Town of Leeds

Agenda
Town of Leeds Town Council
Wednesday, April 13, 2016

PUBLIC NOTICE is hereby given that the Town of Leeds Town Council will, after a brief public opening hold a **CLOSED MEETING** on Wednesday, April 13, 2016 at 6:00pm and a **PUBLIC MEETING** on Wednesday, April 13, 2016 at 7:00pm. The Town Council will meet in the Leeds Town Hall located at 218 N Main, Leeds, Utah.

NOTE: IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK DURING CITIZEN COMMENT, PLEASE SIGN IN WITH THE RECORDER.

Closed Meeting 6:00pm

A Closed Meeting may be held for the discussion of the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual as allowed by Utah State Law 52-4-205(1)(a); or for the discussion of pending or imminent litigation; as allowed by the Utah State Law 52-4-205(1)(c); or for the discussion of the purchase, sale , exchange, or lease of real property, including any form or a water right or water shares; as allowed by Utah Code 52-4-205(1)(d).

Regular Meeting 7:00pm.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Declaration of Abstentions or Conflicts
4. Consent Agenda:
    a. Tonight's Agenda
    b. Meeting minutes of March 9, 2016.
5. Citizen Comments: No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item. (Three minutes per person).
6. Announcements:
    a. Open Public Meetings Act Training, April 15, 9:30am – 3:00pm in Virgin
    b. Celebration of our National Parks presentation, Silver Reef Museum, April 23 at 10:00am
    c. Dumpster Days May 6th - 8th
7. Public Hearings:
    a. Ordinance 2016-02, Compensation of the Clerk/Recorder
8. Action Items:
    a. Discussion and possible action regarding proposed Ordinance 2016-01, Repeal of Land Use Ordinance 2011-03, Chapter 23, Mixed-Use Zoning, Amendments to the Land Use Ordinance 2012-02, Chapter 26, Site Development Plan and Amendment to the Land Use Ordinance 2008-04, Chapter 12, Zoning District, to address the language related to the repeal of the Mixed-Use Zone
    b. Discussions and possible action regarding Zoning Agreement for the Grapevine Wash properties.
    c. Discussion and possible action regarding Zone Change for Parcels L-3282-G and L-3284-B for Tuscan Lenders Group LC from Mixed Use (MXD) to Multiple Residential R-M-7, Residential R-1-10 (10,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-20 (20,000 sq. ft.),Residential R-1-1 (1 acre) on approximately 77 acres
    d. Discussion and possible action regarding Zone Change for Parcel L-3281-A for Capital Funding LTD CO LLC from Mixed Use (MXD) to Residential R-1-10 (10,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-20 (20,000 sq. ft.) on approximately 25 acres.
    e. Discussion and possible action regarding Zone Change for Parcels L-3281, L-3285, L-3284-A-1, L-3286, L-3287 and L-3289 for MSH Investments LLC from Mixed Use (MXD) to Multiple Residential R-M-7, Residential R-1-10 (10,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-20 (20,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-1(1 acre) on approximately 199 acres.

f. Discussion and possible action regarding Zone Change for Parcels L-3282-F, L-3282-D-2 and L-3179-A-3-B for MISI Investments LLC from Mixed Use (MXD) to Multiple Residential R-M-7, Residential R-1-10 (10,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-20 (20,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-1 (1 acre) on approximately 68
g. Ordinance 2016-02, Compensation of the Clerk/Recorder

9. Discussion Items:
    a. Local Option Gas Tax
    b. Ash Creek follow-up
    c. Old Highway 91
    d. 2016 Roadworks
    e. Zoning Map
    f. Cemetery Plots
10. Citizen Comments: No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item. (Three minutes per person).
11. Staff Reports

    Closed Meeting- A Closed Meeting may be held for the discussion of the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual as allowed by Utah State Law 52-4-205(1)(a); or for the discussion of pending or imminent litigation; as allowed by the Utah State Law 52-4-205(1)(c); or for the discussion of the purchase, sale , exchange, or lease of real property, including any form or a water right or water shares; as allowed by Utah Code 52-4-205(1)(d).
12. Adjournment

The Town of Leeds will make reasonable accommodations for persons needing assistance to participate in this public meeting. Persons requesting assistance are asked to call the Leeds Town Hall at 879-2447 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.
The Town of Leeds is an equal opportunity provider and employer.
Certificate of Posting;
The undersigned Deputy Clerk/Recorder does hereby certify that the above notice was posted April 11, 2016 at these public places being at **Leeds Town Hall**, **Leeds Post Office**, the **Utah Public Meeting Notice website** http://pmn.utah.gov, and the **Town of Leeds website** www.leedstown.org.

Kristi Barker, Clerk/Recorder

Town of Leeds

Town Council Meeting
April 13, 2016

1. Call to order:
   Mayor Peterson called to order the regular meeting of the Leeds Town Council at 6:00pm on April 13, 2016 at Leeds Town Hall, 218 N Main.
   A motion to close the public meeting and move into a "Closed" meeting to discuss litigation; as allowed by Utah state Law 52-4-205(1)(c) was made by Councilmember Blake, with a 2nd by Councilmember Cundick. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR				x
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE	x			

The closed meeting began at 6:00pm and went until 6:59pm. The public meeting reconvened at 7:05pm.

ROLL CALL:

	Present	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x	
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x	
COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR	x	
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x	
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE		x

2. Pledge of Allegiance by Councilmember Rohr.

3. Declaration of Abstentions or Conflicts: None.

4. Approval of Agenda:
   Councilmember Cundick moved to approve tonight's agenda and meeting minutes of March 9, 2016. 2nd by Councilmember Rohr. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE				x

5. Citizen Comments:
   Susan Savage, I have a conflict on Wednesday nights and I just want you to know if I come a little late, or leave a little early, I am trying to catch both of them and not to feel I am disrespectful. Mayor Peterson, thank you for coming.

6. Announcements:
   a. Open Public Meetings Act Training, April 15, 9:30am – 3:00pm in Virgin.
      Mayor Peterson indicated this is training that Planning Commission and Town Council were invited to in Virgin. This is not a meeting for the Town of Leeds and there is not going to be an agenda with any business items.

   b. Celebration of our National Parks presentation, Silver Reef Museum, April 23 at 10:00am.
      Mayor Peterson, there is going to be a Celebration of our National Parks presentation. It is the 100 year anniversary of our parks this year and it will be taking place at the Silver Reef Museum. I believe it is the President of the Zion Historical Preservation Group who will be doing the speaking. It will be held on Saturday the 23 at 10:00am.

   c. Dumpster Days May 6th - 8th.
      Mayor Peterson announced Dumpster Days.

7. Public Hearings:
   a. Ordinance 2016-02, Compensation of the Clerk/Recorder
      Mayor Peterson, at our last meeting we appointed Kristi Barker as the Clerk/Recorder and what we have to hold right now because it involves the compensation of one of our officials is a Public Hearing to change that particular rate. The previous Clerk/Recorder was earning $19.00 hour and the proposed rate for Clerk/Recorder going forward would be $16.50 Hour.

      Mayor Peterson asked for a motion to open the Public Hearing on Ordinance 2016-02. Councilmember Rohr, I so move. 2nd by Councilmember Cundick. All voted "Aye". Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE				x

      Mayor Peterson asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing on Ordinance 2016-02. Councilmember Rohr, I so move. 2nd by Councilmember Cundick. All voted "Aye". Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x			

COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE				x

8. Action Items:
   a. Discussion and possible action regarding proposed Ordinance 2016-01, Repeal of Land Use Ordinance 2011-03, Chapter 23, Mixed-Use Zoning, Amendments to the Land Use Ordinance 2012-02, Chapter 26, Site Development Plan and Amendment to the Land Use Ordinance 2008-04, Chapter 12, Zoning District, to address the language related to the repeal of the Mixed-Use Zone
   Mayor Peterson, this particular series has been before our Planning Commission and the Planning Commission unanimously recommended that these particular changes be made to our Land Use Ordinances.

   Mayor Peterson asked for a motion to approve item 8a related to the changes in the Land Use Ordinance
   Councilmember Cundick, I so move. 2nd by Councilmember Rohr. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE				x

   b. Discussions and possible action regarding Zoning Agreement for the Grapevine Wash properties.
   Mayor Peterson, items 8b though 8f we had a closed session earlier this evening and at this time, I would request a motion to continue these items until our meeting on May 25th , 2016, so that final documents can be agreed to and worked up with the other parties involved in these particular items.
   Councilmember Cundick, I so move. 2nd by Councilmember Rohr. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE				x

   c. Discussion and possible action regarding Zone Change for Parcels L-3282-G and L-3284-B for Tuscan Lenders Group LC from Mixed Use (MXD) to Multiple Residential R-M-7, Residential R-1-10 (10,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-20 (20,000 sq. ft.),Residential R-1-1 (1 acre) on approximately 77 acres.
   Item continued until May 25th, 2016 Town Council meeting.

d. Discussion and possible action regarding Zone Change for Parcel L-3281-A for Capital Funding LTD CO LLC from Mixed Use (MXD) to Residential R-1-10 (10,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-20 (20,000 sq. ft.) on approximately 25 acres.
Item continued until May 25th, 2016 Town Council meeting.

e. Discussion and possible action regarding Zone Change for Parcels L-3281, L-3285, L-3284-A-1, L-3286, L-3287 and L-3289 for MSH Investments LLC from Mixed Use (MXD) to Multiple Residential R-M-7, Residential R-1-10 (10,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-20 (20,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-1(1 acre) on approximately 199 acres.
Item continued until May 25th, 2016 Town Council meeting.

f. Discussion and possible action regarding Zone Change for Parcels L-3282-F, L-3282-D-2 and L-3179-A-3-B for MISI Investments LLC from Mixed Use (MXD) to Multiple Residential R-M-7, Residential R-1-10 (10,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-20 (20,000 sq. ft.), Residential R-1-1 (1 acre) on approximately 68 acres.
Item continued until May 25th, 2016 Town Council meeting.

g. Ordinance 2016-02, Compensation of the Clerk/Recorder.
Mayor Peterson asked for a motion to approve Ordinance 2016-02.
Councilmember Rohr, I so move. 2nd by Councilmember Cundick. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE				x

9. Discussion Items:
   a. Local Option Gas Tax.
   Mayor Peterson, this is something that Council and the public may have read about. Last year the State legislator included a 5 cent increase in the actual gas tax and then also set up for local Counties to be allowed to have what they call the local option, which would include a half of percent increase in the actual sales tax. That money would be earmarked for road improvements within the particular County. Some of it would go to mass transit potentially but most of it would be focused on the actual improvements to roads. The decision last year was several communities chose to suggest that it should be included on the ballot, the County Commissioners decided because there would be significant costs, over $100,000 dollars for them to have a County Election last year, they chose to wait one more year to put it on the ballot. It is a similar process to the Rap Tax, which would allow for the voters to decide whether or not they would approve an increase in that particular tax. The Rap Tax did pass by a very small margin in Washington County a couple of years back and now we are faced with the question of the Local Option Gas Tax. The County Commissioners have asked that individual Municipalities discuss it at the Council level and decide what they felt was appropriate for their particular Town to suggest the County do with regard to this. It is a County wide tax if it is implemented; it is a County wide tax that is not implemented if it is following that route. Individual communities have input in the form of being part of the County;

however, they do not have the ability to pass this as local as their own community.
have ranged from some communities not wanting it at all; others very much wanting it to pass. Other communities suggesting that they really feel it is appropriate for the voters to have the opportunity to decide whether they want those additional funds made available for maintaining roads, or whether they prefer to not pay the tax. I wanted to get an idea of what Council's thinking is about this Local Option Gas Tax.
Councilmember Rohr, I believe that the biggest benefit is that the individual communities will receive funds if this were to pass to use within the communities; so this would greatly help with the repair and upkeep of our roads if it were to pass. There was an article in the newspaper and I think it said for the average driver of a family it would run about $42.00 a year. It is a quarter of a percent.
Mayor Peterson, I am sorry, I think I might have said a half not a quarter of a percent in sales tax. I might have mis-spoken before.
Councilmember Cundick, I am not as optimistic as Angela. Legislators just got through stuff and the moneys that were set aside for roads now go to water for the pipeline; so people who thought they already covered part of the basis for improving the roads have lost that now. I don't see any reason to approve more taxes when they are diverting what they have already approved.
Councilmember Sheltman, is this the tax where the County guys came and talked to us about, it didn't effect diesel but it was for regular gas?
Mayor Peterson, I believe when they spoke with us, it had not yet been approved at the State Legislature. They may have been looking into what the alternatives were. This is a sales tax increase, so it would only be on the sales tax which is a little over 6%, it would not apply to food, which is 3% and other categories that are in the 3% category and it would be an increase. One fact that I think is worth knowing is that approximately 30% of the sales tax that is collected in Washington County is collected from nonresidents of Washington County. In some cases nonresidents of the State, but there is the 70% that comes from residents and 30% comes from nonresidents.
Councilmember Sheltman, but is this the one where there is tax on the gasoline?
Mayor Peterson, no this is sales tax on all things in the County.
Councilmember Shelman, I am not even aware of this one and what items.
Mayor Peterson, this is a local option sales tax increase, it is a quarter percent on items that are currently taxed on the 6%, 6.1%, it varies slightly.
Councilmember Sheltman, that is enough as far as my opinion, I am kind of with Ron on that. When is the last time anyone used a tax for what they said they were going to use it for. Most of the people in this County have not got a cost of living increase in the last 8 years. I think we are taxed enough, I think the people in this Town are taxed enough; I think the people in the County are taxed enough. I agree with Ron, there has been some misrepresentation on some of the taxes that have been passed in our history on the County level and they have not been used for what they said they were going to use them for. I kind of have the feeling we are being nickel and dimed at this point and I would prefer to suggest that they do not add this tax.
Councilmember Rohr, I think that the general feel our there is that people don't want any more taxes than they can bear. There has already has been an increase on the gas itself. So I don't know; I know it is expensive to add it to the Election.
Mayor Peterson, we do have the opportunity to think on it further. It sounds like you are a little unsure and I am hearing two definite no's, unfortunately Nate is unable to be here this evening. We need to get them an answer in advance of July. I would suggest that we could discuss it

further, not just oppose it and put it on the May 11th agenda and then depending on the discussion, decide what we would want to do.
Bob Nicholson and the Mayor discussed the tax.

b. Ash Creek follow-up
Mayor Peterson, we had a presentation from the new Superintendent of Ash Creek at our previous meeting. Two things that come to mind is, should we have a localized treatment plant and need an operator, is it something that we would like to know what their cost would be for providing that service to us and for overseeing its actual construction. The other one is about the opportunity to possibly having limited sewer service for those who are desirous of it without having to obligate anybody to sewer service.
Councilmember Rohr, is there any benefit that anyone can think of to reinitiating an Inter-Local Agreement with Ask Creek that we had in the past?
Mayor Peterson, that is a separate topic but one where they would have permitted a pipeline to connect to their existing structure and that is certainly something that we could speak with them about. What I would like to do is just get back to them and ask them for more specific proposals. We are not going to approve anything obviously this evening, but I did feel as if relative to the alternatives that we would be faced with, they would be very integral in any operation of a small scale facility, as well as, the running of any significant sewer lines that might be accessible to a portion of Leeds.
Councilmember Rohr, I think your comment at previous Councils hold truth to this Council. The majority of this Council does not want any kind of mandatory sewer, and or any set up that would lead to mandatory over a time period.
Mayor Peterson, ok and I am perfectly fine unless somebody disagrees to make that clear and reiterate that, but what about the idea of a limited alternative for those who desire a sewer option.
Councilmember Sheltman, I did not hear that. Is that what he said? My understanding was that if they did come over here and put in a line, everybody would mandatorily at some point have to hook in.
Mayor Peterson, what I heard him say is that it would be something that they would look for new development to hook into it, which given the septic was an issue and that it would permit other people if they choose to add to it. Then there was an issue with low points and high points, where if people were choosing to be part of it, they would be faced with needing to lift the sewer up to the line and there would be added expense in doing that.
Councilmember Cundick, there was one other point though, the question that I raised was, if you have sewer in one area, than you have to run the pipe through an area that isn't served, are they then pulled into that and the answer was yes.
Councilmember Rohr, within 300 feet.
Councilmember Cundick, in other words let say if you put in a sewer north up toward Toquerville and you ran the line through Leeds, then Leeds gets pulled into that.
Mayor Peterson, I believe that he indicated there may be alternatives, that in the past it was always mandatory, but I believe there were opportunities where it would be new development and by choice, not by mandatory.
Councilmember Cundick, on the latter point, I got the feeling that it was mandatory at that point. I may have misunderstood, but that was my understanding.
Mayor Peterson, we would need to clarify, I thought it was mandatory for new construction but we would need to ask. I think one of the things we need to be mindful of is, should people have septic systems fail, it is my understanding that you need to go through the process of requesting

a replacement and I don't know if we have had that tested yet, as to how they would treat that with regards to existing homes that have a septic system if it fails and is up for a new permit. I am unaware that there is an issue with that, but I would want to make sure we understand that. So the question becomes how mandatory it is once put in place? If it is not mandatory, is it something that we would be interested in them providing some ideas as to how it could be brought in on a voluntary basis.

Councilmember Cundick, I guess my main concern is whether we got so many issues to deal with right now, until we have a real plan or presentation in front of us to deal with whether we are just spinning our wheels. We have a lot on our plate otherwise.

Mayor Peterson, what about the concept of having them as a potential operator where they would spell out for us what would be involved if we were to have an agreement where they would operate a facility that was set up on a limited basis within Town to serve specific homes?

Councilmember Sheltman, there is two things that he mentioned that were kind of interesting. One is that they don't have an Engineer firm, they hire an outside contractor and the other is they would hire an individual to oversee the septic system, in other words, they would subcontract that. He also said there is no system like this in the County and they have never serviced one before. If that is the case, that kind of opens us up all kinds of possibilities in bringing in another outside entity and possibly getting a better price or better coverage. It was good that he kind of gave us some ideas; although, he hasn't seen one before, but basically the idea that there be ½ hour or 1 ½ of maintenance per week. I am not sure that they would be necessary to do that particular item. One other thing on that since we are talking about it is, I was at the last Planning meeting and there is another applicant coming in that is thinking of some sort of system similar and it has been shown to the Water Conservancy and they approved it; my concern of that is, if we are going to start doing these mini sewer plants, we better make sure that we have some sort of consistency. Maybe in that we require one particular kind so that if we do have an outside entity looking into them, they have a consistency in the way that it works and the way it is maintained. We have an opportunity now to do that now before we get started on that. I hate to see 4, 5 or 6 different units, all from different manufacturers, with different sorts of maintenance problems. Continuity at this point is something that we should definitely look into before we start approving them. The other option is the original talk in 2010 when the viable sewer option was mentioned, the plan was to have a sewer system of some sort in a location that a pool of developers would hook into. I do not see where we are under any obligation to allow a small sewer system and not say "you know what, the original thing was to hook into this large plant" maybe require that. It would be easier for us, or any entity that is going to take care of it. Then we could have a central location where it's away from the Town; that way you are also doing a favor for the developer because it would give them a better idea of what their initial cost would be on a project. They really don't have right now because of the way we are set up with the agreement we have with the Conservancy.

Mayor Peterson, the one thing that I would highlight is there are a few agreements that had been signed where it says "we will reach a mutually agreeable waste water solution". That kind of language requires us to have something in place. As a starting point, I think it might be valuable to just ask them what their terms would be for managing one of these. I am not suggesting that we don't try to get the best price available as long as it is a quality provider, but you need to start somewhere. They could probably provide a definition as to the role they would be playing as well, which if we try to develop it ourselves; I think I would be hard pressed to feel competent to do so. What about Angela's thought regarding the Inter-Local Agreement and whether they would be amenable to revisiting that. I believe that was for

somewhere in the vicinity of 130 hook ups that would be permitted to be put into a pipe connecting with their existing infrastructure.
Councilmember Cundick, I think the concern I would have now is that last time there was a lot of effort that went into it and then it died. If we are going to resurrect it, we need to be fairly certain we want to go forward with it and I don't know if we are in that frame of mind right now.
Mayor Peterson, ok so that is to be held in abeyance by us until were closer in thinking we may actually be looking to make use of it. Next week I will look at getting in touch to find out if they can put together some ideas about being a limited system operator, what it would involve, how they would handle it and I will inquire about just how mandatory it is since there was some disagreement here about what we heard.

c. Old Highway 91
Mayor Peterson, Darren Cottam and Councilmembers disused Old Highway 91, the Town owns a section of road that is 1450 feet in length by 24 feet wide on Old Highway 91 by the I-15 interchange to Toquerville. The County is looking at chip sealing the road and Leeds portion would cost $10,000 without transportation of the chips; that would be an additional $2,000 dollars. The Mayor will follow up to see what Toquerville plans are on the road and what the County would do if Toquerville ops to do this in the future and not in 2016.

d. 2016 Roadworks
Mayor Peterson, this is something that Council last year went through, a multiyear type of schedule with our consultant Darren Cottam and this is what had been scheduled for this year. There is one small peace that was overlooked in the fog seal last year on Pecan lane. That is about $945.00 in total cost. What this gets down to for the most part is a fog sealing program. We did crack seal and patch with regards to asphalt the entire Town, as well as, fog seal for the most part the South East zone of Town. This is looking to match what was done with regards to the fog seal on the other side of Town. From a standpoint of our B & C Road Funds, it is pretty much utilizing what our new flow of B & C Road Funds is, but we still do have a balance that is carrying forward. Darren do you have that figure from what we were able to calculate basis the projections?
Darren Cottam, after last year work that you did, you should have about $64,000 left over.
Mayor Peterson and this would be utilizing the new B & C road funds which would kind of maintain a cushion.
Darren Cottam, right, the estimate coming in from B & C Road Funds this fiscal year is about $54,000. That does not take into consideration the increase in fuel tax and that should net you $15,000 more than the $54,000.
Town Council and Darren Cottam discussed the road maintenance schedule further.

e. Zoning Map
Mayor Peterson, I had a discussion with Bob Nicholson the Town Planner, one of the things that a Town can do is hold a Public Hearing on the entire Zoning Map and making sure that if we we're anticipating changes, highlight individual properties where changes were anticipated; but invite the entire Town that we are about to approve a zoning map. The reason this has appeal to me is, I have spent many hours trying to read backwards whenever there is a question about a particular parcel. The way that the Land Use works is you need to have taken action after a Public Hearing; there are opportunities where maps can be adopted as parts of General Plans, but you should be highlighting if you're changing the Zoning. If you don't, it is a little unclear as

to what happened. I will tell you one area in particular that I came across was that there is a portion of our Commercial Zone that is described in some of notes that were in a file; however, were never part of a Town Council meeting that describes a Commercial Zone Overlay. We do not have anything defined as to what is a Commercial Zone Overlay, but we have maps that are indicating Commercial and it's not saying "Commercial Zone Overlay". If we were to follow this route, I think it would involve some work, it would definitely be the Planning Commission that would hold the Public Hearing but I think what we could get to is a 2016, 100% agreed to, Zoning Map for the Town of Leeds. We could be very diligent going forward and make sure that anytime anything is either brought into Leeds, or changed in Leeds; it gets updated on that map. It sounds like a basic concept that should be followed; regrettably it hasn't been to this point.
Councilmember Cundick, I think it would be very wise to have a definitive baseline.
Councilmember Rohr, having an accurate map has been a goal of mine for a long time.
Councilmember Sheltman, I think it is a great idea.
Mayor Peterson, I will speak with Darrell Nelson the Chair of Planning Commission and Bob Nicholson to work through the process that would be needed to do that. In advance of the General Plan, which Planning Commission has previously discussed updating as well, I think it would be important to try to get this done independent of the General Plan work.
Bob Nicholson, a year ago the County GIS had agreed to update the Leeds Zoning Map for a fee. With a change in their personal, is that off the table?
Mayor Peterson, I think it is possible to do that the question becomes they can only put the map together, they don't have the interior Leeds zoning; they take our word for it when we tell them what a particular parcel is zoned. They still could play an integral part of getting the map prepared, but we have to give them good data for them to do that.

f. Cemetery Plots
Mayor Peterson, we are at a point where there is very limited availability in some of Leeds Cemeteries. There is some availability within the old historical Protestant Cemetery from Silver Reef and that is where more recent requests are being directed to, with regards to any new plots. One that has come out is I believe there are new State requirements that you have digital records for your Cemeteries. It was something that Kristi heard about at Clerk/Recorder training. Grants are available to help get that done and it is per Cemetery, so our three Cemeteries will provide us with triple the fun with regards to the availability to get potential grants to help us with that particular effort. That will not help with providing any new plots, but it will help us provide more accurate records going forward. There is one request that has come forward, Darrell Nelson has served for many years on a voluntary basis as our Cemetery Sexton and thankfully he has not indicated he wants to change that situation; however, one of the things he would like is to have the opportunity to have two plots from the Catholic Cemetery where there are still limited available plots. Before entering into the process that would be needed to try to make that possible, I wanted to find out from Town Council if that is something they would be supportive of.
Town Council members indicated they would all would support it.
Councilmember Sheltman indicated there is property next to the Cemetery that is for sale and discussed the possibility of purchasing it to add on to the Cemetery with Town Council.

10. Citizen Comments:

11. Staff Reports:

Councilmember Cundick, suggested with part of the funds we received from the Rap Tax, putting in a misting system and some fans in the Town Park Pavilion.
Councilmember Rohr suggested thinking about an Arbor Day before December of this year.
Mayor Peterson indicated he would be happy to do that and we had a tree that sheared off in the park and that might be a good place to plant something.

Mayor Peterson, with the Treasurer situation, Ron and I have been interviewing. We will be completing the first round of interviews this week. I also have been working with Hinton Burdick, we were notified that there was a report that we were in delinquency on regarding last year's financials. We have gotten to them all the necessary materials and they said it should be very easy to turn that around and do whatever is necessary to avoid any kind of difficulties with the State that would have kicked in within the next 60 days from the notification which was about a week ago.
Councilmember Rohr, with the Treasurer, are we looking to hire someone for 14 hours a week?
Mayor Peterson, 14 to 28 hours is what I would envision we would be looking to hire somebody for. Early on I think there is a backlog of projects they could work on that would take more than just a half of a part time position; however, once things settle in, perhaps something as little as 14 hours a week.
Councilmember Rohr, do we already have a salary in mind?
Mayor Peterson, We would need to update that and have a Public Hearing just as we did on our Clerk/Recorder. What we have right now is the last three Treasurers have been volunteer and also Town Council members.

Mayor Peterson, It is budget season. I will be look to circulate the budget that we have in place for 2015-2016 and we would want to be looking at that from a critical standpoint to decide whether or not there would need to be any increases or decreases. I will also look to try to get some year to date figures available just so we can see where we are running relative to that.

Mayor Peterson, one other comment I just want to make, there was a rather lengthy discussion at our last Council Meeting. There was reference to a letter that subsequently from a Planning Commission discussion, seems to have not been a letter. The one thing that I would want to make sure is that everybody on Town Council, if we receive a document addressed to the Town Council, that we need to make sure that everyone gets it promptly and not a point later on in a meeting where there is no opportunity to perhaps look into the situation, talk with the people who wrote it and be able to uncover the kind of situation that occurred in advance of it, rather than opposed to waiting for it to happen in the meeting and then having to kind of set the record straight afterwards. I have always I believe distributed everything that I have received that is address to the Town Council, to the entire Town Council, on a timely basis and should any of us receive something, I think that is the appropriate way to do so.

12. Adjournment:
Councilmember Cundick adjourned the meeting.
Time: 8:08pm.

APPROVED ON THIS 11 DAY OF May, 2016

Wayne Peterson

Mayor, Wayne Peterson

ATTEST:

Kristi Barker

Kristi Barker, Clerk/Recorder

Town of Leeds

Town Council CLOSED Meeting Minutes

April 13, 2016

1. Call to order:
   Mayor Peterson called to order the "Closed" meeting of the Leeds Town Council at 6:00pm on April 13, 2016 at Leeds Town Hall, 218 North Main.

ROLL CALL:

	Present	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x	
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x	
COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR		x
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x	
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE	x	

Also in attendance were, Gary Kuhlmann the Town Attorney and Jody Burnett.
Councilmember Rohr arrived to the meeting at 6:06pm.
Bob Nicholson the Town Planner arrived to the meeting at 6:08pm.

2. Purpose of the closed meeting was to discuss impending litigation and related matters as allowed by Utah state Law 52-4-205(1)(c)

3. Adjournment:
   Mayor Peterson adjourned the meeting with the intent of reconvening the Public meeting after a motion by Councilmember Blake and 2nd by Councilmember Cundick. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: WAYNE PETERSON	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ANGELA ROHR	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: ELLIOTT SHELTMAN	x			
COUNCILMEMBER: NATE BLAKE	x			

Time: 6:59pm.

APPROVED ON THIS 11 DAY OF May, 2016

Wayne Peterson

Mayor, Wayne Peterson

ATTEST:

Kristi Barker

Kristi Barker, Clerk/Recorder