

SMITHFIELD CITY COUNCIL

NOVEMBER 15, 2017

The Smithfield City Council met in a regularly scheduled meeting at 96 South Main Street, Smithfield, Utah on Wednesday, November 15, 2017. The meeting began at 6:00 P.M. and Mayor Darrell G. Simmons was in the chair.

The following council members were in attendance: Deon Hunsaker, Barbara Kent, Kris Monson, Jeff Barnes and Curtis Wall.

City Manager Craig Giles, Fire Chief Jay Downs, Police Chief Travis Allen, City Engineer Clay Bodily and City Recorder Justin Lewis were also in attendance.

VISITORS: Char Izatt, Chris Slater (J-U-B Engineers), Darek Kimball (J-U-B Engineers), Marcus Murdock, Russell Smart, Emily Sim (Public Sector Economics), Jamie Anderson, Michelle Anderson, Dianne Campbell, Wade Campbell, Brandon Papke, Michelle Downs, Dayton Crites (Cache County Corporation), Marty Spicer, Bart Roylance, Robbie Christiansen, Glenn Jay Thornley

The following opening remarks were read by Kris Monson:

"Something that once moderated our partisan feelings and bridled our baser instincts has gone missing in an era of unprecedented polarization. Something fundamental to our civic culture has been lost amid the chaos and disruption of the Information Age.

The question is, *What has been lost?*

In a word: civility.

Civility is the indispensable political norm. It is the public virtue that has greased the wheels of our democracy since its inception. Although nowhere mandated in our Constitution, civility is no less essential to the proper functioning of our government than any amendment, court ruling or act of Congress. Without it, little separates us from the cruelty and chaos of rule by force.

The first step is to speak responsibly.

I will be the first to admit to saying things over the course of my public service that I later came to regret. In the heat of an argument, it's easy to indulge in irresponsible rhetoric. But we must avoid this temptation. Whether in town halls, casual conversations with neighbors, or posts on social media, we must likewise refrain from dehumanizing, demeaning, or unfairly disparaging the other side. And we must resist the impulse to frame every tiny policy disagreement as a zero-sum struggle for the soul of the country. We must restore sense, decency, and proportion to our political speech.

It's on us to reinvigorate the public discourse by recommitting ourselves to the virtues of compassion, comity, and compromise. It's on us to renew the soul of our nation through the politics of civility.

Orrin G. Hatch, Sept, 2017 (only sections selected)

In the wake of the past election, I thought that article was particularly relevant. Much damage was done by the demeaning, misleading, illegal flier. To those of you who were behind it, SHAME ON YOU! Individuals, the entire council, as well as the city employees were attacked. I hope as we continue to function as a current council, being followed by a new council, that those who were responsible for the flier will have NO power whatsoever, but that our city government will act AS A TEAM for ALL people in a positive, kind and civil manner with decisions being made ONLY by those who were elected to represent all residents of our city.

APPROVAL OF THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 11, 2017.

A motion to approve the city council meeting minutes from October 11, 2017 was made by Curtis, seconded by Deon and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

RESIDENT INPUT

There was not any resident input.

UPDATE AND DISCUSSION WITH CACHE COUNTY TRAILS COORDINATOR DAYTON CRITES.

Dayton Crites presented the council with the following information:

The participants in the Cache County Trails Program are: Lewiston, Smithfield, Hyde Park, North Logan, Logan, Millville, Nibley, Hyrum, Paradise and Mendon.

Some of the accomplishments of the last two years:

- \$790,000 has been obtained from grants and fundraising
- 12 new miles of public trails have been established
- 10 communities have been provided technical planning and design assistance
- 4,700 hours of volunteer trail work have been coordinated; the vast majority being at a Beaver Mountain project.

Countywide Trails Plan by the numbers:

- 81% of facilities are drawn from existing Cache County plans
- 75% of facilities utilize existing right of ways or public land
- 25% of facilities require private landowner support
- 500 individuals contributed to in-person and online public input

Trails and Active Transportation are considered the following:

- Quiet Streets
- Bike Lanes
- Paved Pathways
- Unpaved Pathways
- Hiking Trails

Smithfield and the Bonneville Shoreline Trail:

- Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife are supportive of a trail system.
- The Berger Family is supportive of the concept but want to negotiate the alignment and terms of the trail through their parcel.
- Hyde Park City is supportive and working with the BLM to acquire a parcel for a trailhead.
- The Tew Family is supportive of a trail system.
- The Baker Family is supportive of the concept but want to negotiate the terms of a trail system.

Discussions have taken place with UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) in regards to having a trail between Richmond and Smithfield. Right now the only option is to ride along the side of the highway which can be very dangerous.

The trail system in the Birch Creek Canyon area is being discussed with the Forest Service to make sure it does not go away.

The CMPO (Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization) is working on a Cache bikeway system.

The intent is to connect the Bonneville Shoreline Trail between Smithfield and Hyde Park in the next few years.

Deon stated he wished there were more biking trails as he had ridden in the 50 mile bike race at Bear Lake over the summer.

Deon's concern is for areas such as 100 East in Logan where a bike trail has ruined the property values of the homes the trail goes in front of. The homeowners can no longer park in front of their own homes. Parking is a big issue where there are bike trails where parking used to be available. Residential neighborhoods and property values are greatly affected by bike paths such as this. Dayton replied his department did not work on that particular project but he understood the concern and issues mentioned. Traditionally bike paths go on roads less travelled.

Deon mentioned another issue is garbage cans are placed in the bike path area and create a safety hazard for those on bicycles as well as those collecting the garbage.

Barbara mentioned her concern was the rumble strips on the side of the highway leading from Smithfield to Richmond. The rumble strips make it so it is not feasible to ride a bicycle on the

side of the highway. Dayton replied he understood the concern but the rumble strips are created and managed by UDOT on the roads they manage and maintain.

Kris mentioned she had been on a committee with Dayton for over two years. Dayton is very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. Dayton knows the trail system and property owners well.

Kris thanked Dayton for his service to the community and valley. Because of Dayton the county and community are more walkable, bike-able and hike-able.

Curtis mentioned the last time Dayton presented to the council it was mentioned one of the landowners had been hard to contact. Curtis asked Dayton if he had been able to communicate with all of the landowners where the trail would go through the Smithfield area? Dayton replied he was still having an issue contacting Vincent Hansen. Mr. Hansen does not reside in the valley.

<p>IMPACT FEE RATE ANALYSIS PRESENTATION BY PUBLIC SECTOR ECONOMICS ON WATER, STORM WATER, AND PARK IMPACT FEES</p>
--

Emily Sim mentioned she has been doing impact fee analysis for cities for over 20 years.

Emily listed the steps in calculating an impact fee:

Step 1: Calculate new development's share of existing public facilities

Step 2: Calculate new development's share of system improvements for each public facility by:

A. Identifying the established level of service for each public facility,
and;

B. Identifying the impact on system improvements required to maintain the established level of service.

Step 3: Other than impact fees, determine the manner of financing each public facility.

Step 4: Determine whether impact fees are necessary to achieve an equitable allocation to the costs borne in the past and to be borne in the future, in comparison to the benefits already received and yet to be received.

Step 5: Assess the relative extent to which properties in Smithfield City have already contributed to the cost of existing public facilities.

Step 6: Assess the relative extent to which development activity will contribute to the cost of existing public facilities and system improvements in the future.

Step 7: Assess the extent to which the development activity is entitled to a credit against impact fees because the development activity will dedicate system improvements or public facilities that will offset the demand for system improvements and assess any extraordinary costs in servicing the newly developed properties.

Step 8: Based on the above steps and the requirements of Utah Code, Title 11, Chapter 36, identify how the impact fee is calculated.

Emily mentioned J-U-B Engineers helped to complete Steps 1 and 2 as part of the new general plan.

Water, storm water and transportation master plans had been recently completed and adopted by the council as well.

Capital improvement projects needed over the next six years are included in the analysis.

It is imperative an existing level of service is determined for the analysis.

Impact fees cannot be used to increase the level of service.

There is not a storm water impact fee being charged by the city at this time.

Storm water projects in the past have been paid for with the fund balance.

Significant park improvements have been paid for with RAPZ tax funding. RAPZ tax funds are not included in the impact fee calculation.

Impact fees can only pay for projects related to new growth.

Water impact fees are currently being used to help pay for the water tank bonds.

Step 7 is rarely seen or encountered.

Mayor Simmons asked if the plan is based over the next six years? Emily stated that was correct.

Emily presented the following information on the water impact fee analysis:

There are currently 3,658 ERC's (Equivalent Residential Connection) in the city.

The growth rate used in the calculation was 2.80%. The same number used in the General Plan.

Table 1 was presented.

Table 1: New Development's Share of Existing Water System

Water Source			
Year	System Improvement	Cost	Present Value
1999	Southeast Bench Well w/ chlorination	\$329,200	\$889,641
1999	Transmission Line to 300 S. for well	\$118,141	\$319,268
2011	Peterson Spring measuring device and redevelopment	\$18,956	\$41,590
2012	Birch Well	\$109,738	\$236,954

Smithfield City Council Meeting Minutes, November 15, 2017

2012	Chlorinator	\$76,035	\$164,180
2014	Upgrade to Birch Well	\$108,132	\$226,291
Present Value of Existing Water Source System Improvements			\$1,877,925
Capacity of Water Source System Improvements (gpm)			4,815
State Requirements (gpm)			2,846
Excess Capacity (gpm)			1,969
Required Storage Per ERC (gpm)			0.778
Number of New ERCs Water Source May Supply			2,531
Cost Per New ERC for Excess Capacity in Water Source System			\$742
Water Storage			
Year	System Improvement	Cost	Present Value
1966	1 MG reservoir and chlorinator, Smithfield Canyon	\$414,880	\$2,288,239
2011	1.5 MG reservoir, transmission lines, PRV station, booster pump, and tie-ins	\$2,130,666	\$4,674,793
Present Value of Existing Water Storage System Improvements			\$6,963,031
ERCs in 2027			4,821
Cost Per ERC for City Wide Fire Storage Capacity in Existing System			\$1,444
Water Distribution and General Water System			
Year	System Improvement	Cost	Present Value
1991	Maintenance Shop	\$8,906	\$28,113
1997	Land	\$1,503	\$4,218
2000	Pressure reducing station at 600 S. and 400 E.	\$10,975	\$29,115
2001	Canyon Waterline Phase 1	\$132,691	\$345,621
2002	1000 E. 600 S. Waterline Phase 1	\$61,036	\$156,128
2004	Canyon Waterline Phase II	\$115,070	\$284,054
2007	300 East / 400 North Water Line	\$140,283	\$328,812
2007	Upper Canyon Water Line Extension	\$11,515	\$26,990
2008	1000 S. Main Water Line	\$56,587	\$130,420
2010	Diversion measuring device at golf course	\$5,777	\$12,882
2016	Telemetry upgrade	\$147,558	\$299,543
Present Value of Existing Water System Improvements			\$1,645,895
ERCs in 2027			4,821
Cost Per ERC for Water Distribution and General Water System Capacity			\$341
Cost Per New ERC for Existing Water System			\$2,528

Projects with excess capacity were determined and reviewed.

The oldest tanks serving the city cannot be included in the analysis because of a lack of solid financial information and documentation on costs from decades ago.

Table 2 shows the capital improvement projects which need to be completed in the next five years.

Table 2: New development's share of the costs for planned improvements to the water system

5-year Capital Improvements Plan - Projects for New Development	Cost
New 2.0 MG 5000 foot reservoir near 800 N with new well nearby	\$3,971,000
Total New ERCs Served - All New Development	1,924
Cost Per ERC	\$2,063.93
Install new PRV Station - Between 200 E and 500 E development	\$118,000
Total New ERCs Served - Northeast Area of City	720
Cost Per ERC	\$164
Water Master Plan Engineering/Planning	\$22,620
Total number of ERCs in 2022	4,200
Cost Per ERC	\$5
Impact Fee Analysis	\$5,000
Number of new ERCs in 2022	542
Cost Per ERC	\$9
Total Cost Per ERC - Northeast Smithfield	\$2,242
Total Cost Per ERC - Other Areas	\$2,079

There are different capacities for different parts of the city.

Table 3 showing the current debt service was provided.

Table 3: Water Debt Service Credit

Date	Payment	Present Value of Total Payments	Number of ERCs	Present Value of Debt Per ERC
2018	\$118,460	\$234,418	3760	\$62.34
2018	\$16,685	\$32,778	3760	\$8.72
2019	\$120,685	\$235,380	3866	\$60.89
2019	\$14,839	\$28,735	3866	\$7.43
2020	\$121,839	\$234,258	3974	\$58.95
2020	\$12,940	\$24,704	3974	\$6.22
2021	\$123,940	\$234,966	4085	\$57.52
2021	\$10,970	\$20,652	4085	\$5.06
2022	\$125,970	\$235,528	4200	\$56.08
2022	\$8,928	\$16,579	4200	\$3.95
2023	\$127,928	\$235,949	4317	\$54.65
2023	\$6,816	\$12,487	4317	\$2.89
2024	\$130,816	\$238,058	4438	\$53.64
2024	\$4,615	\$8,343	4438	\$1.88
2025	\$132,615	\$238,166	4562	\$52.20

2025	\$2,343	\$4,180	4562	\$0.92
2026	\$134,343	\$238,155	4690	\$50.78
Total	\$1,214,731	\$2,273,337		\$544.11

Table 4 shows the proposed impact fee calculation.

Table 4: Water Impact Fee Calculation

New Development in Smithfield - Northeast	
Existing Facilities Cost per ERC (from Table 1)	\$2,528
Costs for Planned Improvements per ERC (from Table 2)	\$2,242
Debt Service Credit (from Table 3)	-\$544
Recommended Standard Water Impact Fee	\$4,226
New Development in Smithfield - Other Areas	
Existing Facilities Cost per ERC (from Table 1)	\$2,528
Costs for Planned Improvements per ERC (from Table 2)	\$2,079
Debt Service Credit (from Table 3)	-\$544
Recommended Standard Water Impact Fee	\$4,062

The amounts listed above are the maximum the city is allowed to charge for a water impact fee in each specified area.

The council can determine the amount to charge up to the maximum amount. Any amount charged less than the recommended fee means current residents are subsidizing new growth.

Recommended fees were listed based on the size of the water meter installed.

Recommended Impact Fee Schedule

Meter Size in Inches	Capacity, GPM	Capacity Ratio to Standard Meter	Northeast Smithfield	Other Areas
3/4	30	1.00	\$4,226	\$4,062
1	50	1.67	\$7,057	\$6,784
1.5	100	3.33	\$14,072	\$13,527
2	160	5.33	\$22,524	\$21,651

Curtis asked how the number of ERC's in Table 3 was determined to be 4,690 in 2026 when today there are 3,760? Emily replied it is based on a growth rate of 2.80%. Chris Slater from J-U-B Engineers mentioned the same rate was used in the general plan as well.

Curtis mentioned the information provided to him at the Cache Summit showed the valley is growing at a much faster rate; can the rate be adjusted? Emily replied it can be but the council has to use a number they can defend and show how it was determined if they are going to change it.

Chris mentioned the 2.8% growth rate is a higher number than being used by the State of Utah in their calculations.

Deon asked if old water lines are accounted for in the analysis? Emily replied that repairs to existing lines cannot be paid for with impact fees. Upsizing of existing lines can be if the change in size is needed because of growth.

Jeff asked where the proposed new tank and well are included for the northeast part of town? Craig replied in Table 2.

Jeff asked if the proposal is to put the new tank on the flat area south of Crow Mountain? Chris replied that is correct. The estimated cost of the new two million gallon tank and well in this area is \$3,971,000.

Emily presented the following information on the proposed storm water impact fee.

Currently, the city does not charge a storm water impact fee.

The following assumptions are used in the Storm Water Impact Fee Analysis:

- All new development will be required to detain to a max discharge of 0.1 CFS (Cubic Feet Per Second) per acre, regardless of development type.
- The current number of developed acres in Smithfield City is 2,704.
- Acreage development rate of 2.8%.

Table 5: New Development's Share of Existing Storm Water System

Year	Description	Cost	Excess Capacity	New Development's Share
2017	Pipe #1 - description coming	\$154,804	20%	\$30,961
2017	Pipe #2 - description coming	\$52,920	48%	\$25,402
2017	Pipe #3 - description coming	\$72,765	39%	\$28,378
Total Cost				\$84,741
Total Number of Undeveloped Acres Served by Excess Capacity				758
Cost Per Acre				\$112

Excess capacity for new growth for Pipe #1 is 20%, for Pipe #2 is 48% and for Pipe #3 is 39%.

The projects listed need to be completed in the next six years. The storm water master plan shows projects for the next few decades but only those completed in the next six years can be included in the impact fee analysis.

Table 7: Cost Per Acre for Engineering and Impact Fee Analysis

Engineering	
Storm Water Master Plan Costs	\$22,720
Total Developed Acres in 2022	3104

Cost Per Acre	\$7
Impact Fee Analysis	
Storm Water Impact Fee Analysis Costs	\$5,000
Total New Developed Acres in 2022	400
Cost Per Acre	\$12
Total Cost Per Acre	\$20

The storm water fund balance has paid for all previous projects since an impact fee has not been charged in the past.

If an impact fee is not implemented existing residents would be paying 100% of the cost of projects needed for new growth.

Table 8 shows the cost per acre for storm water.

Table 8: Storm Water Impact Fee

Cost per Acre for Existing Storm Water System Excess Capacity	\$112
Cost Per Acre for Storm Water Improvements	\$5,017
Cost Per Acre for Engineering and Impact Fee Analysis	\$20
Total Cost Per Acre	\$5,148

A separate chart was provided breaking the acre calculation into different impact fees based on parcel size.

The proposed impact fee for storm water is listed below:

Storm Water Impact Fee Per Acreage

Acres	Storm Water Impact Fee
0.25	\$1,287
0.33	\$1,699
0.5	\$2,574
1	\$5,148
2	\$10,296

Residential and commercial users have to detain and discharge storm water at the same rate which is 0.1 cfs (Cubic Feet Per Second).

Deon asked if all new subdivisions must detain their storm water? Chris Slater replied that is correct. Small storms are detained in the detention ponds and large storms go into the detention ponds and then discharge into the storm water drain system. Piping is needed to transport the storm water during large storms.

Mayor Simmons asked if the numbers are based off of 2017 numbers? Emily stated that is correct.

Jeff asked how runoff from snowpack is handled? Chris replied the approach is to size the system based on the largest storm in 25 years. There is still a possibility a storm could happen larger than the system could handle.

Emily presented the following on park impact fees:

The following assumptions are used in the Parks and Trails Impact Fee Analysis:

- The existing level of service per 1,000 persons is 5.16 acres for parks and 0.33 miles for trails.
- The existing level of service for parks and trails is the proposed level of service for parks and trails.
- Population growth rate of 2.5% was used in the analysis.

Existing level of service is also the proposed level of service for this calculation.

Some cities want more parks but the city has to pay for the new parks with general funds not impact fees.

The growth rate is different at 2.5% as opposed to the 2.8% used in the other calculations.

Growth for the park impact fee calculation is based on people not the number of connections like storm water and water are based on.

Commercial users do not pay a park impact fee.

Table 9 was presented:

Table 9: Parks and Trails Existing Level of Service Per Household

Parks LOS Per Household	
Developed Acreage Per Park	
Central Park	6.3
Forrester Acres	44
Heritage Park	2.5
Mack Park	4.8
Sunset Park	2.6
<i>Total</i>	<i>60.2</i>
Current Population	11,670
LOS per 1,000 persons	5.16
Average Household Size	3.51
Parks LOS Per Household	0.018
Trails LOS	
Developed Miles Per Trail	
Heritage Trail	2.9

Nature Trail	0.2
Sunset Trail	0.8
<i>Total</i>	<i>3.9</i>
Current Population	11,670
LOS per 1,000 persons	0.33
Average Household Size	3.51
Parks LOS Per Household	0.001

Table 10 was presented showing the cost to develop parks and trails.

Table 10: Parks and Trails Base Costs

Type	Park Cost Per Acre	Trail Cost Per Mile
Land (unimproved)	\$29,404	
Hydro-Seeding (at \$0.10 per sq. ft. labor included)	\$4,356	
Prep Work (grading, topsoil)	\$2,500	
Trees (at \$100 per tree, 5 trees per acre average)	\$500	
Sprinkler System (components and labor included)	\$10,000	
Trail Construction Per Mile		\$118,800
Total	\$46,760	\$118,800

The numbers presented in Table 10 are on the low end and expected to be the minimum cost of a project.

The cost of land was calculated by using actual costs for parcels currently for sale in the city.

Table 11 shows individual costs for amenities wanted or needed at a park.

Table 11: Parks System Development Costs	
Parks Systems Improvements	2017 Cost
Small Pavilion	\$8,000
Large Pavilion	\$30,000
Baseball Field	\$15,000
Baseball Field Lights	\$90,000

Bench	\$200
Bleachers (moveable)	\$5,000
Concession Stand	\$15,000
Hydro Seeding for fields	\$0.10
Drinking fountain	\$350
Vinyl fencing per square foot	\$25
Flag pole	\$500
Equipment Storage Room	\$5,000
Large Playground	\$25,000
Scorekeeper's Tower	\$15,000
Walkable Paths	\$14
Horse Arena	\$7,500
Fire pit	\$150
Horseshoe pit	\$50
Picnic Table	\$600
Restroom	\$112,542
Swing set	\$1,000
Sand Volleyball Court	\$2,000
Splash Pad	\$30,000
Skate Park	\$30,000

Table 12 shows the costs of projects at current parks in the city.

Forrester Acres		
Baseball/Softball Field	4	\$60,000
Baseball/Softball Field Lights	3	\$270,000
Bench	9	\$1,800
Bleachers	19	\$95,000
Small Pavilion	2	\$16,000
Concession Stand	4	\$60,000
Drinking Fountains	5	\$1,750
Flag Pole	1	\$500
Equipment Storage Room	8	\$40,000
Large Playground	1	\$25,000
Scorekeepers Tower	6	\$90,000
Walkable Paths (lineal feet)	4300	\$60,200
Horse Arena & Track	1	\$7,500
Restroom (good condition)	1	\$112,542
	Total	\$840,292
	Developed Acres	44
	Development Cost Per Acre	\$19,098

Smithfield City Council Meeting Minutes, November 15, 2017

Mack Park		
Bench	12	\$2,400
Large Pavilion	2	\$60,000
Fire Pit	3	\$450
Horseshoe Pit	4	\$200
Equipment Storage Room	1	\$5,000
Picnic Table	30	\$18,000
Large Playground	2	\$50,000
Bowery	1	\$8,000
Swing Set	1	\$1,000
Sand Volleyball Court	1	\$2,000
Walkable Path (lineal ft.)	1,600	\$22,400
Total		\$169,450
Developed Acres		4.8
Development Cost Per Acre		\$35,302
Central Park		
Bench	10	\$2,000
Bleachers	12	\$60,000
Large Pavilion	1	\$30,000
Flag Pole	1	\$500
Horseshoe Pit	4	\$200
Picnic Table	15	\$9,000
Large Playground	1	\$25,000
Splash Pad	1	\$30,000
Skate Park	1	\$30,000
Walkable Path (lineal ft.)	350	\$4,900
Restroom (good condition)	1	\$112,542
Total		\$304,142
Developed Acres		6.3
Development Cost Per Acre		\$48,277
Heritage Park		
Bench	7	\$1,400
Fence (vinyl, per lineal ft.)	525	\$13,125
Picnic Table	1	\$600
Bowery	1	\$8,000
Walkable Paths (lineal ft.)	1,800	\$25,200
Total		\$48,325
Developed Acres		2.5
Development Cost Per Acre		\$19,330
Sunset Park		

Bench	3	\$600
Large Playground	1	\$25,000
Walkable Path (lineal ft.)	2,550	\$35,700
Total		\$61,300
Developed Acres		2.6
Development Cost Per Acre		\$23,577
Average Development Cost Per Acre		\$29,117

J-U-B Engineers did a park inventory as part of the new general plan process.

Bathrooms assigned a score of poor or fair were not included. Only bathroom facilities with a score of good were included.

The average cost to develop an acre of park in the city was determined to be \$29,117.

Only items with a life span of at least 20 years were included.

Table 13 shows projects paid for with RAPZ tax funding as those funds have to be deducted from the cost of the parks as they were grant proceeds and not included in the impact fee charge.

Table 13: Adjustment Factor

Year	Total RAPZ and Restaurant Awarded Funds to Smithfield City for Recreation Facilities	% of RAPZ and Restaurant Awarded Funds Used for Parks Systems Developments	Notes	Parks Impact Fees Expended for Parks Systems Developments	Proportion of Parks Systems Improvements Eligible for Impact Fees Paid by RAPZ/Restaurant Tax
2017	\$97,000	100%	Used for Central Park	\$264,443	27%
2016	\$150,000	100%	Used for Splash Pad/Skate Park	\$313,762	32%
2015	\$30,000	100%	Used for Splash Pad	\$43,387	41%
2014	\$90,000	100%	Used for Hansen Baseball Field Lighting	\$131,819	41%
2013	\$90,000	100%	Used for Hansen Baseball Field Lighting	\$66,456	58%

2012	\$66,494	0%	Used for Civic Center - not included in Parks LOS	\$110,749	0%
2011	\$70,000	0%	Used for Recreation Center Improvements - not included in Parks LOS	\$21,217	0%
Average Percent of Eligible Parks Systems Improvements Costs Funded by RAPZ/Restaurant Tax					28%

Table 14 showed the new proposed impact fee of \$1,085.

Table 14: Impact Fee Calculation

Parks	
Parks LOS Per Household (acres) = LOS * Average Household Size / 1,000	0.018
Parks Base and Development Cost Per Acre - from Tables 10 and 12 = Base Cost Per Acre + Development Cost Per Acre	\$75,876
Parks Cost Per Household = Parks Base and Development Cost per Acre * Parks LOS Per Household	\$1,374
Adjustment Factor - from Table 13	28%
Parks Impact Fee Per Household = Parks Cost Per Household * (1-Adjustment Factor)	\$985
Trails	
Trails LOS Per Household (miles) = LOS * Average Household Size / 1,000	0.001
Trails Base Cost Per Mile - from Table 10	\$118,800
Trails Cost Per Household = Trails Cost per Mile * Trails LOS Per Household	\$139
Adjustment Factor - from Table 13	28%
Trails Impact Fee Per Household = Trails Cost Per Household * (1-Adjustment Factor)	\$100
Combined Parks and Trails Impact Fee Per Household	\$1,085

Mayor Simmons asked how many people are in the average household in the city? Curtis replied three and a half.

Curtis asked what other cities are charging for their impact fees regarding the highest amount allowed per the analysis. Are they charging the highest allowed or something else? Emily responded that Richmond charges the full amount and Providence does not. Traditionally cities lean towards charging the maximum amount so current residents are not paying any amount towards the cost of new growth. Any amount charged less than the maximum allowable amount means current residents are subsidizing new growth.

Barbara asked if charging the maximum amount will slow growth? Emily replied in theory that is what people think will happen but right now growth is still very strong everywhere and it does not appear to affect growth and expansion.

Barbara asked where the current fees are in relation to what other cities are charging? Kris responded Smithfield's impact fees are either the lowest or close to the bottom.

Emily stated a public hearing is required before the council can vote on the fees they want to charge. Once the fees are approved they do not go into effect until 90 days after they are adopted by the council.

RATE STUDY ANALYSIS PRESENTATION BY PUBLIC SECTOR ECONOMICS ON WATER AND STORM WATER RATES.
--

Emily Sim presented the following information on the monthly storm water utility fee:

The current Monthly fee is \$4.50 per month or \$54.00 per year.

The current ERU (Equivalent Residential Unit) fee is \$2.25 per month.

Currently, there are 3,327 households billed on a monthly basis.

Currently, there are 1,314 ERU's invoiced on a monthly basis.

A five year capital improvement plan has been created as well as a long term capital improvement plan which shows projects over the next few decades.

Based on the current number of monthly users and ERU's annual revenue totals: \$215,150.

A fee structure has been asked to be created/reviewed to determine the rate that needs to be charged to build a one year reserve of cash on hand, pay for annual expenses as well as pay for capital improvements needs over the next five years.

The annual growth rate used for the formula is 2.8% based on past trends.

Revenue needs to be underestimated not overestimated in regards to collecting enough funds to pay for large projects in the future.

The rate used for uncollectible accounts was 2.00%.

Average annual expenses over the last nine years is: \$175,839.

The rate used for inflation moving forward is 3.00%.

The total cost of the capital improvement projects needed over the next six years is estimated at \$5,900,000.

Good fiscal practice is to have one year of cash reserves on-hand.

The current amount in reserve is \$203,853.

The amount of funds needed over the next six years is \$5,961,147.

The reserve needs to be increased significantly starting in the next year to hit the goal of paying for all of the needed capital improvement projects as well as regular expenses in the next six years.

If the monthly rate is not adjusted at this time then bonding will be required in the future and interest will be paid. By adjusting the monthly rate now; bonding can be avoided and no interest will need to be paid on the projects.

Based on the current monthly charge and current expenses the amount held in reserve is decreasing on a yearly basis.

Based on current revenue versus current expense about \$20,000 per year is needed from the reserve. At the current rate all of the reserve will be gone in less than ten years.

Alternative pricing which is also considered a new pricing model shows that the monthly rate needs to be increased from \$4.50 per month to \$20.00 per month. The ERU rate needs to be changed from \$2.25 per month to \$10.00 per month. The proposed change would pay for current expenses, depreciation and future capital improvement projects without having to bond for these projects in the future. These capital improvement projects are needed even if growth stops.

Any amount charged below the proposed rate will result in a short fall of cash and bonding will be required to pay for projects. The proposed fee structure would be for the next six years. The projected costs are based on estimates as all actual costs cannot be determined at this time.

The utility rate can be reviewed on a yearly basis to make sure the amount of reserve needed is being collected to meet the cost of projects in the future.

Emily presented the following information to the council on the monthly culinary water rate:

The current base monthly fee is \$9.00.

A tiered rate is charged for actual water consumption in the following amounts per 1,000 gallons used.

- Zero to 20,000 gallons per month is charged at a rate of \$0.60 per 1,000 gallons used.
- Over 20,001 gallons per month is charged at a rate of \$0.70 per 1,000 gallons used.

The base rate of the city is very low compared to other local cities.

Usage for the chart was based off of actual usage in the city over the last 12 months by the utility account holders.

Current revenue on a yearly basis is:

Base Rate:	\$411,804
Usage Rate:	\$450,318
Total:	\$862,122

The tiered rate revenue consists of:

Under 20,000 gallons per month:	\$193,243
Over 20,000 gallons per month:	\$257,075

Total revenue collected per fiscal year: \$450,318

The Smithfield City rate structure is vastly different than most other communities as Smithfield's rate schedule is mainly based on usage. The majority of other communities base their monthly rate schedule on a higher monthly base rate.

Alternative pricing was provided to show one possible rate schedule that would meet the need of having one year of reserve in place, funding needed capital improvement projects and making sure all current expenses are covered.

Inflation was included for expenses at a rate of 3.00%.

Current debt service is an actual amount not an estimate.

Expense amounts were an average of the last few years.

Capital improvement projects needed over the next six years are estimated to cost \$5,000,000.

A one year reserve of cash on hand is recommended and that would equate to \$1,200,000. Right now the reserve on hand is \$496,886.

One proposed rate schedule to meet the expenses, depreciation and capital projects needed over the next six year was as follows:

Adjust the Monthly base rate to \$20.00 per month.

Tiered usage schedule would be as follows:

- Zero to 10,000 gallons would be charged at a rate of \$0.90 per 1,000 gallons used.
- 10,001 to 20,000 gallons would be charged at a rate of \$1.00 per 1,000 gallons used.
- Over 20,001 gallons per month would be charged at a rate of \$1.25 per 1,000 gallons used.

Current pricing, if left unchanged, results in a decrease in the reserve fund of \$230,183 per year. So the current reserve on hand would be gone in less than three years.

The long term goal would be to pay cash for infrastructure projects over the next six years and not have to bond and pay interest.

Mayor Simmons asked if it was possible to obtain the spreadsheet so the council could plug in their own numbers to come up with their own scenarios of what they feel is best? Emily responded she would be happy to supply the spreadsheet for everyone to be able to run the scenarios they want to review.

Mayor Simmons asked if the actual growth rate from the last couple of years is known? Curtis replied he did not know the actual number but guessed it would be around 4%.

Emily updated her spreadsheet to show a growth rate of 4.00% and no other changes were made to other variables. By changing the growth rate from 2.80% to 4.00% the amount of funds collected would be collected in five years and not six years.

Curtis asked for the growth rate to be changed to 2.00%. At a growth rate of 2.00% rather than 2.80% the amount of funds needed would come up short and bonding would be required to pay for projects.

Emily mentioned it is up to the city council and mayor to determine the course of action taken by the staff in regards to the amount of fees charged per month.

Some cities save money for years to pay for projects and never pay any interest. Other cities bond and pay interest. Smithfield needs to decide what kind of city they want to be financially and plan accordingly and adjust rates to match those plans.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON ORDINANCE 17-16, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMITHFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 17 “ZONING REGULATIONS” SECTIONS 17.44.010 “ESTABLISHMENT OF ZONES”; 17.48.030 “AREA, WIDTH AND YARD REGULATIONS”; 17.48.060 “MODIFYING REGULATIONS”; 17.52.050 “MODIFYING REGULATIONS”; 17.56.050 “MODIFYING REGULATIONS” AND 17.060.050 “MODIFYING REGULATIONS”.

Clay informed the council this ordinance is mainly a housekeeping ordinance as some new zones were added. The following new zones were added: Gateway, Airport and PUD (Planned Unit Development).

Somehow in the past the zoning designation of A-5 (Agricultural 5-Acre) had been deleted from the code when it should not have been so it is being put back in to keep some existing parcels in compliance.

In the past there had been confusion on corner lots so the code is being updated to be easier to understand. This change was made in four sections of the code in “Modifying Regulations” sections.

Barbara thanked the staff for addressing corner lots as there had been some confusion in this area in the past. It is nice to have corner lots on their own and easily identifiable of what is allowed and not allowed.

A motion to adopt Ordinance 17-16, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Sections: 17.44.010 “Establishment of Zones”; 17.48.030 “Area, Width and Yard Regulations”; 17.48.060 “Modifying Regulations”; 17.52.050 “Modifying Regulations”; 17.56.050 “Modifying Regulations” and 17.60.050 “Modifying Regulations” was made by Curtis, seconded by Jeff and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON ORDINANCE 17-18, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMITHFIELD CITY MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 17 “ZONING REGULATIONS” AND ADDING CHAPTER 17.89 “MIXED-USE OVERLY ZONE” IN ITS ENTIRETY.

Clay informed the council as part of the adoption of the new general plan a mixed-use overlay zone was added. The zone now needs to be added to the city code.

This ordinance is based off of information gathered from what other cities are doing and what is applicable to Smithfield City.

The planning commission has reviewed and approved the ordinance and has forwarded to the council for consideration.

Barbara asked if all of this was new code or some old code was being replaced? Clay stated all of the code in this ordinance is new.

Kris asked for clarification on 17.89.100 “Lighting” and if this is changing the dark sky ordinance for the city? Clay said this is just requiring the regular amount of street lights like in the past where they are required every 300 feet. The dark sky ordinance is not being changed.

Curtis mentioned a new proposed subdivision named Lantern Hills has several street lights because of how long the roadway is. Clay mentioned street lights are required in all cul-de-sacs and at all intersections per city code.

Kris asked if developers complain about lighting requirements? Clay replied most are good to work with as the city notifies the developer of the lights that are allowed. All new street lights must be LED as well.

Jeff asked in Section 17.89.150 "Historic Buildings" when a conditional use permit would be required? Clay stated as the ordinance is written that would be determined by the council, planning commission and historical society. Curtis replied this section is to document the history of the building. Craig replied this section of the ordinance will need to be changed to be legal. The city would need to create a Historical Preservation Authority. The council is not allowed to be the Historical Preservation Authority. A historical district would need to be created as well. State code also requires land use applications to be dealt with in 30 days not 60 days as listed in the ordinance. Demolition permits have a 14 day response requirement per code.

Curtis mentioned several items in this section need to be reviewed and it would be best to remove the entire section at this time and review at a later time.

A motion to adopt Ordinance 17-18, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 "Zoning Regulations" and adding Chapter 17.89 "Mixed-Use Overlay Zone" in its entirety with Section 17.89.150 "Historical Building" being removed in its entirety and Section 17.89.160 "Conflicts" being renumbered to 17.89.150 was made by Curtis, seconded by Kris and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

<p>DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON AN INTERLOCAL FIRE AGREEMENT BETWEEN SMITHFIELD CITY AND RICHMOND CITY.</p>

Chief Downs informed the council he had been approached by Richmond City Mayor Jeff Young, Fire Chief Troy Hooley and Council Member Lyle Bair about helping them with their issue of a lack of daytime coverage. This is a common issue in the valley and state. With the addition of the three new full-time employees it would be feasible for Smithfield to assist Richmond when needed.

The proposed contract would provide coverage; Monday through Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. The hours and contract can be amended if needed.

The Smithfield Fire Department currently offers coverage 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 365 days per year.

The dollar amount in the agreement is the same as in the contract with Hyde Park City.

Chief Downs explained Richmond City is trying to be proactive as they know they have a problem and want to address it before it becomes a larger issue.

Mayor Simmons asked if assistance is already being offered? Chief Downs replied that is correct due to the mutual aid agreement between the cities in the valley.

Chief Downs explained the proposed agreement is actually better for those in need of service and for those responding to the scene. The way the system currently works is when an issue arises in Richmond a page is sent out, if the page is not responded to by someone from Richmond within five minutes then Smithfield or the county is contacted to respond. The five minute delay can be life and death in some cases and the contract would allow for immediate response and allow the firefighters and EMT's an extra five minutes to do their job before the situation gets worse.

Mayor Simmons asked if this will add additional burden to the Smithfield department? Chief Downs replied Smithfield is already responding so not much would change. The new transfer program is still being tweaked. Right now coverage is required to Richmond if they do not respond. The contract will generate additional revenue to the city on a yearly basis like the Hyde Park contract does.

Barbara asked if residents of both cities will benefit? Chief Downs replied Smithfield already has full-time coverage but this will allow problems in Richmond to be responded to immediately.

Mayor Simmons asked if the agreement is reviewed annually? Chief Downs stated that is correct and the additional revenue to the city will be around \$5,000 per year.

Jeff mentioned Item 5 in the contract says the contract will be reviewed every five years and that needs to be reworded to annually. Chief Downs agreed.

Chief Downs mentioned as Richmond grows the contract is updated and the amount of revenue increases as well. The amount of revenue is not a set amount but based on the population and changes as the population increases.

Chief Downs informed the council the appendix portion of the contract talks about procedures for when both chiefs are on scene and other operational items.

Mayor Simmons asked if the contract would start on December 1st? Chief Downs replied that is correct. Smithfield has already been assisting during November and Richmond has agreed to pay for the month of November as well.

A motion to approve the interlocal fire agreement between Smithfield City and Richmond City with Item 5 being reworded to annual and not every five years was made by Kris, seconded by Jeff and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

CANVASS THE ELECTION RESULTS OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2017 GENERAL ELECTION.

Justin thanked the poll workers for their volunteer service on Election Day, Tuesday, November 7th. Jackie Hancock, Mary Kay Hunsaker, Michael Neilson, Janae Martin and Randy Martin were thanked for their service to the community. They arrived at 6:30 A.M. and did not leave until after 9:00 P.M. on Election Day.

Justin presented the council with the following information:

General Election Canvass for November 7, 2017

Polling Location: Civic Center

	Early	Civic Center	Provisional	Absentee	Total	Percent
Mayor – Four (4) Year Term						
Darrell G. Simmons	130	379	8	6	523	44.70
Jeffrey H. Barnes***	103	529	4	11	647	55.30
City Council – 4 Year Term						
Barbara Scholes Kent	137	431	4	3	575	26.20
Jamie Anderson***	157	630	8	14	809	36.86
Wade C. Campbell***	148	640	9	14	811	36.95

Regular Votes 914
 Accepted 914
 Rejected 0

Absentee Votes 17
 Accepted 17
 Rejected 0

Early Votes 238
 Accepted 238
 Rejected 0

Provisional Votes 22
 Accepted 12
 Rejected 10

Total Voters 1,191
Total Registered Voters 5,325
Voting Percentage 22.37%

Justin informed the council the ten Provisional Ballots that were rejected were because the voters were not registered voters. This is determined by the Cache County Clerk’s Office.

All of the early votes, regular votes and absentee votes were accepted.

Jeff Barnes was elected as mayor and Jamie Anderson and Wade Campbell were elected to serve on the city council. Those elected will be sworn in during a ceremony on Tuesday, January 2, 2018.

With Jeff being elected as mayor this will create a vacancy on the city council which will be advertised and discussed at a later time after Jeff takes office as mayor. The process will allow for any registered voter, 18 years or older who has resided in the city for a minimum of the last 12 months to apply.

Voter turnout was 22.37%.

Justin stated he was not aware of any issues or concerns in regards to Election Day or the process overseen by the city.

A motion to certify the election results of the Tuesday, November 7, 2017 general election was made by Curtis, seconded by Deon and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

The council meeting was temporarily adjourned at 8:20 P.M. to hold the RDA board meeting.

The council meeting reconvened at 8:45 P.M.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON CHANGES TO THE EMPLOYEE PERSONNEL MANUAL.
--

Craig discussed the following items in the employee personnel manual.

There are challenges with holiday pay and time off for both the fire department and the police department. Coverage is offered by both departments every day of the year so allowing every employee to have days off for holidays is not possible. The staff had researched what other cities are doing and the majority of them rather than have holiday pay for these departments they add eight hours of PTO (Personal Time Off) to the employee's hours for each holiday. This way all shifts are covered and the employee is able to utilize the hours at a later time. This would not apply to office staff or department heads of either department. Just those in the field and working on shifts.

The fire department had recently restructured to have 24 hour coverage. With this change there is no longer a need for the pager pay program so it would be eliminated. There would be a need now for a call back policy which would be new in its entirety.

The old section of the manual in regards to cell phones and computers for business and personal use would be removed and an entire new section would be added. The new section is more in depth and has been reviewed and approved by the legal counsel of the city.

Mayor Simmons asked how social media is controlled? Craig replied the city staff monitors the city Facebook page and it has limited access by certain employees.

Jeff asked if employees are required to carry city issued cell phones? Craig replied the majority of full-time employees are required to do so. Specifically the fire department, police department and public works department. Phones have replaced radios which were used in the past.

Jeff asked if some employees carry a personal phone as well as a city phone? Craig replied that is correct. Personal phones are paid for by the employee.

Mayor Simmons asked if every employee would have to review and sign off stating they had read this new policy? Craig stated that is correct.

Jeff asked how often cell phones have to be monitored by the city staff? Craig replied very seldom. There has to be an issue that must be addressed in order for the cell phone or computer to be monitored. There is no random checking of content on a cell phone or computer.

Barbara asked if this section was completely new? Craig replied it is a combination of the current policy and new items that are more in depth. The section should now be easier to understand what is allowed and not allowed.

A motion to approve changes to the Employee Personnel Manual was made by Jeff, seconded by Deon and the vote was unanimous

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON RESOLUTION 17-17, A RESOLUTION DEMANDING NOTICE FROM THE OWNER(S) OF UNUSED BURIAL RIGHTS IN THE LOTS AND SPACES OF THE SMITHFIELD CITY CEMETERY WHICH HAVE BEEN UNUSED FOR BURIAL PURPOSES FOR MORE THAN 60 YEARS; REVERSION OF TITLE TO SMITHFIELD CITY.

Justin informed the council the proposed Resolution would reclaim ownership of cemetery plots in the city listed under names of people that have not contacted the city in at least 60 years.

The intent is to find the family members of the owners of the plots to get the information corrected or to have the city reclaim the plots and be able to sell them again so they can be used. This project had been worked on for a long period of time to determine the names to list in the resolution.

The process is to get the resolution adopted. Legal counsel for the city and the city staff had worked together to create the resolution based on state code.

Once the resolution is adopted it is then posted on the Utah Public Notice Website, in *The Herald Journal* for three consecutive Sunday's, at the city office, on Facebook and through Parlant.

Those making claim to the burial plots in question have 60 days to respond. The names listed as current owners of the plots in question are also mailed a letter to the last address of record on file.

There are approximately 354 burial plots listed in the resolution.

There is ownership information on some of the plots such as name and address. Some of the plots have extremely limited information such as just a last name only.

The cost to publish the advertisement in *The Herald Journal* for three consecutive Sunday's will be \$2,871.48.

Anyone coming forward to claim the plots in question must provide proof of who they are and how they believe they have ownership to the plots in question.

The intent is to not simply reclaim all the plots in question but to correct the ownership of the plots and take back those plots where ownership cannot be determined.

Currently, there are about 100 burials per year in the cemetery. This could possibly save expansion of the grounds to the east by three years.

Barbara asked what happens if the resolution is not passed? Justin replied then ownership is still in question and most likely the plots will never be utilized.

Kris felt the resolution was a good idea. Jeff concurred and stated this would help save the cost of developing the area to the east until a later time.

A motion to adopt Resolution 17-17, a Resolution demanding notice from the owner(s) of unused burial rights in the lots and spaces of the Smithfield City Cemetery which have been unused for burial purposes for more than 60 years; reversion of title to Smithfield City was made by Curtis, seconded by Jeff and the vote was unanimous.

Yes Vote: Hunsaker, Kent, Monson, Barnes, Wall

No Vote: None

CITY MANAGER REPORT

Craig asked the council now that the presentation on impact fees and utility rates had been presented to the council what does the council want to do? Do they want to have a public hearing and possible vote in December or wait until 2018? Kris replied she would like to see both items discussed at the December council meeting.

Craig asked if the council wanted to consider the rates presented by Emily in her study or something different? Kris replied a big injustice is being done to the residents by keeping the impact fees so low. Developers are coming here because of the low cost to build. Impact fees

need to be increased to help control growth and make sure the best possible services are offered to the residents.

Craig asked if utility rate increases would also be discussed in December? Kris replied she would like that discussion in December as well. Jeff replied something must be done now or the city will have to bond and pay interest later.

Craig informed the council that depreciation must be dealt with in the future as well. It is a finding in the audit report which will be presented to the council in December. Water, Storm Water, Sewer, and Golf all must account for depreciation moving forward to stay in budget and state compliance.

Craig reminded the council the annual employee Christmas party will be held on Thursday, December 14th at 1:00 P.M. at the Birch Creek Golf Course Clubhouse.

Barbara asked if the discussion on impact fees and utility rates could be delayed until the new council takes over in January? Kris replied she felt the current council and mayor have the knowledge and experience to deal with the issue now. Kris did not feel it was appropriate to force this decision on a brand new council and mayor. Let the blame fall on the current council and mayor not the new council and mayor.

Jeff asked if different scenarios could be run to see how rates would be affected with minor changes? Mayor Simmons replied all scenarios need to be reviewed as things will constantly change over the next six years. Mayor Simmons said the new council and mayor might consider different scenarios and a thought process different than the current council and mayor so they should be the ones making the decision. The bottom line is the rates have to change; it is just a matter of how much.

Kris replied impact fee changes don't go into effect until 90 days after approved so the sooner they are adopted by the council the better.

Barbara mentioned she would rather have the new council and mayor deal with the changes since they will have to answer for why they were done after they are implemented. Kris disagreed and stated the current council and mayor have the expertise to make the best decision now. Mayor Simmons mentioned this is a big deal to consider and much thought needs to be given.

Barbara stated the entire community is affected by this and it must be well thought out.

Kris mentioned the city did not have a park impact fee until she proposed it and it needs to be amended as soon as possible. Barbara replied she did not mind reviewing impact fees in December but felt the utility rate discussion should not happen until after the first of the year. Curtis replied he was fine to discuss in December or 2018 as he would be involved no matter when the discussion occurs.

Kris mentioned the monthly base utility rate in Richmond with a 90 gallon garbage can is \$129.55 per month. Kris stated her average monthly utility bill in Smithfield is around \$71.00

per month including water usage. Mayor Simmons replied he was not disagreeing a change is needed but wanted to make sure the timing was correct for everyone involved. Kris replied a lot of money needs to be saved to pay for the infrastructure projects and the sooner the better to start saving the needed funds.

Barbara mentioned this is not something new to the council as everyone knew this discussion was coming. Mayor Simmons replied everyone just needs to be prepared and informed with the information they want to see and review.

Craig asked what different scenarios the council wanted to review? Mayor Simmons replied he wanted to know the actual growth over the last eight years not just assume it is 2.8%. Jeff concurred. Mayor Simmons stated an actual growth rate should be used not an estimated rate.

Mayor Simmons mentioned if interest on mortgage loans increases even 1.00% the housing market will slow dramatically.

Jeff stated he wanted to have the discussion on impact fees and utility rates as soon as possible.

Craig replied the growth rate is a good medium point because if the growth rate in the formula is too high and it does not occur at that rate then revenue will be lower than expected.

Mayor Simmons mentioned based on the comments of the council both discussions would occur at the December council meeting. Curtis responded he felt it was appropriate to have both discussions at that time.

Craig asked the council to inform him of any scenarios they wanted to see and review before the next council meeting.

Curtis mentioned he did not want to have the highest or lowest utility rate in the valley but somewhere in between. A commitment needs to be made by the council to fix this issue and save the needed funds over the next five to six years.

Craig mentioned the utility rate of Smithfield should not be compared to other communities as their expenses and debts would be vastly different than Smithfield as well as the number of users on the system.

Craig mentioned some cities look at small yearly base rate increases after the rate is adjusted to the appropriate level.

Craig asked the council to inform him of any potholes they encounter as the weather is changing and potholes will start to appear more frequently.

COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS

Deon informed the council the Lion's Club is donating a tree to the Night of Giving fundraiser held by the Smithfield Chamber of Commerce.

Deon mentioned he talked to a resident residing in an apartment in the area of 250 East 600 South. The resident was planning on building a home across the road in the new proposed subdivision. Since the council had denied the rezone request for the area requesting larger lots than proposed this resident said he would no longer be able to buy a lot there because of the increased cost for the larger lot.

Barbara mentioned the Senior Ball had been a success. The ball had a Halloween theme this year and it may or may not be used in the future. On December 2nd there will be a leadership training event for the youth council. The youth council will be helping with the Turkey Trot, sponsored by the Recreation Center, as well on Saturday, November 18th.

Kris mentioned the Turkey Trot starts at 10:00 A.M. on Saturday the 18th. Those that want to dress in a costume are welcome to do so.

Jeff informed the council a young man who had Jeff's permission had removed shrubs, trees and bushes off of specifically marked graves in the cemetery on Saturday, November 11th. There are still a few that need to be cleaned off and letters will be sent to the caretakers of those graves asking them to come into compliance.

Curtis mentioned the Night of Giving is approaching. This is the last year Stacey Dority will be helping out. Stacey's assistant will be taking over at the start of the year.

Curtis asked where the doors for the Trick or Treat Street are stored? Jay Downs responded at the Civic Center. The fire department helped take them to Sky View High School for the event and then return them to the Civic Center after the event was over. Curtis was hopeful the city would sponsor a door for the event in the future.

Curtis mentioned the mini-subdivision ordinance had a preliminary review by the planning commission in November. The public hearing on the ordinance would go before the planning commission on December 20th and then come before the council in January 2018.

Curtis stated with Jamie Anderson and Wade Campbell being elected to serve on the council that would create two vacancies on the planning commission as they are both currently serving on the commission. Curtis invited a local civil engineer and trucking company business owner to fill the roles of alternate commissioner in the future. Both had expressed interest in the past in serving. Andrew Soelberg and Mindy Spackman will be approved as full-time commissioners at the December council meeting. Currently, Andrew and Mindy are serving as alternate commissioners. There are still three residents on a waiting list willing to serve on the planning commission as well.

Curtis asked Craig to work with BRAG (Bear River Association of Governments) to renew the recycling program in the city which has expired. Heritage Glass, a local company, gets a benefit by the city having this program in place. Craig replied the process is for the business owner to ask the city to support the agreement. The city has willingly done so in the past.

Curtis mentioned he had attended a CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) meeting about their program. The city should apply for the grant funding to help pay for renovation and repairs to the exterior of the senior center. Projects in the range of \$30,000 to \$200,000 are typically approved. The grant is easier to obtain if the city is willing to pay a matching portion of at least five to seven percent of the project cost. This year there is \$650,000 in available funding. In order to apply there was a mandatory meeting which Curtis attended. There were only approximately nine entities that attended the meeting. Providence, Garden City and Cornish all plan to apply for funding. Applications are due by January 31, 2018. Brian Carver is in charge of the program and willing to help any entity that is qualified to apply. Justin mentioned a public hearing is required to start the process. Curtis stated that is correct and the hearing must be held no later than December 31, 2017.

Curtis informed the council himself, Jeff and Craig had attended the Cache Summit. A slideshow on growth was presented. Curtis will get a copy to show people that want to see population growth projections for the future of Cache Valley. The forecast is for huge growth in the next couple of decades.

Curtis mentioned he had talked with Lisa Duskin Goede who works with the Bear River Heritage Area. They map the location and information on all of the museums in Southern Idaho and Northern Utah. Smithfield is not included in the list. Glenn Jay Thornley informed the council the Smithfield museum is not included as there is a designation the city needs to apply for in order for the museum to be listed. The city had not done this in the past. Glenn Jay is going to provide Curtis with the information on this designation and what is needed to get the local museum listed.

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Simmons did not have any additional items to discuss.

****Kris made a motion to adjourn at 9:22 P.M.****

SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION

Darrell G. Simmons, Mayor

ATTEST:

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION
96 South Main
Smithfield, UT 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 15, 2017**. The meeting will begin at 6:00 P.M.

Welcome and Opening Ceremonies by Kris Monson

1. Approval of the city council meeting minutes from October 11, 2017
2. Resident Input
3. Update and discussion with Cache County Trails Coordinator Dayton Crites.
4. Impact Fee Rate Analysis presentation by Public Sector Economics on Water, Storm Water and Park Impact Fees.
5. Rate Study Analysis presentation by Public Sector Economics on Water and Storm Water Rates.
6. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 17-16, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations” Sections 17.44.010 “Establishment of Zones”; 17.48.030 “Area, Width and Yard Regulations”; 17.48.060 “Modifying Regulations”; 17.52.050 “Modifying Regulations”; 17.56.050 “Modifying Regulations” and 17.060.050 “Modifying Regulations”.
7. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 17-18, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations” and adding Chapter 17.89 “Mixed-Use Overlay Zone” in its entirety.
8. Discussion and possible vote on an interlocal Fire Agreement between Smithfield City and Richmond City.
9. Canvass the election results of the November 7, 2017 General Election.
10. Discussion and possible vote on changes to the Employee Personnel Manual.
11. Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 17-17, a Resolution demanding notice from the owner(s) of unused burial rights in the lots and spaces of the Smithfield City Cemetery which have been unused for burial purposes for more than 60 years; reversion of title to Smithfield City.

12. City Manager Report
13. Council Member Reports
14. 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 needing special accommodation for this meeting should contact the City Recorder at (435) 792-7990, at least three (3) days before the date of the meeting.