

# Town of Leeds

---

## Agenda Town of Leeds Town Council Wednesday, June 8, 2022

**PUBLIC NOTICE** is hereby given that the Town of Leeds Town Council will hold a **PUBLIC MEETING** on Wednesday, June 8, 2022, at 7:00 pm. The Town Council will meet in the Leeds Town Hall located at 218 N Main, Leeds, Utah.

### **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 May 25, 2022.
7. Citizen Comments: No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item. (Three minutes per person).
8. Announcements:
  - a. Update on fourth of July celebration and social event
9. Public Hearings:
  - a. 2022-2023 Tentative Budget, General Fund and Capital Improvement Fund
10. Action Items:
  - a. Action on Approval of Final Budgets for 2022-2023, Resolution 2022-03
  - b. Discussion possible action regarding bank account set up to receive trash payments via Leedstown.org website
  - c. Discussion possible Action on Zone Change Request on Parcel L-4042-A, from Open Space (OS) to Commercial (C ): L-4042-A from Mixed Use (MU) to Commercial (C ) approximately 10.01 acres for Kennedy Family Ventures LLC.
  - d. Discussion possible action regarding appointment of Alan Roberts to the Planning Commission
11. Discussion Items:
12. Citizen Comments: No action may be taken on a matter raised under this agenda item. (Three minutes per person).
13. Staff Reports
14. Closed Meeting: A Closed Meeting may be held for any item identified under Utah Code section 52-4-205.
15. 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 Clerk/Recorder does hereby certify that the above notice was posted June 6, 2022 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](http://www.leedstown.org).



Aseneth Steed, Clerk/Recorder

# Town of Leeds

---

## Town Council Meeting for Wednesday, June 08, 2022

### Regular Meeting 7 PM

1. Call to Order/Roll Call: 7:00

**ROLL CALL:**

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
MAYOR: BILL HOSTER	<u>x</u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING	<u>x</u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	<u>x</u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON	<u>          </u>	<u>x</u>
COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER	<u>x</u>	<u>          </u>

2. Pledge of Allegiance: Councilmember Stirling

3. Declaration of Abstentions or Conflicts: None

4. Approval of Consent Agenda and Minutes Tonight's Agenda

Councilmember Cundick moved to approve tonight's agenda of June 8, 2022. Second by Councilmember Hunsaker. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

	<u>Yea</u>	<u>Nay</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Absent</u>
MAYOR: Bill HOSTER	<u>x</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>X</u>
COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>

### Town Council Meeting Minutes of May 25, 2022

Councilmember Hunsaker moved to approve meeting minutes of May 11, 2022. Seconded by Councilmember Cundick. Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

	<u>Yea</u>	<u>Nay</u>	<u>Abstain</u>	<u>Absent</u>
MAYOR: Bill HOSTER	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>X</u>
COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>

Citizen Comments:

Scott Garrett: I represent Lynn Potter in some matters that he has before the Town. Just wanted to make a couple of comments. So, Lynn's been working on his property on the north end which he's been trying to develop for a number of years now and he's been through quite a process in trying to get that property where he could develop it. You may be familiar with it. You may not. I don't know how much the Council has changed. I don't know how much you know, but the Town and Mr. Potter did seek an opinion from the property rights ombudsman to get some clarification on whether or not Mr. Potter had a subdivision prior to 1999, which would exempt him from the Hillside Ordinance. And so that's kind of been the issue that's been going back and forth. We came to Town Council, I think it was in April, you put us on the May agenda for the Planning Commission. We went to the Planning Commission meeting to ask that the Hillside Ordinance not be applied to Mr. Potter's property. They heard our case and took it under advisement. We came back at the next meeting, which was just last week. They voted in favor of recognizing Mr. Potter's property as a subdivision prior to 1999 and therefore exempting it from the Hillside Ordinance. We asked to be put on the Town Council agenda. I received a letter from your Counsel or an email from your Counsel this week saying that we were not going to be allowed to be on the agenda. He stated that the reason why was because this issue had been dealt with and decided and voted upon by the Town Council on June 23, 2021. So almost a year ago. I've reviewed those minutes and there is nothing in those minutes where the Council talked about whether or not the Hillside Ordinance applied to Mr. Potter's property and so it was just a discussion about the slope and what was necessary and those types of things, but the actual issue of whether or not the hillside ordinance applies to Mr. Potter's property, doesn't seem to have been considered by this Council. And so, we really want, we're just asking to be allowed to be placed on the agenda for you to consider that request. I don't think we're asking too much. It certainly is an issue that this Town has been grappling with, as evidenced by the property rights ombudsman opinion, which in it states that, you know, the issue that we're dealing with is whether or not the Hillside Ordinance applies to Mr. Potter's property, and that's an issue that the Town would have to decide, pursuant to Mr. Potter's site plan application, which he filed some time ago. So that opinion came back. I think it was perceived that it kind of fell in favor of the Town, but it was never addressed or ruled upon. Mr. Potter is going back and forth. He was told he had to comply with this ordinance. He then decided that maybe it didn't apply to him. He went through the whole process of getting that ombudsman opinion, which was substantial, and a lengthy process. Now we just want to, we want to talk about it. We want you to rule on that and make a decision. Mr. Potter wants the opportunity to present his case, and have you rule on that specific issue. And so, I think, you know, it makes sense to me that you allow that to happen and to go forward. I think it would save a lot of time and cost on both sides, if we can just be heard. It seems

in as much because we put so much effort into getting the property rights ombudsman opinion and all the discussions, and he's been coming to these meetings for years. It just seems like it would make sense to move this forward. We really want the opportunity to be heard and we're going to continue to push until we get that opportunity. And so, you know, please reconsider your decision. I don't know if it was your decision. I know it wasn't voted upon by you. It seemed it was. It came to me from your Town's Counsel, but you know, he has property here in your Town. He's made application. He's gone through the process with you. We just ask that he have that right to be heard. The Planning Commission heard it. They recommended that it be forwarded to this body. We feel like we are kind of being shut down and locked out of the process at this point. So, my comments are just please, you know, reconsider that, and allow us to be on the agenda and be heard. Then you can decide for yourself whether or not you think the Hillside Ordinance applies or it doesn't apply. I think he has the right to due process. Right? And constitutionally a right to be heard. I don't think it's been considered yet and ruled upon. The minutes do not indicate that is the case. We would ask for your consideration in that regard. Thank you.

Mayor Hoster: Thank you.

Lynn Potter: He's nice and diplomatic. My name is Lynn Potter. And I have property here in Leeds. I am not. And so, I have alienated the Town, okay. Everybody knows who I am. I talked to more than just Scott. I talked to about three or four lawyers. Getting the affidavit is kind of a slam dunk for us for winning this if we can get it before a court, okay. But you don't want us to get it before court. Because if you drive us towards a court we can sue for cost. Yeah, we can. You really want to bring this before yourself and make a decision. So, I'm asking you right now for a commitment for the next Town Council meeting. Will you give us a commitment to put us on the next Town Council meeting?

Mayor Hoster: This is a comment section.

Lynn Potter: Okay. But I can also ask questions in the comment section and many times people do. We have tried for the last couple of weeks to get a meeting with you and Craig and he said no. Before all this came down. Actually, just wouldn't even answer our emails. Will you talk to us? No, nothing in public. You won't do anything in public. Okay. I understand that. That is the advice you've been given. Okay. I wanted to do this in public, because I didn't want it done behind closed doors, because I believe things should be out in the open. Good Luck.

Mayor Hoster: Thank you

Robin Snyder: Lynn's property is right behind me. I don't think it makes a difference to him because he's digging in the hill anyway, I have pictures to prove it. That's all I have to say.

## Announcements:

### Update on Fourth of July celebration and social event

Mayor Hoster: We have upcoming on July the fourth a celebration and social event, and Councilwoman Hunsaker, has taken the charge and really helped us with organizing this, if you'll take a moment with Lorrie and maybe share what you've put together so far.

Councilmember Hunsaker: We're trying to find out how many people might be interested in doing another potluck like was done at the 150 so that's been put on the Facebook page and there will also be flyers being put up. Now no one look at Aseneth right now with the next comment I make. But if you'll call Town Hall, she will have a pre drawn up chart so she can check off how many people for each event so that it tries to make it as simple as possible. Right now, the way it stands, we will start out with the annual pancake breakfast that we always have. So that's from 8:00 to 9:30am. Then we'll be having a parade. And everybody is welcome to join in the parade. including strollers to classic cars, I believe you're going to try and get the fire department and the sheriffs to participate. Our grand marshal this year will be Ned Sullivan. He has agreed to do that driving his tractor and pulling his family in the hay wagon. So that should be good. In the heat of the afternoon a break and then at 6pm. would be the potluck, and the Town will supply the protein. If people would just bring side dishes, salads, or desserts, that should work out well. That is from Six to Seven thirty and then at 7:30PM. Susan Savage has been nice enough to be holding a movie, and we're going to do it in town hall. So, it will be air conditioned. The movie is called My Father's Highway. A thank you and shout out to Phil tucket and DOC Utah for letting us play that free of charge. The movie is about the building of the 15th through the gorge. It is still the most expensive highway ever built in the country it's supposed to be just amazing. So, it's very cool that we were able to do that. And then at eight o'clock, for those that are not in the movie will be a watermelon bust in honor of Ron Cundick the king of watermelon busts and I've had to explain to people we will not be sculpting watermelons, we will be eating them. So, it was a little confusion with the whole bust word. At dark personal fireworks as long as it is approved by the Fire Authority on the day of will be allowed on the basketball courts only. That will take care of that we may need to do a second showing of the movie because of the interest we've been receiving. If you want to hear Aseneth's and Susan's pipes there'll, be leading the Star-Spangled Banner for the parade, so come and listen to them and sing-along. That is where we are.

Mayor Hoster: Well, done. That is awesome. It's going to be exciting. Thank you for all your hard work on this.

## Public Hearings:

2022-2023 Tentative Budget, General Fund and Capital Improvement Fund

Mayor Hoster asked for a motion to open the public hearing for 2022. Councilmember Hunsaker moved to open the Public Hearing for 2022-2023 Tentative Budget, General Fund and Capital Improvement Fund. Second by Councilmember Cundick.

No Comments from the public.

Councilmember Cundick moved to close the Public Hearing for 2022-2023 Tentative Budget, General Fund and Capital Improvement Fund. Second by Councilmember Hunsaker.

Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: Bill HOSTER	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON	_____	_____	_____	X
COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER	x	_____	_____	_____

Action Items:

Action on Approval of Final Budgets for 2022-2023, Resolution 2022-03

Mayor Hoster: This segues into the first action item, which will be the approval of the final budgets for fiscal year 2022-23. Council, please take your time, if you have any questions with regard to the budget on here. I will point out a couple of things. If this does get a motion to approve. The first is that the property tax will need to be adjusted. We were on the phone with the state trying to get that. What that will be for the town, they didn't have that information for us. So that number will be modified. I don't see it going down but nonetheless, the budget is perfectly balanced right now. And so, it'll throw things off a little bit when that number gets changed a little. We also have given some consideration to trying for a match grant for the cemetery, which will be in the amount of about 16,000, of which you can see that we have but have not we did not allocate it. It was kind of a last movement concept. I'll bear the burden for that one. We do have the monies available for it in moving a couple of things about. It's anticipated that we may have to do an amendment if we move forward with approving this budget simply on the matter of the cemetery, but we could also do a conditional approval given consideration of the tax percentage that will be applied. Please take your time and review. If you have any questions. I'm happy to answer them. I will point out that one of the biggest ticket items on here, which is the flood mitigation off of Main Street, we are working with UDOT as well as Washington County Water Conservancy District about a possible cost share. So that number is going to change. In presenting the number that we have available and funds to them they said that's in today's dollars

from the time that we got that money is not going to be sufficient so we are working with UDOT to reevaluate our allocation of funds for that repair and their percentage, and which will also increase our percentage. Our percentage right now I believe is residing at about 86,000. Nonetheless, we're also in contact with Senator Baker's office and Senator Ipsen's office to identify if there's any additional funding that might be available to us for that purpose. This silence can be deafening but I wanted to give Council time to review any questions or last changes that have occurred on here. If the council was comfortable with the final budget as presented, giving understanding that we still need to adjust for the property tax allotment for the town. I'll ask for a motion to approve this budget.

Councilmember Cundick made a motion to approve the Budgets for 2022-2023, Resolution 2022-03. Councilmember Hunsaker Seconded the motion.  
Motion passed in a Roll Call Vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: BILL HOSTER	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON	_____	_____	_____	X
COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER	x	_____	_____	_____

Discussion possible action regarding bank account set up to receive trash payments via Leedstown.org website.

Mayor Hoster: The next action item is discussion possible action regarding a bank account set up to receive trash payments via the Leedstown.org website. Counsel has been given to the town with regard to separation of funds and building essentially financial firewalls for any kind of vulnerabilities. It has been identified that we can implement a credit card acceptance or PayPal acceptance or however digital currency acceptance through our website, however, that can pose a vulnerability of access to our main accounts. Therefore, it's proposed that we set up an additional account, which is funneled out each week by the clerk or bookkeeper will then move those funds into the major account. This will leave us with the limited liability. Such an action item for bank account is required, does require a vote by the Town Council. And I would ask for a motion to approve setting up a separate account for website transactions.

Councilmember Hunsaker: And that will be for all not just trash?

Mayor Hoster: Yes, any kind of financial transaction that's done on the web. Any other questions or discussion on the item?

Councilmember Cundick: I'm not quite clear. Did you say, any other transactions that are done? What other transactions are we contemplating besides the trash We could eat fees for licenses?

Mayor Hoster: Correct. We could Yes, we could go into like the dogs' fees. I don't think we'll go into the business licenses yet. It might be pretty complex but, in the future, it could come under that the idea is to keep those funds separate from our general account so there's no vulnerability of any kind of compromise for the main funds.

Councilmember Cundick: What extra costs do we incur by setting it up this way?

Mayor Hoster: I don't believe we have an additional cost for a separate account because of our bank or our business account with the bank, we're able to set up multiple accounts without additional fees.

Councilmember Hunsaker: And this account would stay at Zions, right? It is just as a separate account.

Mayor Hoster: Yes, it does have to stay Zions Back for that to not cost us anything. And again, these will be credit card transactions, or any kind of digital currency. I don't want to make it sound like it's Bitcoin or something. But it's more if they have like a PayPal account or something that maybe even Venmo that is accepted through the services. But again, we don't want access to our main account.

Councilmember Cundick: I don't accept Bitcoin just so we're clear on that.

Mayor Hoster: I didn't want that depth perception. So, thanks for helping you.

Councilmember Hunsaker: If there are fees, because I know when we had spoken to them before that there was a certain number that you were allowed, and that was part of your free account. So, if it goes over that and there's a charge, it can Are we doing the 3%? Is that what I saw? 3% would cover that right?

Mayor Hoster: The credit card transaction fees, we'll have a convenience fee associated with them on the website.

Councilmember Cundick moved to set up a separate bank account at Zions Bank to accept website financial transactions. Councilmember Hunsaker seconded. Motion passed in a roll call vote:

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
<b>MAYOR: BILL HOSTER</b>	x	_____	_____	_____
<b>COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING</b>	x	_____	_____	_____



COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON	_____	_____	_____	X
COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER	x	_____	_____	_____

- a. Discussion possible Action on Zone Change Request on Parcel L-4042-A, from Open Space (OS) to Commercial (C): L-4042-A from Mixed-Use (MU) to Commercial (C) approximately 10.01 acres for Kennedy Family Ventures LLC.

Councilmember Stirling: We discussed with the applicant the fact that quite a few of the general public had discussed they did not want commercial over there, because it left it wide open to the potential of different avenues coming in. And then also the County had just taken a very similar action on a parcel next to them in the County and they denied that. But we had talked with the applicant about doing a planned unit development so that it would especially be tied to one commercial avenue at that point. And I believe that we left it at that point.

Mayor Hoster: Does Council want to hear from the applicant?

Councilmember Stirling: The problem is that a planned unit development in our book has to go back to Planning Commission, because the planned unit development is, again, there, it has to start there inevitably. Even though you're still doing a zone change, it's actually changing the complete dynamics of it so it would have to go back to Planning Commission as a planned unit development. If that's what you wanted, or we can decide tonight on this particular zone change.

Mayor Hoster: So, Ben, I don't know, if you were intending to do a planned unit development, some of the information that the County provided for Council to review included that of a planned unit development. But I think the communication came, you know, went back and forth. Were you intending to do a planned unit development?

Ben Gottfredson: I'm very open to what you're describing. Basically, the conversation was a lot of the citizens were like, yeah, storage makes sense but we're so worried about something else going in Commercial. So, we are saying, hey, let's make sure we pin it down. Let's put the control back in the hands of the leadership here so we can work hand in hand, because we really want to come in, keep all the promises we've made. We'd be happy to do whatever is asked of us. That was brought up and I was under the understanding that we could do that here. Otherwise, we would have just set up to go back there before we came back here. And maybe we can preapprove it here and then go back there or something. But we can discuss whatever you guys are interested in discussing.

Mayor Hoster: I don't know if that's what you had initially wanted to go for. And that's an agreement between you and the developer that's presented to the Town Council on a definitive set that's tied to that land, and of which can be in perpetuity of the only use for that land versus changing it to a Commercial There's nothing to really go over on it, but that was where that discussion came to. It wasn't really in the PUD as much as it was that if I understand correctly from you, but you're leaving the options open to the Council. I understand.

Ben Gottfredson: We're just doing this one type of project; the seller is really concerned about their property being transacted and we've been in this for close to six months now. So, we're just wanting to do anything we can to help move it along.

Mayor Hoster: From the Clerk, do we have a power of attorney from the property owner?

Clerk: We have a signed document by a representative from the Kennedy family.

Mayor Hoster: Do we have a power of attorney from the representative? Because, on a real estate transaction, we have to have the property owner or power of attorney from that property owner to have the discussion.

Aseneth Steed: We required proof from the owners before Planning Commission had their public hearing, and when they came here for the Public Hearing. We requested that they have written authorization. It was included in your packets for the Public Hearing meeting.

Mayor Hoster: I don't recall that. I think that was the time I wasn't here. Okay. Ben we just need to confirm that on any kind of a real estate transaction or ruling that we have full representation of the property owner.

Leif Burton: We are here. We do support that.

Mayor Hoster: This is an affidavit not a power of attorney. That is a very critical point. Do you have title on the property?

Leif Burton: Yes. The family trust owns the title.

Ben Gottfredson: He is here. I've never met him in person just text. Instead of signing the power of attorney, we opted to have him here in person.

Councilmember Cundick: This is not an individual. It is from a trust.

Leif Burton: My name is Leif Burton. I am part of the Kennedy family trust. We own the property, but we're not here to make any statements.

Councilmember Cundick: Are you a trustee?

Leif Burton: No. I'm representing them.

Councilmember Cundick: Just so I'm clear. Are you representing as an attorney or agent or what's your capacity?

Leif Burton: They have given me power of attorney to come and stand in. I am not here to make any statements other than we support Ben. We've given him permission to have power over the property.

Councilmember Cundick: I mean, I'm just curious how you could represent the trust if you're not a trustee, or if you're whatever.

Leif Burton: The trustee has given me power of attorney to talk for them. That's all I'm going to do is just let you know that we have given Ben permission to do that, and he has power of the property for now.

Mayor Hoster: Leif, do you have the copy of that power of attorney from the trust to yourself to represent them?

Leif Burton: I can get that if needed.

Mayor Hoster: Okay. Council, it's my opinion that the ability for the Town to effectively rule in a real estate property zone requires the property owner's permission, whether it's in person through counsel with power of attorney and without either one of those available to us, we're not in a position to move forward with any kind of a grant for that commercial property. Other options are available for our discussion on this action item. I'll leave that open to the Council to discuss your question at this time.

Councilmember Stirling: So, I'm looking at chapter eight, just so you can reference in the ordinances. It's planned unit development. And a lot of times when you have a developer's agreement, you want to have a planned unit development with that, which basically says the purpose of the planned unit development is to allow diversification in a relationship of various uses and structure to the sites, and to permit more flexibility in the use of such sites. And that has to be recommended to the Town Council by the Planning Commission in any zoning district. From what I've kind of done my research on it, what inevitably, I think needs to be done, even if I know, you're the applicant, but I believe that it would be advantageous for you to actually have the owner, do his due diligence with the original Planning Commission, unless you can get an actual, like affidavit from the trust and not just a representative of a representative of the trust, which it appears is what this gentleman is. Having said that, if you are able go to the Planning Commission, and potentially do a planned unit development with your developer's agreement, which you would have to go ahead and discuss with like an attorney and have that done, but at that point, then we would be able to bring it to the Town Council. And then we would have a definitive answer of what it is you're doing, what that particular business will be tied to at that particular land. And then from there, we would be able to do the zone change with the PUD and the developer's agreement all in one. And I believe that having that, the

individuals that came in had concerns about it, I think most of the concerns would be taken away. They would know that that is exactly what's going to happen there.

Councilmember Cundick: I guess my concern is it seems to me that the basic question is, are we going to make it Commercial or not? It seems to me that if you were to go ahead and go all through the effort for a planned development, and it was not approved that wasted a lot of money, a lot of time. I think we need to address whether it's going to be Commercial or not. Right now, we, I can't assent to any development I haven't looked at or so forth and I don't want to get the impression that I'm agreeing one way or the other until I see it. I am concerned that if you go out and spend a lot of money with a Planned Unit Development then come back and it's not approved you will say wait a minute you counseled, you the Town Council indicated you probably were in favor of that and maybe they are I don't know. But that isn't what's before us right now. Before us right now is whether there ought to be a change to of zone to Commercial for these two zoning properties. I am reluctant to go forward with promises or implications here that we will or will not approve something in the future. I think we need to somehow make a decision on zoning.

Mayor Hoster: I respect, Councilman Cundick's comments with regard to the applicant's expenses on the process. I'd like to defer to Scott Messel if you have any comments.

Scott Messel: Yes. It was tabled in the last meeting. The Town Council is not required, if they don't want, to hear it again or make another motion on it. It can be tabled indefinitely. You can take it up and discuss it and make a determination on it in this meeting, or if you want to have more public input, you could table it or set a Date Certain in the future that you want to hear it. If you wanted to have more involvement or more discussion between now and that point you could do that.

Councilmember Cundick: Are we clear that a development could not occur until there's a zone change? Are we clear on that?

Scott Messel: Yes

Councilmember Cundick: Okay. That, to me, is the hurdle. Whether you want more information before you decide I don't know. That has to be resolved before putting more effort into it.

Councilmember Hunsaker: I agree with what Danielle is saying, because that's what we discussed. For me, it's not that I'm trying to be a jerk, and I know you have gone to Planning Commission and you're back here, but to do a zone change without the current property owner's consent; without that in place, I cannot in good conscience do that. I can't even look to change it to Commercial without some kind of the developer's agreement in place before that happens. I know that puts you in a hard situation because you're trying to buy the property and we need to know, we are saying the affidavit is not enough and it's just kind of messed up all around.

Councilmember Hunsaker: What we could potentially do is, so that he's not continually coming here for the next year, we could approve a Commercial zone on the basis of the developer's agreement, and the planned unit development. With that Planned Unit Development and development agreement, I believe that most of the people at the Public Hearing they would have probably been in more agreement with it with those, but I think at one point, we need to give direction. Personally, I'll say it I'm okay with having the Commercial. The part of the Commercial that's actually in the let's see here, your Mixed-Use to Commercial I would agree with. I'm still not open to the Open Space going to Commercial. Unless you can bring something to the table showing something in your developer's agreement, or the planned unit development. I understand in the reading, and I could be wrong, correct me if I'm wrong, but they came over from the County as Open Space. Is that correct?

Mayor Hoster: Yes.

Ben Gottfredson: I should be better with my history. But I know that they've switched it back and forth. And I even did away with the Mixed-Use zone at all. It's kind of zoneless right now

Councilmember Stirling: The Open Space has never been changed from what I read. But on the Mixed-Use, you're correct on that. I would be okay with Mixed-Use to Commercial. The Open Space to Commercial, I have a hard time changing Open Space when it's been that way for quite some time. I don't know the basis of why that was Open Space. But in our ordinances, it very rarely changes from Open Space to something else.

Ben Gottfredson: Sure. I think what you just proposed, I'm going to mess up the wording, but basically, changing the zone, conditional to the Developers Agreement, which would give me enough to go ahead and buy it. Right? That would simplify it. We don't have to drag the Kennedy family all over and, and I can move forward. And we can have that trust in that plan. As long as you guys still have control, I'm really happy to do that and take it over.

Councilmember Stirling: We still don't have the right to be able to change this without a Kennedy family member that's actually a trustee of the trust that is approving that. That particular paper that was turned in doesn't give the right to change the property.

Ben Gottfredson: I've tried to take notes, but we'll try to get really clear direction because I tried really hard to give them the direction that you gave me.

Councilmember Cundick: I'm not willing to commit one way or the other on that right now. You're committing on one half of the property, but I'm not willing to commit on either half. It is too open ended as far as I'm concerned at this point.

Councilmember Stirling: Well, we have to give him a direction of whether to go or, or to not. If we say, come back to Planning Commission, to see if you can have a planned unit development and to see if we'll accept your developer's agreement, it doesn't give him

any definite ideas. So tonight, we need to decide whether we want it to be Commercial or not. If we are not deciding to have it Commercial, then we shouldn't waste any more of his time or money.

Mayor Hoster: That's my concern too Ben. If you had some sort of a contingency that you'd move forward with a purchase and then be left at the mercy of what might happen. I'm actually very concerned about that. My opinion is that Councilwoman Stirling is definitely right, we should probably have a motion to either move it in one direction or the other this evening to give the applicant clearance on how to facilitate with council. Council, keep in mind and some of you were present for this, we had a prior lawsuit regarding the Grapevine Wash that occurred because an applicant was under the impression from phraseology, and the contingencies, and inconclusive minutes the developer was under the impression that if they perform certain duties that were of a costly nature that they would be considered. That consideration was withheld, and a lawsuit ensued. We want to make sure that we are avoiding that. As Councilman Stirling has indicated we want to be very clear with you to make sure we don't step back into that. With that council in mind, it's probably something to give either a motion to deny, or as has been proposed, approval upon contingency for the Mixed-Use to Commercial. Those seem to be the two options that have surfaced out of this dialog.

Councilmember Stirling: Do you know what your percentage of Mixed-Use is on your ratio?

Ben Gottfredson: Extremely close to 50/50? Just decimals off.

Scott Messel: While you think about that, it was mentioned earlier. So, this green line is the Town boundary. Over here is unincorporated area The developer of the property owner over here proposed doing a very similar project on this piece The County Commission denied it for many reasons. They didn't feel it was appropriate, so close to the cemetery and near the residential. I would also let you know, this property that the vineyard is currently on, they are looking at doing more improvements to the vineyard and to come in into compliance. It was rezoned by the County Commission yesterday from the A20 to the A5 for Agritourism. A5 can be a vineyard or tasting facility anything. I mean, it could be a pumpkin patch, those types of things fit within the Agritourism classification. They're going to be doing some improvements to their property to spruce it up, beautify it, and make it a more aesthetically desirable.

Mayor Hoster: The owner of that property called actually right before Town Council to reemphasize your point. So, thanks for bringing that up.

Councilmember Stirling: I'm ready to make a motion.

Mayor Hoster: Oh please.

Councilmember Stirling made a motion to approve the zone change requests on parcel L-4042-A of Mixed-Use (MU) to Commercial (C) contingent upon the Planned Unit

Development (PUD) and the Developers Agreement and deny the Open Space (OS) to Commercial (C).

Councilmember Cundick: Can we have discussion about this? I guess my concern is that, I don't know what kind of development agreement we would get. I don't know what it would provide. I don't know what the conditions would be, and it just seems to me that just opens Pandora's box. I like to get my arms around something one way or the other, I can understand Commercial or not, but I, and I don't want to I just don't want to go to Commercial with it just sitting out there that anything can happen to it either.

Ben Gottfredson: Doesn't a developer's agreement mean that you have to agree to the terms.

Mayor Hoster: Well but what was said is a developer's agreement and we then have to decide if we want, what that developer's agreement be. So, if you walk down the path of getting a developer's agreement, you bring it before Planning Commission, and then Town Council, and we deny it, and you've gone through all these expenses, where I think Councilman Cundick is saying is that there's too many variables. Does that clarify it for you?

Councilmember Stirling: I believe when he came, originally, he presented a strong case that it's not his first storage unit, and the other storage units that he has done are very successful and have great reviews, which I looked at. I believe at this point, with a motion on the table for approving the Mixed-Use to Commercial with the developer's agreement of Big Ben storage, and the planned unit development that accompanies that, I don't think that there's very many things that are open ended variables, because he has come to do Big Ben storage in a Commercial area and we're not leaving it open to any other commercial business. Anyway, that's my motion.

Mayor Hoster: The motion is still open for discussion and is still alive. I look at this, and I'll be quite honest with you that I don't want to see any of it turned to Commercial. The Open Spaces are most appropriate there, especially considering that it is a Council opinion, which resides in the constituents' vocalization. That vocalization was pretty obvious from the minutes during that Public Hearing on this Commercial space. In my opinion, the area does reside across the street from another development that is similar, however, that development does set down and it is not an obvious elevation from what this other development would be. Also, it isn't right next to a cemetery. For those reasons, it is my opinion that we should not grant that motion.

Councilmember Cundick: Well, so we would need a second before we voted on it. Right?

Mayor Hoster: Correct. We'll need a second on the Motion to approve the zone change requests on parcel L-4042-A of Mixed-Use (MU) to Commercial (C) contingent upon the Plan Unit Development (PUD) and the Developers Agreement and deny the Open Space (OS) to Commercial (C). Do I have a second for that?

Councilmember Cundick: I'll second the motion.

Mayor Hoster called for a Roll Call

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: BILL HOSTER	_____	x	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	_____	x	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON	_____	_____	_____	x
COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER	_____	x	_____	_____

Motion Denied.

Mayor Hoster asked if there were any other motions to be made.

Councilmember Stirling: So, let me ask. Basically, the idea is to not change to Commercial at all. Is that what I'm understanding?

Mayor Hoster: That's...

Ben Gottfredson: What would this be someday like houses or just farm?

Councilmember Stirling: No, it can't be farm because there's not enough water in Leeds to even sustain that.

Scott Messel: If they don't move forward with recommending Commercial, it stays the way it is. There may be other options in the future.

Councilmember Cundick: That does not mean that in the future someone could not, including yourself, could come to ask for some other.

Ben Gottfredson: I'm not talking about formality. What do you want this to be? You want this to be what? In a perfect world what is this property?

Councilmember Cundick: You know, we heard a lot of input from people who live around there. They did not say what we want, but they said what they don't want?

Ben Gottfredson: They don't want anything?

Councilmen Cundick: Well, I don't think they said, I don't want anything.

Mayor Hoster: I agree with Councilman Cundick. I don't think that's the case. I don't know how to answer that for you, Ben, of what they do want to see there. But some of the concerns that were surfaced are that you're coming right next to an area that was



just rezoned for the agricultural tourism. Putting an RV storage unit next to that kind of devalues their operation. The other component in consideration is that the cemetery is right next to where your operation is going to be. And the third component is the property that resides right in there. If we were to move forward with your operation, he has already vocalized and contacted us and he will do the exact same thing and we would, without bias have to have to move forward on it. So, it's not just going to be your property that would be affected on this decision for that area. The exact same design of what he wanted to do was in concert with what you proposed. Those are the considerations. To say what the Town Council could recommend for that property is inappropriate. We can't, really vocalize that, but we can tell you the things that have surfaced that are not wanted at least, and this is an area where a Council gets to make a determination and assess from what we hear from the constituents. When we look at the future prospects that area actually sits according to our General Plan and the annexation map, that that now sits in the center of town. If we move forward with the full annexation as set forth in our General Plan, and do not want to see an RV storage center in the center of town by our cemetery. And that was another consideration from my opinion.

Ben Gottfredson: With all due respect, there are storage units there, you think of the cemetery on Dixie Drive, it's right next to commercial things, they just make it, so it looks nice. I think there would be ways to do it. So, thank you

Mayor Hoster: I respect that opinion. I've listened all the way along, you've been wonderful with the Town in your application. Ben, what I don't see happening is that we want to replicate whatever mistakes other cities have done. The citizens have really vocalized that putting something of that nature there is not appealing to the cemetery. The other storage units that are down below and out of sight seem to be a little less obnoxious to the aesthetic. That's this Mayor's opinion. In this board, I stand as a voting member, but that's my opinion, if that's of any assistance to your question. We don't have another motion on the table, though, to deny this. And so, at this point, Council, we need to come to a decision. Again, we don't want to waste the applicants time or money, but we do want to get to a direction on this. The motion was denied for the Mixed-Use being moved to Commercial, the options are to table this, or the options are to have a motion to deny the application.

Councilmember Cundick: We voted to deny it.

Mayor Hoster: No, the motion was to accept.

Councilmember Stirling: I think another aspect of this is that we do not have a Mixed-Use zone. It's really unfair to this applicant that has come to try and find something to do with the zone. We haven't given them an option at all. I feel like that property rights should be respected. Just because of the fact that it may not be what a certain dynamic of the area, the property owner should have rights to what he wants with his land. When I listened to all of the individuals that were coming in, they were more concerned with the traffic and leaving that Open Space, they would be able to mitigate that traffic

problem and be able to potentially make that area a lot more quiet for the cemetery than any other business I can think of. I don't ever hear anything at all from the storage unit on the bottom property. I understand with his storage units' reviews they're very clean and the beautification has gone through quite a stringent process. At this point, it's unfair to not give direction on the zone. We do not have Mixed-Use in our ordinances. It's left the property owner not knowing which direction to go. He has come here for six months and made it all the way from Planning Commission and yet we are not giving direction.

Scott Messel: In the Planning Commission the motion to approve, it failed. It wasn't approved or denied.

Mayor Hoster: It was a push.

Councilmember Cundick: I understood things stay as they are.

Scott Messel: Yes

Councilmember Stirling: How can that stay Mixed-Use if we do not have a zone of Mixed-Use.

Councilmember Cundick: We have one. We just don't have any more of them.

Councilmember Stirling: Well, Mixed-Use does allow for...

Scott Messel: The option with that and with any zone is zoning ordinances change all the time. It may be appropriate to do something else there. But what's before the commission at this time is to go Commercial or to specifically go Commercial for storage units.

Mayor Hoster: That's what I'm understanding.

Councilmember Hunsaker: Can you go back to Planning Commission and the Planning Commission actually fit Mixed-Use get their recommendation as to what that zone should roll over to and then come to us?

Councilmember Cundick: It's not our job right now to decide what that Mixed-Use might be, or whether it's appropriate. Our job right now is to deal with the application before us. I'd like to make a motion that we deny converting either of these zones to Commercial so it's super clear on where that is.

Councilmember Cundick made a motion to deny the zone change request on parcel L-4042-A, from Open Space (OS) to Commercial (C): L-4042-A from Mixed-Use (MU) to Commercial (C) approximately 10.01 acres for Kennedy Family Ventures LLC. Councilmember Hunsaker seconded.

Councilmember Stirling: Can I discuss something?

Mayor Hoster: Yes, discussion is still open.

Councilmember Stirling: In the Mixed-Use zone, which was chapter 23 in the Land Use Ordinance if you're all stating that it will stay Mixed-Use, in the Mixed-Use zone you can already have storage units. So, you wouldn't have to change this to Commercial. In the original Mixed-Use zoning ordinance, it was, it is agreeable that you could have storage units. The fact is that if it's denied to not become Commercial, you wouldn't have to do your zoning change because what I am hearing from the rest of Council is that it would stay Mixed-Use zoning. That would mean you're grandfathered into the original ordinance which means you wouldn't have to change it to Commercial. You would be able to come in I assume, you could continue to do your developers agreement if you wanted to with the Planning Commission and it would be an agreeable thing.

Scott Messel: I am not the attorney, but I don't necessarily agree with that. All due respect, The Town repealed, removed that ordinance for a purpose. Nothing had been developed on the property at that time. And so, although it has a Mixed-Use, it's almost like the Mixed-Use is a holding zone in a way. So, they couldn't go back to its uses because if, let me see not to muddy it but, if it was zoned Mixed-Use and they had started through the application process of doing a land use development in the Mixed-Use zone, then I agree that it would be grandfathered in to move forward with that but being that...

Councilmember Cundick: You can't resurrect it.

Scott Messel: Correct. An example and maybe it's not a good example but another I had years ago in Provo, there was a guy that came back from World War II, bought some property up on the east side of Provo. He built a basement home. It was just an in-ground basement home. He came in and wanted to build a duplex. He wanted to keep going and build on a duplex for BYU housing on top of it. His argument was that at the time he bought the property in the 1940s and started building his home that he could have built multiple units. Well, he didn't, he only built one unit. He built the basement house. He could built an upstairs to a basement house. So, it's just a standard house, but he wasn't grandfathered in to be able to come back now and build a multifamily dwelling.

Councilmember Stirling: I understand that. But we have not given them an option of changing the zone. Ron just said, it would stay as is, which is Mixed-Use zoning.

Councilmember Cundick: But the point is because it's no longer a viable zone, then you can't use that as a basis to start something new on it. That's the point.

Councilmember Stirling: But we are not giving him direction.

Councilmember Cundick: Well, he is asking for Commercial. If he doesn't get it, then he doesn't get it. He can't ask for Mixed-use. He can't go back to Mixed -Use because it really isn't a viable zoning right now. I understand what you're saying. But, until somebody comes in and changes, then it stays that; but you can't use that as a basis to start a new project.

Mayor Hoster: I want to confirm, though, that the question isn't a rhetorical question with regard to what else could you do there. Your intent is just to do what you presented? So, it's a rhetorical question.

Ben Gottfredson: I mean, to some extent. If you said, oh, well, you could build houses there, we're looking out for that too, or you can build the project.

Mayor Hoster: I think our Councilwoman's concern is to give that direction and support because we do respect the landowner's property rights. We want to be able to facilitate them. The reason I'm circling back is because I'm also familiar with other conversations with regard to what can those current property owners do with that property. Is it fair to them? We want to as a Town Council provide assistance there. We can't guide them through this. Nor can we guide you and that's why I'm asking, is it a rhetorical question? Is this something that you have no interest in outside of building RV storage units or is there other purposes that you would consider for the property and that's why you're asking?

Ben Gottfredson; Okay, let me answer. Hopefully, I answered correctly. My intent is, if you said, you could build whatever you want there, it would be storage units there. On behalf of myself. If you're like, no storage units which I have one more thought I'll come back to, but if you don't want storage units in there, okay. What do you want there? We've talked about all these different things like gas stations, Commercial, Residential, and Multifamily. What is your proposal of going there? What would the next step be? My intent was only storage units but if you're telling me no, I'm puzzled. I would like to know what would go there, that would just give me some closure. I would even consider, I mean, I'm an investor, I could even do whatever you asked me to do there.

Mayor Hoster: Okay. So, it's not a rhetorical question. It is a question, full question.

Councilmember Cundick: He is asking for guidance we cannot give him.

Mayor Hoster: Exactly.

Ben Gottfredson: Let me just say one more thing. These storage units we're proposing to build are beautiful. They are not the ancient junkyard that we grew up with as thinking of storage units. In town, there have been a lot of these RV units in some of the richest, most successful areas right outside of Entrada and Tuweap, right outside of Sun River there is some of these really nice RV things.

Mayor Hoster: The Town already has this.

Councilmember Stirling: Well, but completely filled, and this is something that everybody needs.

Ben Gottfredson: I think in hindsight Sun River might not have fought that so hard. I'm serious because these things are very successful. They are in high demand. And they are not junkyards anymore. They're beautiful and they're needed. If it's accessible to you, that's considered a value to add. I would say maybe the conception is a little bit off. I would argue that you probably would benefit from having them in the middle of town. Historic downtown Leeds will always be on the east side of the freeway. Even if it's you've drawn as in, the middle, and these RV units are there, I think this is a community where RV's and toys, people want a nice secure place to put them. As you can look at other communities in southern Utah it's not necessarily an indication of a cosmetic scar. It's a beautiful thing that we can do for people.

Mayor Hoster: So, point of order is really we appreciate the additional commentary about the purpose of the RV storage unit, but the reality is that we have a motion to deny them at this point, based on just that, we can't give you counsel as to what else you could do there. We could have you could speak with our town planner Scott Messel, or the property owners can, with regard to options. We do want to help them with having their property rights and being able to exercise the value of that property. We also don't want to devalue the other value of the properties that are adjacent to it. We've got to respect their rights as well. That is the fine balance that we reside in. I respect your proposal; I think it was a fantastic job with regard to that, but those are the reasons why the motion has been presented that we don't move on a change to Commercial zone.

Councilmember Stirling: Let me caution though, you said that the reason being is because of the storage unit, we're not voting on whether or not the storage units can go in. The motion on the table is whether it can be Commercial. So, in the future, if somebody else comes back and asks for Commercial, and we grant that in any way shape or form, he will have some type of repercussions to come back.

Scott Messel: No. I would not say that.

Ron Cundick: No. I don't think we will.

Multiple Voices: Oh, okay, well, no, well, I think there shouldn't

Ron Cundick: I think you are out of order to say that.

Councilmember Stirling: There should not be a reason to say he can't have Commercial, but you have somebody else that you've been talking to that may want to do something else that is going to be Commercial as well.

Councilmember Cundick: We will address that in the future, if it comes.

Councilmember Stirling: The property owner should be able to make note of that because that is not fair.

Councilmember Cundick: You are not going to convince me as a Councilmember to say that I have or haven't got a cause of action if that happens, that is ridiculous.

Mayor Hoster: It is out of order. What we'll do is identify that, for whatever reason, anybody wants to oppose a vote is opinion by the Councilmen. It doesn't give precedence; It doesn't open any gateways and it's certainly not a liability or prejudice to any of the Councilmembers.

Councilmember Stirling: What I'm saying is you can't say the reason that we are not approving Commercial is because of what he's bringing in, because he's not bringing that.

Mayor Hoster: That was not a motion. [Multiple voices]

Councilmembers Stirling: I thought he said something about, I thought you said something about the storage unit in your discussion.

Mayor Hoster: In discussion, it was not in the motion.

Councilmember Stirling: Right. But while you were saying the reasons being that motion was on the table, I thought you said something about the storage units and so that's why I brought that up is it has nothing to do.

Councilmember Hunsaker: It wasn't storage unit specific. It was Commercial.

Councilmember Stirling: Okay

Councilmember Hunsaker: And, not having the agreement ahead of time by the owner of the property so that the words or the verbiage is in there, so that we know exactly what it is because then that doesn't set them up for failure. If we have that going through a system with the verbiage in the contract, then, I think, that is what I need for me.

Leif Burton: My name is Leif Burton. I'm associated with Kennedy Family Ventures. I have been a part of this since beginning. I've also proposed an orchard. I've proposed stables. I've proposed glamping. We've come up with everything we could come up with. And we've been shut down at every turn. I mean, Ben is not off when he asks, what can we put in there? Everything we've proposed has been turned down. What can we do with the land? I feel like you are shutting us out as landowners when you give us no guidance whatsoever. At the beginning of this discussion, you said that...

Mayor Hoster: So, let me, let me put a point of order. So, the reality is that the Council is not in a position to provide the landowner guidance on what you can and cannot do with your property. That would be...

Scott Messel: You can talk to me later if you want but it's not something that has to be determined or the Council is required to respond to in this meeting.

Mayor Hoster: And for your benefit, I want to make sure that you understand that we want to be able to help you with that and so I'll ask that you have Scott's card hereafter. I'm happy to join in that discussion and dialogue, or any of the Councilmembers here and try and help facilitate options. We will go through the proper channels if we need to redo different things through the Planning Commission or what have it be, but have that open dialogue with you, which I don't know if that existed prior. It sounds like it may have been missing and we can't do anything about that in the past. Certainly, please understand that we're not trying to deny you any of those past histories, but in this circumstance, the ability to change this to a Commercial has been motioned, and that's as far as we can counsel on it. So, the motion still stands. It is open for further dialogue, but the motion still stands to deny for Open Space on L-4042-A and Mixed-Use to Commercial. If there's no further dialogue, do I have a second?

Councilmember Hunsaker: Second.

Mayor Hoster: I do have a second. Is there any further dialogue?

Councilmember Stirling: What goes on from here? If it passes then it is denied, they are done?

Scott Messel: Yes.

Mayor Hoster: Correct.

Councilmember Cundick: Yes

Councilmember Stirling: And then? They can't come back to do.

Scott Messel: They could come back with another proposal. They always have that right.

Mayor Hoster: Is there anything else?

Councilmember Stirling: They could come back with a Planned Unit Development through the Planning Commission.

Mayor Hoster: Yes

Councilmember Cundick: This doesn't cut off anything in the future. All it does is take care of this particular application.

Mayor Hoster: The motion has been seconded and if there's no other further dialogue, Council, we'll go ahead and begin with a roll call vote starting on my left, please.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: Bill HOSTER	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING	_____	x	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON	_____	_____	_____	x
COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER	x	_____	_____	_____

Discussion possible action regarding appointment of Alan Roberts to the Planning Commission

Mayor Hoster: Next Action item is discussion of possible action regarding appointment of Alan Roberts to the Planning Commission. I've spoken with Alan about continuing on in that role. He's receptive to it. It is my plea to the Council to nominate Alan Roberts to the Planning Commission, and I asked her a motion.

Councilmember Hunsaker made a motion to approve the appointment of Alan Roberts to the Planning Commission. Councilmember Cundick Seconded the motion.

Motion passed in a roll call vote:

ROLL CALL VOTE:	Yea	Nay	Abstain	Absent
MAYOR: Bill HOSTER	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: DANIELLE STIRLING	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: RON CUNDICK	x	_____	_____	_____
COUNCILMEMBER: STEPHEN WILSON	_____	_____	_____	x
COUNCILMEMBER: LORRIE HUNSAKER	x	_____	_____	_____

Mayor Hoster: I would like to add to the Minutes that we are grateful for his contributions, his volunteerism, and efforts to this town.

Discussion Items: None

Staff Reports:



Councilmember Cundick: I've got a very quick one about recycling. I went down to Las Vegas with the waste management people. They have the largest recycling facility in North America. A couple of points I want to make. First of all, we're going to prepare a report on our visit, but just point out a couple of things. They recycle the equivalent of about 500 cars a day in terms of tonnage. That's the good news. The bad news is that about half the stuff that goes into the recycle ends up in the landfill because people don't give the right things to be recycled. My takeaway from that is, when in doubt, don't recycle because they get T shirts, they get all kinds of things that could be recycled someplace else, but they can only recycle down there the things that they say they can which is paper and plastics, aluminum, and metal. Of course, that includes cardboard. So, if you put things in there that could be recycled by somebody else or some other facility like tires or this kind of thing. It doesn't help down there because they can't do it. As an oddity, if you keep the lids off your plastic containers, then the lids won't be recycled because the way they sort through things that small stuff drops through so something as small as a cap on a bottle won't ever get recycled. It will just fall down and go to the landfill automatically. So, if you really want that bottle cap recycled, keep it on the bottle. One of the biggest problems is flexible plastics, like the grocery bags, every night, they spend four hours untangling all of the conveyor belts. They get tangled up during the day with all these what they call loose or a flexible plastic. So that is a no go. In St. George locally they're concerned about unsecured loads because we have so much stuff flying out of the backs of cars or pickups and on the roads. So, they have a program now that's called "Secure the load or secure a fine." If you take a load down to the landfill that isn't secured, they use the word secured whatever that means It doesn't necessarily mean covered there, it has to be secured, they will fine you down there. They made me aware that we can have free pickup for bulk items so if you have an old refrigerator, or an old water heater, this kind of thing, you can call, and they'll come up and pick that up for free from your place. I wasn't aware of that. I just hauled a water heater out there myself. I wish I had known about that before. It has to be something that they recycle. Then also, they have now built a place for appliances. They won't be bearing, in the future, all these used appliances, they will be selling those to be recycled. So that'll be a big improvement. Presently, there is no charge for household waste. So, you can go out there for free. But if you have commercial waste, then they will want to weigh it and charge you for that commercial waste.

Undecipherable voice. Mayor requested to use the mic.

Councilmember Cundick: I cannot hear you. The whole idea is that if you're into construction, that kind of thing. That' is beyond just the normal household use.

And so, they will weigh that and assess a fee for that. That is my update and as soon as I can agree on a summary of our visit, we will either send that out with the newsletter or otherwise make it available to the town. I think it's important to understand what can really be recycled. I've always used the rule when in doubt recycle. But as I went through this, I realized that is not the best rule. It just cost extra money to deal with things that they can't handle. That's my report.

Mayor requested speaker to come to the mic and state and state their name.

Michelle Poet: So, some recycling centers won't take freezer boxes cardboard because it's got wax on it. Did they say anything specifically about that?

Councilmember Cundick: They didn't talk about carbon with wax. They had tons of cardboard that came straight from Amazon down it had stacks and stacks of it. I don't know if it had wax on it or not. They will not take appliances there. That's why we're trying to arrange something separate here in St. George. So, if they take your appliance here, we can send it someplace.

Michelle Poet: Yes. There is metal recycling places in town, we can drop off water heaters too. And if you really want, they'll pay for some. The sale prices are really low.


Councilmember Hunsaker: other than the Fourth of July, all I have is the new flag came for the cemetery. We had a temporary one up because it was looking so poor before Memorial Day. So, I just put up a holding one. So, it'll be the right size again here shortly. And as of tomorrow, it'll, the four by six will be backed up flying proudly.

Mayor Hoster: Great. My staff report will be on DTAC this week, we did talk about air quality. The task force provided a presentation to us. Very insightful, it was with regard to the monitors that are set, mostly to the south of us. The construction companies actually fund this organization and are working in concert with the various cities. I did ask about being able to put a monitor here for any of the anticipated development that might occur and to confirm that we are staying within the particulate amounts that are appropriate. I understand that there are complaints that are addressed by people who are qualified to identify any kind of sun blockage. So those people would need to come out in those circumstances. But this was something that was put together by the Air Quality Task Force presentation. They are making every effort to try and mitigate any secondary dust and things that occur as a result of construction whether it be vehicles on the road,

or on the site for excavation, which is pretty relevant to some of the things that we just recently passed, and Mark present up for us. They also have requested some additional funds for the transportation plan for Washington County of which was approved. I believe it was 2.5 million. That is the end of my report. There's nothing from the fire department.

Adjournment: 8:28

Approved this 22 Day of June 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Hoster, Mayor

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aseneth Steed, Clerk/Recorder

Ordinary Income/Expense

	2021-22		Apr-Jun	Annual	Proposed	Change in
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Projection	Projection	2022-23 Budget	Budget
<b>Income</b>						
<b>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</b>						
Charges for Services Other	5.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00
Charges for Copies and Fax	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00
GRAMA Request	0.00	50.00	15.00	15.00	50.00	0.00
Total Charges for Services Other	5.00	75.00	15.00	20.00	75.00	0.00
<b>Cemetery Revenue</b>						
Burial Fees	550.00	2,000.00	500.00	1,050.00	1,000.00	(1,000.00)
Lot Sales	2,000.00	800.00	1,200.00	3,200.00	800.00	0.00
Total Cemetery Revenue	2,550.00	2,800.00	1,700.00	4,250.00	1,800.00	(1,000.00)
<b>Sanitation Revenue</b>						
Curbside Recycling	6,469.20	7,700.00	2,446.90	8,916.10	9,500.00	1,800.00
Sanitation Revenue - Other	44,512.75	55,000.00	15,753.30	60,266.05	63,000.00	8,000.00
Total Sanitation Revenue	50,981.95	62,700.00	18,200.20	69,182.15	69,100.00	9,800.00
Charges for Services - Other	0.00	25.00	10.00	10.00	25.00	0.00
Total CHARGES FOR SERVICES	53,536.95	65,600.00	19,925.20	73,462.15	71,000.00	8,800.00
<b>CONTRIBUTIONS &amp; TRANSFERS</b>						
Donations/Grants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
WCSSD RECYCLE CONTRIBUTI	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Donations	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Historical	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
RAP GRANT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Historical -(CLG Grant)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Historical	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Donations/Grants-other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Donations/Grants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Contributions & Transfers Otr	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Transfer from Beginning Func	0.00	82,080.00	0.00	0.00	82,080.00	0.00
Class B & C Road Funds	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
General Fund	0.00	27,200.00	0.00	0.00	35,069.00	7,869.00
Total CONTRIBUTIONS & TRANSFERS	0.00	109,280.00	0.00	0.00	117,149.00	7,869.00

	2021-22		Apr-Jun	Annual	Proposed		Change in
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Projection	Projection	2022-23 Budget	Budget	
<b>IMPACT FEES INCOME</b>							
Impact Fee Public Safety Income	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
Impact Fee Roads Income	3,295.00	13,180.00	3,295.00	6,590.00	13,180.00		0.00
Impact Fees Park Income	1,300.00	5,200.00	1,300.00	2,600.00	5,200.00		0.00
<b>Total IMPACT FEES INCOME</b>	<b>4,595.00</b>	<b>18,380.00</b>	<b>4,595.00</b>	<b>9,190.00</b>	<b>18,380.00</b>		<b>0.00</b>

	2021-22		Apr-Jun	Annual	Proposed	Change in
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Projection	Projection	2022-23 Budget	Budget
<b>INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE</b>						
Class C Road Funds	55,059.11	240,000.00	19,000.00	74,059.11	240,000.00	0.00
Court Fines	12,788.32	10,000.00	3,522.52	16,310.84	18,000.00	8,000.00
Leeds Area Wild Lands Fire Fees	0.00	3,801.00	0.00	0.00	3,801.00	0.00
Leeds Area SSD payment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MPO Grant	0.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	0.00	(35,000.00)
CIB Grant	0.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	35,000.00	0.00	(35,000.00)
State Grants (includes CARES+ARP)	51,660.00	357,291.00	0.00	51,660.00	357,291.00	0.00
<b>Total INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>119,507.43</b>	<b>681,092.00</b>	<b>92,522.52</b>	<b>212,029.95</b>	<b>619,092.00</b>	<b>(62,000.00)</b>
<b>LICENSES &amp; PERMITS</b>						
Liquor	600.00	400.00	0.00	600.00	400.00	0.00
Encroachment Permits	672.50	125.00	0.00	672.50	125.00	0.00
Animal Licenses	295.00	200.00	25.00	320.00	300.00	100.00
Building Inspection Fees	700.00	200.00	200.00	900.00	900.00	700.00
Building Permits	9,631.51	10,000.00	2,500.00	12,131.51	12,000.00	2,000.00
Business Licenses	570.00	600.00	110.00	680.00	600.00	0.00
Conditional Use Permits	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00
Developments Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Misc. Licenses, Permits & Fees	525.00	0.00	0.00	525.00	0.00	0.00
Subdivision Applications	1,550.00	0.00	0.00	1,550.00	0.00	0.00
Zone Change Applications	1,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total LICENSES &amp; PERMITS</b>	<b>15,544.01</b>	<b>11,625.00</b>	<b>2,935.00</b>	<b>18,479.01</b>	<b>14,425.00</b>	<b>2,800.00</b>
<b>Professional Services Revenues</b>						
Engineering Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Legal Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Professional Services Reven	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total Professional Services Rev</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
Zone Change Applications	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

	2021-22		Apr-Jun	Annual	Proposed	Change in
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Projection	Projection	2022-23 Budget	Budget
<b>MISC. REVENUE</b>						
Miscellaneous Revenue Other	550.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Returned Check Fees	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(50.00)
Developer Expense Reimbursem	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISC REVENUE uncategorized i	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total Miscellaneous Revenue Other</b>	<b>550.00</b>	<b>50.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>(50.00)</b>
<b>Interest Earnings on accounts</b>						
Interest Income Parks Fund	187.31	175.00	60.00	247.31	300.00	125.00
Interest Income Roads Fund	249.82	225.00	80.00	329.82	400.00	175.00
Interest Capital Imp Fund	392.24	425.00	135.00	527.24	600.00	175.00
Interest Inc Public Safety Fund	12.48	12.00	4.00	16.48	17.00	5.00
Interest Income General Fund	2,517.27	2,500.00	835.00	3,352.27	4,000.00	1,500.00
Interest Income Historical Fund	2.77	3.00	1.00	3.77	4.00	1.00
Interest Income Roads B&C Fun	672.38	625.00	225.00	897.38	1,000.00	375.00
Interest Inc Sidewalks & Gutter	52.22	90.00	17.00	69.22	100.00	10.00
Interest Earnings on accs - Othe	595.12	1,500.00	200.00	795.12	1,000.00	(500.00)
<b>Total Interest Earnings on accounts</b>	<b>4,681.61</b>	<b>5,555.00</b>	<b>1,557.00</b>	<b>6,238.61</b>	<b>7,421.00</b>	<b>1,866.00</b>
<b>Rents &amp; Concessions</b>						
4th July	708.00	1,000.00	0.00	708.00	1,500.00	500.00
Rent and Deposit on Pavilion	325.00	750.00	155.00	480.00	500.00	(250.00)
Wild West Days in Leads	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Community Celebrations	850.00	0.00	285.00	1,135.00	1,000.00	1,000.00
<b>Total Rents &amp; Concessions</b>	<b>1,883.00</b>	<b>1,750.00</b>	<b>440.00</b>	<b>2,323.00</b>	<b>3,000.00</b>	<b>1,250.00</b>
<b>Total MISC. REVENUE</b>	<b>7,114.61</b>	<b>7,355.00</b>	<b>1,997.00</b>	<b>8,561.61</b>	<b>10,421.00</b>	<b>3,066.00</b>

	2021-22		Apr-Jun Projection	Annual Projection	Proposed		Change in Budget
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget			2022-23 Budget	Budget	
<b>Tax Revenues</b>							
<b>Property and RAP Tax Revenues</b>							
Prior Years' Taxes - Delinquent	2,750.98	1,000.00	50.00	2,800.98	2,800.00	1,800.00	
Penalties	20.01	10.00	7.00	27.01	10.00	0.00	
Interest on taxes	5.85	5.00	2.00	7.85	5.00	0.00	
Gen. Sales & Use Taxes	137,640.10	122,151.00	45,000.00	182,640.10	125,000.00	2,849.00	
Gen. Property Taxes - Current	66,045.66	67,490.00	1,400.00	67,445.66	67,490.00	0.00	
Fee-in-Lieu of Property Taxes	3,445.63	3,200.00	1,000.00	4,445.63	4,400.00	1,200.00	
Tax Revenues-Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
RAP Taxes	13,609.73	14,000.00	4,500.00	18,109.73	18,000.00	4,000.00	
<b>Total Property and RAP Tax Revenue</b>	<b>223,517.96</b>	<b>207,856.00</b>	<b>51,959.00</b>	<b>275,476.96</b>	<b>217,705.00</b>	<b>9,849.00</b>	
<b>Franchise Taxes</b>							
Municipal Energy Tax	40,811.23	40,000.00	13,500.00	54,311.23	56,000.00	16,000.00	
Municipal Telecom License Tax	4,778.65	4,000.00	1,500.00	6,278.65	6,200.00	2,200.00	
Franchise Taxes - Other	0.00	8,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(8,000.00)	
<b>Total Franchise Taxes</b>	<b>45,589.88</b>	<b>52,000.00</b>	<b>15,000.00</b>	<b>60,589.88</b>	<b>62,200.00</b>	<b>10,200.00</b>	
<b>Total Tax Revenues</b>	<b>269,107.84</b>	<b>259,856.00</b>	<b>66,959.00</b>	<b>336,066.84</b>	<b>279,905.00</b>	<b>20,049.00</b>	
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>469,405.84</b>	<b>1,153,188.00</b>	<b>188,933.72</b>	<b>657,789.56</b>	<b>1,130,372.00</b>	<b>(19,416.00)</b>	
<b>Gross Profit:</b>	<b>469,405.84</b>	<b>1,153,188.00</b>	<b>188,933.72</b>	<b>657,789.56</b>	<b>1,130,372.00</b>	<b>(19,416.00)</b>	



Expense	2021-22		Apr-Jun	Annual	Proposed	Change in
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Projection	Projection	2022-23 Budget	Budget
Construction/Impact Expenses	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Impact Parks Spent	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Construction/Impact Expenses	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>CULTURE &amp; RECREATION EXPENSE</b>						
4th July fireworks	0.00	2,500.00	0.00	0.00	2,500.00	0.00
Cemetery Expenses						
Cemetery Water Expense	360.00	480.00	120.00	480.00	480.00	0.00
Open/close grave	650.00	2,000.00	500.00	1,150.00	2,000.00	0.00
Cemetery Expenses - Other	0.00	250.00	0.00	0.00	250.00	0.00
Total Cemetery Expenses	1,010.00	2,730.00	620.00	1,630.00	2,730.00	0.00
Historical-Tithing House	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Historical Preservation						
CCC Camp	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Historical Preservation - Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Historical Preservation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Culture & Recreation Costs						
Community Celebrations	1,073.68	0.00	0.00	1,073.68	0.00	0.00
Refund back on Peach Pavilion	50.00	150.00	50.00	100.00	150.00	0.00
Wild West Days	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Arbor Day	156.11	0.00	0.00	156.11	0.00	0.00
Easter	0.00	300.00	300.00	300.00	300.00	0.00
Princess Pageant	0.00	1,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,000.00	0.00
Culture & Recreation Costs - Otr	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Washington Co Fair	0.00	1,300.00	0.00	0.00	1,300.00	0.00
Culture & Recreation Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Culture & Recreation Costs	1,279.79	2,750.00	350.00	1,629.79	2,750.00	0.00
Total CULTURE & RECREATION EXPENSE	2,289.79	7,980.00	970.00	3,259.79	7,980.00	0.00
<b>GENERAL GOVERNMENT EXPENSES</b>						
Administration	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Administration General	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

	2021-22		2022-23		Change in Budget
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Apr-Jun Projection	Annual Projection	
LASSD BOND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Wild Lands Fire Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Liability Insurance & Bonds	1,115.50	20,000.00	5,000.00	6,115.50	20,000.00
Planning & Zoning	0.00	2,000.00	0.00	0.00	2,000.00
Materials	159.67	0.00	0.00	159.67	0.00
Dues & Subscriptions	498.05	2,000.00	1,800.00	2,298.05	2,000.00
Building Maintenance	1,434.56	23,000.00	1,500.00	2,934.56	30,000.00
Banking Fees	0.00	100.00	5.00	5.00	100.00
Bldg Permit Surcharge Fees	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Power	2,020.20	3,600.00	1,000.00	3,020.20	3,600.00
Gas	661.44	750.00	150.00	811.44	750.00
Water-Admin	545.56	480.00	120.00	665.56	480.00
Phone	2,384.43	3,000.00	700.00	3,084.43	3,000.00
Reconciliation Discrepancies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Uncategorized Expenses+CAF	23,248.92	0.00	0.00	23,248.92	0.00
Administration General-Other	40.00	3,801.00	250.00	290.00	3,801.00
Travel & Training	95.00	3,000.00	300.00	395.00	3,000.00
Total Administration General	32,203.33	61,731.00	10,825.00	43,028.33	68,731.00
Admin Office Supplies					
Copier Lease	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Postage/Shipping	713.68	1,200.00	400.00	1,113.68	1,200.00
Admin Office Supplies - Other	2,002.57	5,000.00	900.00	2,902.57	5,000.00
Total Admin Office Supplies	2,716.25	6,200.00	1,300.00	4,016.25	6,200.00
Training	0.00	0.00	500.00	500.00	0.00
Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4142 - Admin Wages					
Unemployment Insurance	0.00	1,200.00	0.00	0.00	1,200.00
Admin Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Employee Benefits	146,471.89	12,000.00	0.00	146,471.89	0.00
Payroll Processing	386.00	1,000.00	280.00	666.00	1,000.00
Payroll taxes	4,243.00	6,750.00	1,500.00	5,743.00	8,413.47
4142 - Admin Wages - Other	22,817.13	44,500.00	7,500.00	30,317.13	61,100.00

	2021-22		Apr-Jun	Annual		Proposed		Change in
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Projection	Projection	2022-23 Budget	Budget		
Total 4142 - Admin Wages	173,918.02	65,450.00	9,280.00	183,198.02	71,713.47	6,263.47		
Administration - Other	47.57	0.00	0.00	47.57	0.00	0.00		
Total Administration	208,885.17	133,381.00	21,905.00	230,790.17	146,644.47	13,263.47		
Legislative								
Codification	0.00	7,200.00	0.00	0.00	1,500.00	(5,700.00)		
Dues and Subscriptions	1,666.67	3,750.00	2,000.00	3,666.67	3,750.00	0.00		
Total Legislative	1,666.67	10,950.00	2,000.00	3,666.67	5,250.00	(5,700.00)		
Professional Services General								
Professional Services Admin	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Planner	7,260.00	9,000.00	2,000.00	9,260.00	14,000.00	5,000.00		
Computer Technology	741.96	4,500.00	2,300.00	3,041.96	4,500.00	0.00		
Information Technology	347.85	4,000.00	3,100.00	3,447.85	4,000.00	0.00		
Engineering	5,161.99	7,000.00	2,000.00	7,161.99	7,000.00	0.00		
Building Inspections	6,350.00	7,000.00	2,000.00	8,350.00	9,000.00	2,000.00		
Silver Pointe Estates	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Accounting	0.00	900.00	300.00	300.00	900.00	0.00		
Total Professional Services Adm	19,861.80	32,400.00	11,700.00	31,561.80	39,400.00	7,000.00		
Professional Services								
Public & Legal Notices-Gener	241.35	2,000.00	300.00	541.35	2,000.00	0.00		
Legal								
Prosecutor-Public Defender	9,448.00	10,000.00	2,000.00	11,448.00	12,000.00	2,000.00		
Legal - Other	6,380.00	30,000.00	6,000.00	12,380.00	30,000.00	0.00		
Total Legal	15,828.00	40,000.00	8,000.00	23,828.00	42,000.00	2,000.00		
Audit	4,205.26	5,000.00	0.00	4,205.26	5,000.00	0.00		
Master Transportation & Gene	17,282.40	76,000.00	58,717.60	76,000.00	0.00	(76,000.00)		
General Plan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Elections	1,260.93	2,000.00	0.00	1,260.93	0.00	(2,000.00)		
Legal Notices	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Public & Legal Notices Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Total Professional Services	38,817.94	125,000.00	67,017.60	105,835.54	49,000.00	(76,000.00)		
Total Professional Services General	58,679.74	157,400.00	78,717.60	137,397.34	88,400.00	(69,000.00)		
Total GENERAL GOVERNMENT EXPEN	271,521.37	309,711.00	102,622.60	371,854.18	248,274.47	(61,436.53)		

	2021-22		Apr-Jun	Annual	Proposed	Change in
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Projection	Projection	2022-23 Budget	Budget
<b>HIGHWAYS &amp; STREETS</b>						
Class B & C Road Funds	0.00	200,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	260,000.00	60,000.00
Equipment	0.00	6,000.00	0.00	0.00	6,000.00	0.00
Fuel for Truck	1,209.43	1,300.00	600.00	1,809.43	1,300.00	0.00
Main Street Project	4,404.00	<b>342,000.00</b>	0.00	4,404.00	<b>342,000.00</b>	0.00
Repair & Maintenance	1,506.98	15,000.00	1,000.00	2,506.98	15,000.00	0.00
Utilities Street Lights	3,420.60	5,000.00	1,300.00	4,720.60	5,000.00	0.00
4401 - Highway & Street Wages	12,357.16	14,000.00	3,300.00	15,657.16	14,000.00	0.00
<b>Total HIGHWAYS &amp; STREETS</b>	<b>22,898.17</b>	<b>583,300.00</b>	<b>9,200.00</b>	<b>32,098.17</b>	<b>643,300.00</b>	<b>60,000.00</b>
<b>Parks/Public Works</b>						
TreeCityUSA	0.00	1,786.00	0.00	0.00	1,786.00	0.00
Building repairs/maintenance	887.67	1,000.00	600.00	1,487.67	1,700.00	700.00
Park Equipment	137.89	1,500.00	0.00	137.89	1,500.00	0.00
Park improvements	80.00	10,000.00	1,000.00	1,080.00	10,000.00	0.00
Park Maintenance	2,241.88	3,000.00	750.00	2,991.88	3,000.00	0.00
Shop Repairs/Maintenance	507.97	750.00	600.00	1,107.97	1,300.00	550.00
Silver Reef Highlands Park+CARES	0.00	97,871.00	0.00	0.00	97,871.00	0.00
Truck Fuel & Maintenance	26.97	500.00	450.00	476.97	500.00	0.00
Water & Utilities	779.00	900.00	120.00	899.00	900.00	0.00
4601 - Public Works Wages	21,140.16	32,500.00	7,200.00	28,340.16	34,880.00	2,380.00
<b>Total Parks/Public Works</b>	<b>25,801.54</b>	<b>149,807.00</b>	<b>10,720.00</b>	<b>36,521.54</b>	<b>153,437.00</b>	<b>3,630.00</b>
<b>SANITATION EXPENSE</b>						
Dumpster	1,369.87	2,000.00	650.00	2,019.87	2,000.00	0.00
BluCan- Recyclable	6,247.29	7,500.00	1,750.00	7,997.29	8,000.00	500.00
Garbage	36,568.31	49,000.00	12,200.00	48,768.31	49,000.00	0.00
<b>SANITATION EXPENSE - Other</b>	<b>915.02</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>915.02</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Total SANITATION EXPENSE</b>	<b>45,100.49</b>	<b>58,500.00</b>	<b>14,600.00</b>	<b>59,700.49</b>	<b>59,000.00</b>	<b>500.00</b>
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>367,611.36</b>	<b>1,109,298.00</b>	<b>138,112.60</b>	<b>503,434.17</b>	<b>1,111,991.47</b>	<b>2,693.47</b>
<b>Net Ordinary Income</b>	<b>101,794.48</b>	<b>43,890.00</b>	<b>50,821.12</b>	<b>154,355.39</b>	<b>18,380.53</b>	<b>(22,109.47)</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>101,794.48</b>	<b>43,890.00</b>	<b>50,821.12</b>	<b>154,355.39</b>	<b>18,380.53</b>	<b>(22,109.47)</b>

	2021-22		Apr-Jun	Annual	Proposed		Change in
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Projection	Projection	2022-23 Budget	Budget	
		2021-22	Apr-Jun	Annual	Proposed	Change in	
	Jul 21-Mar 22	Annual Budget	Projection	Projection	2022-23 Budget	Budget	
Total Income	\$ 469,405.84	\$ 1,153,188.00	\$ 188,933.72	\$ 657,789.56	\$ 1,180,503.00	\$ 32,715.00	
Total Expense	\$ 367,611.36	\$ 1,109,298.00	\$ 138,112.60	\$ 503,434.17	\$ 1,109,429.40	\$ 131.40	
NET	\$ 101,794.48	\$ 43,890.00	\$ 50,821.12	\$ 154,355.39	\$ 71,073.60	\$ 32,583.60	