or so pages are signature pages as each member of the subdivision would have to sign the agreement and have it notarized. The agreement will be discussed and possibly voted on at the December 10th council meeting.

Jim advised the council the residents of the subdivision wanted the agreement voted on at this council meeting but since the council had not had a chance to review the document; the vote would not occur until December 10th. Jim had informed the members of the subdivision the city would plow the roads in the interim if it snows.

Brent asked the council what would keep other PUD's from coming before the council and making the same request now? Kris remarked it has been months since this was approved and

nobody else had asked. Brent stated once the word gets out on this agreement other groups will ask. Barbara stated the city wanted to have more public roads than private roads. Jim stated the other PUD would be Stonehaven and there are two public roads that go through there.

Brent remarked there is another one on Center Street up east by the golf course. Jim stated that was correct and that area had made a request to the city in the past to be taken over by the city and the request was denied. The road needed to be seal coated and the owners of the area wanted the city to take over the road and then have the city pay to seal the road.

Mayor Simmons remarked there are several contractors that want to do their own roads as well and not turn them over to the city. Kris remarked that developers like to own their own roads but the residents don't want them private. Mayor Simmons stated that is not always the case as the private roads can have the snow pushed in a more expedient manner as the city has miles of roads and a guarantee of a certain time cannot be made. Jim stated that Stonehaven could not be done by the city as the city would just push the snow to the side and it would block the cars in and that would be a problem. Jeff also stated that particular area would be a terrible area for the city trucks to try and plow.

Mayor Simmons asked the council to review the legal agreement as it would be a specific line item at the next council meeting. Jim stated he needed to thoroughly review the document as well. The document had been drafted by city attorney, Bruce Jorgensen.

Mayor Simmons asked if the cost of the document preparation was paid by the city? Jim stated no, it was paid by the PUD.

Jim informed the council the storm water piping on the 800 South project had been completed as well as the water and sewer lines. The paving will be done on November 18th; weather permitting.

Jim remarked there is a party interested in the Thornley property to the west of Joyce Pitcher's property on 800 South and they had visited with Dennis about what could be done with the area. The area will be reviewed and some suggestions made. Having 800 South done on the Pitcher property will open up more commercial lots to the west of the Pitcher property.

Jim mentioned getting the elevator for the library project has been a struggle and it is the fault of the elevator company; not the contractor. The elevator was supposed to ship on approximately November 3rd and actually shipped on November 11th. The elevator comes in pieces and is assembled in the elevator shaft area a piece at a time. The book shelving in the upstairs still needs to be secured to the floor but it has been installed. Right now the intent is to close the library building for a couple of weeks after Thanksgiving to make the transition from the old building into the new building.

Kris asked who is going to move all of the items from the old building to the new building? Jim stated that Julie Marshall is working to get some volunteers together that will help with the move.

Jim informed the council the main level (bottom floor) should be ready by Thanksgiving with the exception of the elevator. The entire new building needs to be cleaned upstairs and downstairs before anything can be moved in. Once the new library is occupied and the old library vacated the contractor will start the renovation of the old building.

Jim mentioned that he was working with Doug Petersen to have the gaps in the logs on the historic cabin filled with foam. The chinking of the cabin would be completed in the spring when the weather is warmer but the cabin will be sealed off with foam for the winter.

Kris asked if a decision had been made on putting a piano in the Youth Center? The local irrigation company had offered to donate a piano to the city for use in the Youth Center.

Jim expressed concern about putting the piano in the Youth Center south entryway as it would be in the way and damaged by the youth.

Kris mentioned the building is a city building for youth sports and that she had visited with recreation center director Brett Daniels and he was worried about it being damaged as well as marking up the gym floor when it is moved back and forth.

Mayor Simmons asked if it could be stored in the Civic Center and utilized there? Justin mentioned that no matter where it is taken it needs to be tuned and some maintenance work completed. Jim reminded the council the senior center has a baby grand piano in there for people to use as well.

Brent asked if the church group still rents a room during the week in the Civic Center? Jim stated that was correct.

Barbara asked if it was possible to move the piano into the upstairs room on the west side of the Youth Center? Jim and Jeff both responded the stairs are too narrow and steep to get the piano up there safely.

Kris asked who would be responsible to pay to tune the piano and move it? Jim stated if the city takes ownership; it would be the responsibility of the city to move it and pay to maintain it.

Mayor Simmons asked if there was a real need for a piano in the Youth Center? Jeff remarked the historical society would use the piano and the piano might spur additional building rentals if groups know they can play music.

Barbara expressed concern that there is limited space in the Youth Center entryway and putting the piano there would take away the area people hang coats.

Jim mentioned the intent of the city is to do some work in both entryways next budget year.

Jeff commented he thought the piano would be an asset to the city and could be put in a room at

the Civic Center. Jim remarked the city would move it from the irrigation building and pay to get it tuned if the city wanted to take ownership.

Mayor Simmons mentioned it needed to be clear the ownership of the piano is by the city not the historical society like other departments in the city. The departments do not own the items; the city does.

Barbara suggested putting the piano in the Civic Center to see if it could be utilized there. Jim commented he would work with Doug Petersen and the irrigation company to get it moved over to the Civic Center.

Brent asked when the employee Christmas party was being held? Justin stated on Monday, December 22nd, at the Birch Creek clubhouse.

COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS

Brent did not have any additional items to discuss.

Jeff informed the council the Historical Society will be having a nativity display in the Youth Center on Monday, December 1st in conjunction with the live nativity that will happen that evening just outside the Youth Center. Jim remarked he was not sure if all of the lights on the trees would be ready by then. Kris stated it would not be a problem as the stage still has power and can light up for the live nativity.

Kris informed the council the annual “Night of Giving” would be on Saturday, December 6th and the event would be held at Sky View High School. The cost of the event is \$25.00 per person and tickets can be purchased at Lee’s Marketplace. There are going to be some big ticket items that will be auctioned off. The Turkey Trot is on November 22nd and the youth council will be helping out with the race.

Barbara asked the council for help in getting names for the youth council of who they could take some treats too during the holiday season. The youth council tries to take some goodies to some of the elderly people and shut-ins in the city during the holiday season.

Mayor Simmons asked how many names the youth council is looking for? Barbara remarked there was not a specific number and the youth council would make sure everyone on the list is contacted.

Barbara informed the council the weekly event at the Senior Center is going quite well and Sarah is doing a great job. There is a concern by those attending the event that some senior citizens in the community need help but they don’t know how to find out who they are.

Jeff mentioned one of the local LDS stakes had just done a food drive and delivered 20 to 25 boxes of food to the local food pantry. If there is a need in the community some of those boxes of food could be delivered or picked up for members of the community.

Brent expressed concern there were only 80 people or so that attended the Senior Ball. Barbara stated the youth council advisors thought it was about the same number in attendance as last year but it seemed to be fewer. Brent suggested possibly holding the event later in the evening as Day Light Savings Time was not in effect when the event was held and it is lighter longer into the evening. Barbara mentioned the location was changed due to a funeral and there was a Utah State University athletic event at the same time as well and this could have been a factor in the lower attendance.

Barbara informed the council the feedback that was received showed those attending like having the event at the earlier time and earlier in the year. Several senior citizens had expressed interest in coming but ended up being sick on that day. The response by those in attendance about having a live band was very positive and the band was appreciated.

Barbara mentioned the youth council leaders are going to keep a better record of how many attend so that food preparation can be better handled in the future. The Lion's Club had planned on having about 300 in attendance and had made that amount of food but only about 100 attended with the kids and leaders eating as well.

Mayor Simmons thanked Barbara and the youth council advisors for all the good things they are doing with the youth council.

Dennis did not have any additional items to discuss.

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Simmons informed the council the new Community Corp Committee would start officially meeting the first Wednesday of each month. Fire Chief Jay Downs and Police Chief Travis Allen are currently assembling the committee. Jeremy Hunt will oversee the committee. A small committee will be formed to establish policy in regards to city emergency preparedness and then spread the word to the community.

Mayor Simmons stated the training seminar the council and himself attended at the Fire Station was very impressive and the department is a great group of members working together. The department has received a significant amount of grant money over the last several years and done incredible things with the funding. Jim stated the fire department has obtained several grants over the years ranging from \$5,000 to \$40,000. One educational grant in the amount of \$100,000 was received and is used over several years training and educating members of the department.

A motion to adjourn at 9:48 P.M. was made by Kris.

SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION

Darrell G. Simmons, Mayor

ATTEST:

Justin B. Lewis, Recorder

SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION
96 South Main
Smithfield, Utah 84335
AGENDA

Public Notice is given that the Smithfield City Council will meet in a regularly scheduled meeting at 96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah on Wednesday, **November 12, 2014**. The meeting will begin at 6:00 P.M.

Welcome and Opening Ceremonies by Council Member Monson.

1. 6:03 P.M. Approval of the city council meeting minutes from the October 22, 2014 City Council Meeting
2. 6:05 P.M. Resident Input
3. 6:15 P.M. Discussion with a representative of UDOT on a speed study conducted on 100 North from Main Street to 800 West.
4. 6:45 P.M. Consideration of a request by Travis Taylor, agent for Smithfield Ridges, LLC for approval of Phase 8 (10 lots) of the Final Plan for Smithfield Ridges Planned Unit Development located at approximately 600 South 1085 East. Zoned R-1-12 (PUD) Combined Single Family Residential/Planned Unit Development Overlay Zone.
5. 7:00 P.M. Audit report presentation by Jones Simkins, LLC for the period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014.
6. 7:15 P.M. Appeal by Chris Biggs for the denial of a kennel license by the planning commission for a kennel permit for four (4) dogs located at 200 Summit Drive. Zoned R-1-12.
7. 7:35 P.M. Public hearing on possibly vacating a right-of-way area located at the intersection of Crow Mountain Road (600 East) and Upper Canyon Road.
8. 7:50 P.M. Discussion and possible vote on the vacating of a right-of-way area located at the intersection of Crow Mountain Road (600 East) and Upper Canyon Road.
9. 7:55 P.M. Public hearing on Ordinance 14-02, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Zoning Regulations, Title 17: 17.01.070: "Definitions"; 17.12.100 "Exceptions to Height Limitations"; 17.36.060 "Permitted Signs, Permits Not Required"; and 17.120.010 "Use Allowance Matrix".
10. 8:10 P.M. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 14-02.

11. 8:15 P.M. Child & Family Support Center to update the city council on the purchase of a building at 502 South Main.
 12. 8:30 P.M. Discussion and vote on Resolution 14-10, a Resolution accepting the annexation request by Jessica Tams Quinton for certain real property under provisions of Sections 10-2-403 and 10-2-405, Utah Code Annotated, 1995, as amended for Parcel Numbers; 08-045-0035 and 08-045-0022.
 13. 8:40 P.M. City Manager Report
December 26th, Fire Dept. Equip Purchase, Dog Survey,
800 S Update, Three Creeks Road Agreement
 14. 8:55 P.M. Council Member Reports
 15. 9:10 P.M. Mayor's Report
- Adjournment

Items on the agenda may be considered earlier than shown on the agenda.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needed special accommodation for this meeting should contact the City Recorder at (435) 792-7990, at least (3) days before the date of this meeting.

Prepared, posted in the City Office and library, emailed to each Council Member, emailed to the Herald Journal, Smithfield Sun, and forwarded to be posted on the City Web Site on 11/10/14, and the Utah Public Meeting Notice website.