



SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION
96 South Main
Smithfield, UT 84335

AGENDA

Public Notice is given that the Smithfield City Council will meet in a regularly scheduled meeting at 96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah, on **Wednesday, July 9, 2025**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 PM.

Welcome/pledge of allegiance and thought/prayer by Mayor Monson

1. Approval of the city council meeting minutes from June 11, 2025.
2. Public comment on items not on the agenda or not requiring a public hearing during the meeting.
3. Discussion and possible approval of Dustin Smith as a Commissioner on the Smithfield City Planning Commission.
4. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing a COG (Cache County Council of Governments) grant application for funding to construct a new road at approximately 925 South from 150 East to 250 East.
5. Discussion and possible vote on amendments to the Employee Personnel Manual.
6. Discussion on Municipal Code Section 12.40 "Maintenance of Street Right-Of-Way" (Park Strip).
7. Continued discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-07, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 "Zoning Regulations", Chapter 17.12 "Supplementary And Qualifying Regulations", adding Section 17.12.235 "Keeping Pigs", amending Chapter 17.04 "General Provisions", Section 17.04.070 "Definitions", Chapter 17.14 "Animal Rights Regulations For R-1 Zones", Sections 17.14.030 "Number Of Animals Permitted", 17.14.080 "Prohibited Animals", and Chapter 17.48 "Agricultural Zone", Section 17.48.050 "Farm Animals".
8. City Manager Report
9. Council Member and Mayor Reports
10. Closed Meeting to hold a strategy session to discuss the purchase, exchange or lease of real property. Utah Code Annotated 52-4-205 (1) (d).
11. Closed Meeting to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual. Utah Code Annotated 52-4-205 (1) (a).

Adjournment

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

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodation for this meeting should contact the City Recorder at (435) 792-7997, at least three (3) days before the date of the meeting.



SMITHFIELD CITY COUNCIL MINUTES June 11, 2025

The Smithfield City Council met in a regularly scheduled meeting at 96 South Main Street, Smithfield, Utah on Wednesday, June 11, 2025 at 6:30 p.m. Mayor Monson was in the chair. Opening remarks by Todd Orme

Council Members in Attendance: Sue Hyer, Todd Orme, Jenn Staker, Ted Stokes

Council Members Excused: Wade Campbell

City Staff: Justin Lewis (City Manager), Clay Bodily (City Engineer), Brian Boudrero (Planning Manager), Dana Lazcanotegui (City Recorder), Travis Allen (Police Chief), Jeremy Hunt (Fire Chief), Josh Wright (Public Works Director), Shawn Bliss (Library Director), Karen Bowling (Assistant Library Director), Zach Smyer (Golf Superintendent), Brett Daniels (Rec Center Director), Eric Kleven (Golf Professional)

Visitors: Jeff Barnes, Blaine Hamblin, Dan Sundstrom, Lee Helms, Dave Erickson, Dave Forrester, Danny & Holly Hansen, Kyle & Cheyanne Thatcher, Kimberly Sorensen, Caralee Stokes, Chris Olsen, Brad Thatcher, Carmen Garza Ordonez, Janet Hillyard, Tori Hillyard, Wendall & Sandra Jung, Dallas Nicoll, Dan Sundstrom, Kelley, Vikki & Allie Ballard, Alan Lower

Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes from May 14, 2025

*****Motion made by Councilmember Staker to approve the May 14, 2025 meeting minutes. Councilmember Orme seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker, Stokes

No Vote: None

Absent: Campbell

Resident Input

Danny Hansen shared his thoughts regarding the rezone request for the property on 400 West. The plan is much better than any previous proposal. Although the desire is for less density, this seems like a good compromise and is not a Planned Unit Development (PUD). His concern is that development continues to occur in areas where roads are an issue. The main road, 400 West, is narrow and needs to be addressed at some point. The width should be increased for safety. The opening of the LDS Temple will only compound the problem in this area of the city.

Chris Olsen, from the Planning Commission, appreciated Councilmember Stokes reminder that this is the time for public comment on items that do not have a public hearing. Sometimes, the process can be confusing. He suggested including more clarifying language on the agenda, such as "*Resident Input for any items except for public hearings*".

Lee Helms, who lives on 400 West, is concerned about the rezone and development, which will be discussed later in this meeting. He would like to see 1-acre lots along 400 West. He is worried about secondary water. Visionary Homes has no secondary water; they use culinary water to water their lawns. The property has water rights, and it is essential to ensure that secondary water is available.

Kim Sorensen, who lives on 400 West, agreed with Mr. Helms comments. When she drives home each day, she takes 400 North, which narrows and has a train track crossing and a stop sign. There is considerable concern about traffic in this area. The road, 400 West, is a narrow country road that cannot handle additional traffic. She is concerned about safety. She does not know how the road can be widened and improved. She enjoys living in a country setting.

Caralee Stokes agrees with the comments. Although this proposal is an improvement over the previous ones, she remains concerned about development in this area. Her primary concern is traffic. There is already quite a bit of congestion around Lee's Marketplace. She noted that KSL reported on an accident study, and Cache Valley was listed as the number one place for accidents.

Cheyenne Thatcher expressed frustration about taking resident input before discussing the project. She would like to hear the developer discuss his plans and then allow residents to ask questions. She sent an email in before the meeting. 400 West needs to be safe. She hopes the homes along 400 West will face east and not have access to 400 West. She questioned how this would be maintained and enforced. Councilmember Stokes thanked her for the photos she submitted for review.

Tori Hillyard agrees with all the comments. It is frustrating that more and more homes continue to get approved. She said they did not buy their home with the intention of giving up any land. Her husband has attended and spoken at several meetings, and they have submitted letters expressing their concerns. It feels like "it doesn't matter". She thinks there should be an alternative route through some of the land sold for this development. Councilmember Stokes noted that nothing in that part of town has been approved since the new council members were elected; however, they cannot retroactively change what has happened.

Recognition of the Arbor Day poster contest winners

Councilmember Orme introduced two of the winners, Tylee Barlow and Allie Ballard, and invited them to display their pictures. There were over 300 submissions, and he appreciates everyone who participated. Jeff Barnes said the winners helped plant a tree at Forrester Acres during the Health Days celebration.

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-16, an Ordinance annexing Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-045-0009, 08-045-0012 and 08- 049-0005. The parcels are located at approximately 800 East Upper Canyon Road. The parcels total approximately 7.2 acres.

Mr. Lewis explained that this is the last step in the annexation process. The Lower family has five (5) acres on the north side of Upper Canyon Road. The City owns the

parcels where the old garbage dump used to be on the south side of the road across from the Lower parcel. The City has no plans to develop or take any action with the city owned parcels; the desire is for them to be within the City limits. He pointed out that the Cache County Council reviewed and approved a small peninsula in the lower part of the area. This step does not approve any development. The properties will be located within the City, zoned A-10 (Agricultural 10-Acre), and will require rezoning based on the development type.

6:54 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

There were not any comments or questions.

6:55 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-16

Councilmember Stokes disclosed that he has represented a client against the Lowers in a recent litigation; however, it will not affect his consideration or vote for this proposal.

*****Motion made by Councilmember Stoke to adopt Ordinance 2025-16, an Ordinance annexing Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-045-0009, 08-045-0012 and 08- 049-0005. The parcels are located at approximately 800 East Upper Canyon Road. The parcels total approximately 7.2 acres. Councilmember Staker seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker, Stokes

No Vote: None

Absent: Campbell

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-14, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-042-0012, 08-042-0013, 08-042-0014, 08- 042-0015 and 08-043-0015 from A-10 (Agricultural 10-Acre) to R-1-12 (Single Family Residential 12,000 Square Feet). The parcels are located at approximately 485 North 400 West. The request was submitted by Heritage Land Holdings, LLC.

Mr. Boudrero explained that Heritage Land Holdings is requesting a rezone from Agricultural 10-Acre to R-1-12 Residential (minimum 12,000 square feet). The property is bordered on the east by residential and agricultural zones, Cache County property to the north, and residential to the south.

Mayor Monson noted that several projects/rezones have been proposed on this site over the last couple of years.

Councilmember Orme understands the reasoning for the R-1-12 request and the desire for 1-acre lots, but his primary concern is that the streets are insufficient and unsafe. When he ran for a seat on the council years ago, one of his promises was to

ensure that development does not overrun infrastructure. This is an infrastructure failure, but he does not want to stop development. Something needs to be done. With the LDS Temple nearing completion, 400 West and 800 West are going to be a nightmare in regard to traffic. It would be short-sighted to make a decision without considering how to improve the roads around this project.

Councilmember Stokes asked what improvements are needed on the west side of 400 West to develop the property. Mr. Bodily said the developer will be required to deed to the City the right-of-way and install curb, gutter and sidewalk along where their development is located.

Councilmember Stokes asked about the road width. Councilmember Staker measured that road, and it was 16 feet at the most narrow point and 19 feet at the widest point. If the General Plan outlined the requirements, where did the City go wrong with this road. The developer and/or residents would have to deed the property to widen the road, and she questioned whether this was a fair request, given that it was no fault of their own. She is struggling to find a compromise because growth cannot be undone; it seems as if the “cart has been pulling the horse” for years.

Blaine Hamblin, with Heritage Land Development, said they would measure from the center of the road to the property line. He does not know why the width of the road is what it is. They plan on meeting all applicable City regulations.

Councilmember Orme noted that another challenge is that there are power lines to the west that are close to the road. Mr. Bodily said he would need to measure them; they are required to be located in the public right-of-way. Councilmember Orme noted some of the poles are 18 inches to two feet from the edge of the pavement. If additional land is needed, those poles would have to be moved. Mr. Bodily said that if the property were deeded to the City, a franchise agreement with Rocky Mountain Power is in place, which would require them to relocate the poles at no expense to the City. Questar/Enbridge may charge a small fee, but all utilities would have to remain within the City’s right-of-way.

Councilmember Stokes asked if there has to be an outlet to 400 West. Mr. Bodily said that if there are more than 10 homes, two outlets are required. Councilmember Stokes is concerned because only the section of road in front of the proposed development would be improved, not the entire road. Mr. Bodily said it would be similar to what is being done by the LDS Temple on 800 West. Councilmember Stokes clarified that the road will not be 66 feet but will be at least 33 feet from the center of the road (on the west side) to the new development; Mr. Bodily concurred.

Councilmember Stokes questioned whether this property is undevelopable in its current state. Mr. Bodily said a travel lane is 12 feet wide. Councilmember Staker said there is a need to consider the farm equipment that travel that road.

Councilmember Stokes likes the idea of 12,000-square-foot lots. This has come a long way from previously proposed MPC developments. He does not know if it is because it is the only thing left to develop or if it is the product that people prefer. He thinks high-density housing developments have run a bit dry due to interest rates and other issues. He has said previously, and he does not intend to go back on his word, that he

would prefer 12,000 square foot lots, which is what Smithfield was built on. There are; however, areas where this is not conducive. He agrees with the request but wonders what is possible with the road issues. Councilmember Staker agrees and appreciates the proposal but does not think the roads can handle more development until they are improved. Councilmember Stokes questioned whether the road concerns are “fixable”. This development may be premature due to road and traffic issues.

Councilmember Orme said the Council needs to look beyond the scope of A-10 (Agricultural 10-Acre) because whatever is done will impact the 2-acre and 1-acre zones. The options should be studied more carefully before a decision is made. Councilmember Staker agreed that more time, thought, and effort should be put into this development and the roads before it is approved.

Councilmember Stokes asked about northern expansion. Mr. Lewis pointed out that landowners request annexations. There is potential for future development, but the area is quite constrained due to existing homes and structures.

Councilmember Orme is not willing to approve the request as it currently is. The Council owes the residents a realistic timeline to come up with some answers rather than just “kicking the can down the road”. Mayor Monson agreed that it needs to be considered for the sake of both the residents and the developer. Councilmember Stokes said the answer seems obvious, another outlet needs to be created because 400 West cannot be changed. Councilmember Orme would like residents, council members, and staff to collaborate on developing some options.

Mr. Lewis said this is a difficult challenge that affects many people. Heritage Land Development has presented its plans several times, and this one seems reasonable. The staff can explore some alternatives and consider the legal implications.

*****Motion made by Councilmember Orme to TABLE Ordinance 2025-16 so that staff can do further research and investigation. Councilmember Staker seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker, Stokes

No Vote: None

Absent: Campbell

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-13, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-222-0026, 08-222-0027, 08-222-0028, 08-222-0029, 08-222-0030, 08-222-0031, 08-222-0032, 08-222-0033, 08-222-0034, 08-222-0035, 08-222-0036, 08-222-0037, 08-222-0038, 08-222-0039, 08-222-0040, 08-222-0041, 08-222-0042, 08-222-0043, 08-222-0044, 08-222-0045, 08-222-0046, 08-222-0047, 08-222-0048, 08-222-0049, 08-222-0050, 08-222-0051, 08-222-0052, 08-222-0053, 08-222-0054, 08-222-0055, 08-222-0056, 08-222-0057, 08-222-0058, 08-222-0059, 08-222-0070, 08-222-0071, 08-222-0072, 08-222-0073, 08-222-0074, 08-222-0075, 08-222-0076, 08-222-0077, 08-222-0078, 08-222-0079, 08-222-0080, 08-222-0081, 08-222-0082, 08-222-0083, 08-222-0084, 08-222-0085, 08-222-0086, 08-222-0087, 08-222-0088, 08-222-0089, 08-222-0090, 08-222-0091, 08-222-0092, 08-222-0093, 08-222-0094, 08-222-9001, 08-222-0064, 08-222-0063, 08-222-0062, 08-222-0061, 08-222-0060, 08-222-0065, 08-222-0066, 08-222-0067, 08-222-0068 and 08-222-0069 from RM PUD (Multiple-Family Residential Planned Unit Development Overlay Zone) to RM PUD (Multiple-Family Residential Planned Unit Development Overlay Zone). The parcels are located at approximately 380 East 800 South. The request was submitted by Dan Sundstrom.

Dan Sundstrom is requesting a rezone from an RM-Planned Unit Development to another RM-Planned Unit Development with an updated plat. They have resubmitted preliminary plans for the remaining units in the existing Meadows at Sky View PUD. In addition to the site and development plan, they have included, as required, a landscape plan and stated that they will build all in one phase. The updated plan includes 79 townhome units, in addition to the existing 25 units, an interconnecting trail system, and open space with amenities.

Mr. Boudrero said that, according to the City Code, because the site plan is being adjusted, the applicant must request a rezone, even if it is to the same zone. The bulk of the open space has been allocated to the north, parking has been added, and the sewer pump station is no longer needed, and the storm water system is being relocated underground. The Planning Commission approved the changes.

Councilmember Orme asked what allowed the sewage pump station to be dropped from the plan. Mr. Boudrero said they now have the opportunity to tie into the existing sewer system which has been completed since this project started.

Councilmember Stokes asked where the trails would be located. Mr. Boudrero pointed out the wider sidewalk location on the plat map.

Mr. Sundstrom pointed out that, although not required, a road is being put in the center of the plan, 910 South, to provide better access and design.

*****Motion made by Councilmember Hyer to adopt Ordinance 2025-13, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-222-0026, 08-222-0027, 08-222-0028, 08-222-0029, 08-222-0030, 08-222-0031, 08-222-0032, 08-222-0033, 08-222-0034, 08-222-0035, 08-222-0036, 08-222-0037, 08-222-0038, 08-222-0039, 08-222-0040, 08-222-0041, 08-222-0042, 08-222-0043, 08-222-0044, 08-222-0045,**

08-222-0046, 08-222-0047, 08-222-0048, 08-222-0049, 08-222-0050, 08-222-0051, 08-222-0052, 08-222-0053, 08-222-0054, 08-222-0055, 08-222-0056, 08-222-0057, 08-222-0058, 08-222-0059, 08-222-0070, 08-222-0071, 08-222-0072, 08-222-0073, 08-222-0074, 08-222-0075, 08-222-0076, 08-222-0077, 08-222-0078, 08-222-0079, 08-222-0080, 08-222-0081, 08-222-0082, 08-222-0083, 08-222-0084, 08-222-0085, 08-222-0086, 08-222-0087, 08-222-0088, 08-222-0089, 08-222-0090, 08-222-0091, 08-222-0092, 08-222-0093, 08-222-0094, 08-222-9001, 08-222-0064, 08-222-0063, 08-222-0062, 08-222-0061, 08-222-0060, 08-222-0065, 08-222-0066, 08-222-0067, 08-222-0068 and 08-222-0069 from RM PUD (Multiple-Family Residential Planned Unit Development Overlay Zone) to RM PUD (Multiple-Family Residential Planned Unit Development Overlay Zone). The parcels are located at approximately 380 East 800 South. The request was submitted by Dan Sundstrom. Councilmember Staker seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.***

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker, Stokes

No Vote: None

Absent: Campbell

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-10, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Chapter 17.32 “Conditional Uses”, Section 17.32.100 “Special Provisions For Kennel/Cattery and Companion Animal(s) Conditional Use Permits”, Chapter 17.04 “General Provisions”, Section 17.04.070 “Definitions” and Chapter 17.120 “Use Matrix Table”, Section 17.120.010 “Use Allowance Matrix”.

Mr. Lewis highlighted the significant changes. The term “designated land use authority” is being replaced with “planning department.” Currently, four dogs are allowed with a kennel permit; this proposal would increase the limit to five dogs. The definition of “cattery” will be removed.

Mr. Lewis confirmed for Councilmember Orme that permits run with the applicant, not the property. If a person moves, the new owner would have to apply for a permit; if needed.

Councilmember Stokes asked if kennels are a conditional use permit. Mr. Boudrero said they are administrative permits. Councilmember Stokes suggested removing the word “conditional” to avoid any ambiguity.

Mr. Boudrero verified for Councilmember Orme that a dog run is not required if the yard is fenced.

After a brief discussion, the Council agreed that the proposal be modified to allow four dogs maximum not an increase to five.

*****Motion made by Councilmember Hyer to adopt Ordinance 2025-10, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Chapter 17.32 “Conditional Uses”, Section 17.32.100 “Special Provisions for Kennel/Cattery and Companion Animal(s)**

Conditional Use Permits”, Chapter 17.04 “General Provisions”, Section 17.04.070 “Definitions” and Chapter 17.120 “Use Matrix Table”, Section 17.120.010 “Use Allowance Matrix” amending the Ordinance to allow a maximum of four (4) dogs. Councilmember Orme seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.***

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker, Stokes

No Vote: None

Absent: Campbell

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-09, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 6 “Animals”, Chapter 6.12 “Animal Control Regulations Generally”, Section 6.12.020 “For Animal Establishments”.

Mr. Lewis said this is similar to the previous ordinance, but it is located in a different section of the Code. If approved, it will match the four allowed dogs and also remove the definition of 'cattery'.

7:43 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

There were not any comments or questions.

7:44 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-09

*****Motion made by Councilmember Stokes to approve Ordinance 2025-09, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 6 “Animals”, Chapter 6.12 “Animal Control Regulations Generally”, Section 6.12.020 “For Animal Establishments” amending the Ordinance to allow a maximum of four (4) dogs. Councilmember Staker seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker, Stokes

No Vote: None

Absent: Campbell

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2025-05, a Resolution amending the Fiscal Year 2025 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025.

Mr. Lewis outlined some key changes to consider since the mid-year adjustments.

- **Revenue** \$2,001,491, increase in sales tax (\$150,000), RAPZ tax (\$50,000), mass transit tax is a pass-through tax, local road fund tax increase (\$5,000), Police Department JAG grant (\$4,500), Class C road funds (\$70,000), RTIF (Rural Transportation Investment Fund) tax (\$280,000), planning fees, because of

development, increased (\$134,000), grave plot purchases (\$12,000), grave digging (\$9,000), justice court fines increased (\$18,400), total of all interest revenue line items increased (\$103,000), Police Department Protect & Serve grant (\$3,692), Library CLEF grant (\$4,610), donations to Historical Preservation Commission (\$6,500), County Fire contract increased (\$29,000), ambulance revenue increased (\$50,000), Fire department QRU contract (\$5,000), Fire department per capita grant (\$5,751), Wildland Fire revenue (\$130,000), Rec Center revenue increase (\$138,000), Golf Course revenue (\$319,000), Park impact fees (\$129,000).

Expenses (general highlight):

- Pay off a police department truck early (\$44,000).
- Use of funds from two grants they received.
- Streets, using RTIF tax, Mass Transit & Local Roads grants.
- Utilities for streetlights and street repairs.
- Civic Center - \$1,000
- Ambassador Program – \$2,825
- Douglass Mercantile Remodel - \$65,000 which ties in with RAPZ tax funding
- Cemetery – mapping and part-time help
- General Capital Improvement Fund - \$93,000 transfer
- Fire – increase wages to cover wildland fire deployment, supplies, and a new ambulance truck purchase
- Recreation - \$1,400 for miscellaneous programs.
- Golf - \$61,000 wages; course maintenance \$5,000; utilities \$9,000
- Mr. Lewis outlined the impact fees under the various funds.

Overall, the total budgeted expenses for this fiscal year would be \$29,964,986. Mr. Lewis is proud of the City's progress and its ability to fund numerous large projects with cash and grants and not incur any debt.

7:54 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

There were not any comments or questions.

7:55 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2025-05

*****Motion made by Councilmember Orme to adopt Resolution 2025-05, a Resolution amending the Fiscal Year 2025 Budget, which is the period of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025. Councilmember Staker seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0 *****

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker, Stokes

No Vote: None

Absent: Campbell

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-15, an Ordinance enacting compensation increases for specific city officers and elected officials.

Mr. Lewis stated that Utah Senate Bill SB91 requires a public hearing for transparency and accountability regarding wage increases for the Mayor, City Council, department heads, and other appointed officials. This proposal is for a 4.00% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), effective July 1, 2025. This request aligns with other personnel increases.

7:56 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

There were not any comments or questions.

7:57 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2025-15

Councilmember Stokes does not like the self-serving nature of giving council members an increase.

Councilmember Stokes asked how wages are distributed. from. Mr. Lewis stated that because the mayor and council members are responsible for all funds, the increase would come from the General fund, Water, Sewer, and Storm Water enterprise funds. For department heads, their increase would come from their departments, except in a few cases where it may be allocated across multiple funds as applicable. The 4.00% was based on inflation from last year.

Councilmember Stokes said that although it is not a huge expense, he asked if the money could be allocated toward something else instead of a raise for the Council. Mr. Lewis said that it can be allocated and appropriated at a later time per the Council's wishes.

*****Motion made by Councilmember Stokes to adopt Resolution 2025-15, a Resolution enacting compensation increases for specific city officers amending the Resolution to not include increases for the mayor or city council. Councilmember Orme seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker, Stokes

No Vote: None

Absent: Campbell

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2025-06, a Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026.

Mr. Lewis noted that the new budget has been discussed since February. He highlighted a couple of items, including the 4.00% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for all employees and a 2.00% discretionary merit increase for department heads to distribute to their staff as they see deem appropriate.

Per Councilmember Campbell's recommendation during the last discussion, the mini-excavator purchase has been removed.

The electronic road signs are still being proposed because they will come from a local dedicated road tax fund which is a restricted fund. The staff believes these can be quite useful in a number of different scenarios, and they can also be rented out if an interest arises.

The RAPZ tax approval projects have been included now they are formally adopted: \$3,500 for the Youth Theatre, \$50,000 for the Douglass Mercantile Building improvements, and \$205,000 for the Rec Center which is for Forrester Acres improvements.

The Golf Course total has not changed; however, the equipment line has been updated with some funding going to Course Capital Improvements.

The new budget does not include the new 3-million-gallon water tank; that project will be put out to bid later this summer. Once a final number is determined, it will be part of the midyear budget adjustments.

As presented, the General Fund's proposed revenue is \$13,809,787.

Enterprise Funds are not required to balance. The City is paying cash for the very large storm water project which is on 1000 South Main to 1200 West.

Mr. Lewis also noted that impact fees and grants are not included other than the RAPZ tax, which has already been approved. There is some concern about the long-term sustainability of grant funding. All departments are continually looking for grant opportunities.

8:08 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Chris Olsen stated that a significant amount of time and effort went into compiling this budget. He complimented Mr. Lewis's work and appreciated the Council's willingness to donate their wage increase toward something else.

8:10 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2025-06

Councilmember Stokes asked about the approximate 36% increase in Public Works wages. Mr. Lewis stated that some employees have been reassigned to different areas, which changes the source of their wages; therefore, allocations are now dependent on job assignments. Some departments are showing an increase, while others are showing a decrease. For example, the Streets department has one employee who has retired. The Cemetery is increasing because an employee is being reallocated to help there. No new full-time positions, other than those previously requested and approved are being requested. He did note that the Police Department Administrative Assistant is being proposed to move from part-time to full-time. Councilmember Stokes asked about the new police officer being hired. Chief Allen said he would be a Police Officer III based on his years of experience. Mayor Monson said he will be introduced to the Council at the July council meeting. Chief Allen said he was hired last fall and had to attend the Academy in March because his certification had expired. He has ten years of experience, but there was a break in service, so he had to recertify.

Councilmember Stokes is very concerned about the park tree issues and has suggested allocating funding toward addressing this issue. Mr. Lewis said funds that are not allocated or approved can be put into a "To Be Appropriated" line item that the Council can designate at another time.

Mayor Monson noted that the department heads have worked hard on their budgets over the last year and it is hard to make changes this late in the process.

Councilmember Stokes expressed concern about converting the police administrative assistant position to full-time, citing the need to conduct background checks as one of the considerations. He does not think that it will be as cumbersome or time-consuming as anticipated because he has personally done it. He is also hesitant to fund more training for the police department because he has conducted extensive research and is unsure if they are taking full advantage of all the free training available. Due to recent activity he does not want to fund more fuel as well. Chief Allen has taken steps to address some issues within the department, and he appreciates the corrective actions taken; however, he thinks reallocating some of this money could help with the park strip tree issue.

Mr. Lewis noted that holding the same rate on property tax as last year would likely result in a 2.25% increase which would equate to \$8.61 per average household per year and would equal \$45,859 overall. The initial thought would be asking to dedicate this funding to the park strip tree line item. He noted again that this will be discussed at next month's meeting. The staff has some options to present for the council to consider.

Councilmember Orme questioned why certain line items from the previous budget had not been utilized. He thinks it might be inappropriate to change the proposed budget without knowing more details from the department heads. He does not want frugality to interfere with having a less professionally trained staff. He would admonish department heads to take full advantage of free training and determine what is

necessary for their departments. He wants staff to be the best that they can be.

Mr. Lewis said that the training budget for this past year was not all spent, partly because there were more free training opportunities than there had had in a long time. Also, many of the trainings were local. He feels good about what has been done and is being done, but there are always ways to improve, and the amount of training is not necessarily reflected in the budget. He does not want to spend just to zero out a budget line item.

Mayor Monson noted that the ULCT (Utah League of Cities and Towns) offers training twice a year, which the Council should take advantage of. Councilmember Stokes said he is aware of the ULCT agenda and will not attend those trainings, but he is willing to participate in other unbiased trainings.

Councilmember Stokes said it is unfair to compare some trainings to Active Shooter training. He approved an additional police officer last year because he was told that it would increase the likelihood of handling an active school shooter. There are facts that he could state for the record, but he will not, which would prove that an additional officer was not needed. There have been events within the police department over the last year that make it clear that one was not needed. The police department did not attend any active shooter training, which were free, which is extremely concerning. Chief Allen stated that all officers have registered for Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training (ALERRT), which is hosted by the County and conducted in sessions throughout the year. Most will attend the July or September session. Councilmember Stokes received several reference calls for Smithfield officers applying for positions in other departments. The departments he spoke with asked why Smithfield officers do not attend active shooter training. He asked a couple of Smithfield officers, who said they had not attended the training. He cannot provide the police department with more money, as this is the primary reason they were given the additional funds. He is frustrated because every penny matters, and the park strip tree problem in the City is massive. He is not convinced that another officer was needed last year, given that one was not hired for months, and the fact that he had to go through the academy proves that it was not a necessity.

Councilmember Orme wants to ensure that all departments are held accountable for the decisions and choices they make. He also advised taking full advantage of any free training opportunities. He would like to see all employees become as capable as possible. Smithfield residents are very fortunate to have such short response times from both the police and fire departments. He does not think the proposed budget, which the department heads worked very hard on, should be changed at this time.

*****Motion made by Councilmember Hyer to adopt Resolution 2025-06. Councilmember Orme seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 3-1.*****

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker

No Vote: Stokes

Absent: Campbell

Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2025-07, a Resolution to inform the State of Utah Water Quality Board of actions taken concerning the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for 2024.

Mr. Bodily explained that this is an annual report that must be submitted each year, detailing all necessary actions to maintain the sewer collection system. One of the requirements is the report come before the city council for review.

*****Motion made by Councilmember Staker to adopt Resolution 2025-07, a Resolution to inform the State of Utah Water Quality Board of actions taken concerning the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for 2024. Councilmember Hyer seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Hyer, Orme, Staker, Stokes

No Vote: None

Absent: Campbell

City Manager Report

City Recorder Dana Lazcanotegui provided the following update:

2025 Election Update

Mayor - one (1) four-year term
- one (1) to be elected:

Candidates:

- Aaron Rudie
- Kris Monson

City Council - two (2) four-year terms
- two (2) to be elected:

Candidates:

- Blaine Richard Nuttall
- Chris Olsen
- Lizette Villegas
- Sue Hyer
- Jay D. Downs

Election Dates & Voting Information

Primary Election: Tuesday, August 12, 2025

General Election: Tuesday, November 4, 2025

A primary election will be held to narrow the number of council member candidates from five to four.

✓ Mr. Bodily is working with an engineering company, Cache County, and Hyde Park

City on a traffic study for 1000 East, 250 East, and 100 East, as well as a possible connection from Wolf Pack Way to either 250 East or 100 East. A grant is paying for the majority of the cost. No roads are being proposed, and no property is being purchased as part of this study. The information collected in the studies will be presented to the Council.

- ✓ Juneteenth is a Federal holiday and will be observed on Thursday, June 19, 2025.
- ✓ He thanked the Council and department heads for their involvement in the budget discussions. It is a big undertaking, and he is very proud of all the work, especially the projects that will be completed with cash. He continues to appreciate the Council's guidance and assistance with the budget process.

Council Member & Mayor Reports

Todd Orme

- ✓ The Tree Committee is busy, constantly looking at ideas and working on possible solutions.
- ✓ The Douglass Mercantile is continuing to make improvements, he appreciates the additional RAPZ tax funding which was just approved.

Ted Stokes

- ✓ Met with Jessica Higginbotham; more funding is needed for the annual Storybook Festival which is held in December. The Smithfield Chamber of Commerce is off until September but will request more funding from them when they reconvene in the fall.
- ✓ Trails Committee – there were some issues regarding how the Bonneville Shoreline Trail would connect in the 300 South area. Cache County exercised its Open Lands Grant and paid just under two million to purchase property on the mountain above the high voltage power lines between Birch Canyon and Dry Canyon. This will make the grade of the trail steeper than it would have been if it had followed the area near the power lines like suggested in the past.

Jenn Staker

- ✓ The Arts Council is starting the summer concert series, featuring performances on June 20th, July 19th, and August 15th at 7:00 p.m. at the pavilion by the Library. Seize the Night has been contracted to do the sound again.
- ✓ The seniors are currently meeting twice a month for lunch.
- ✓ The Health Day Ambassadors have four more parades to participate in this summer.

Mayor Monson

- ✓ She and the mayors and city managers of Hyrum and North Logan met with Cache County Fire Chief Rod Hammer and Cache County Auditor Matthew Funk to discuss the proposed new fire district. The meeting helped provide answers and a better understanding of the proposal. This is in its infancy and will take many years to come together.
- ✓ She has received many questions about green waste dumpsters. Logan City

previously provided this service. Residents can purchase individual green waste cans for \$9.00 per month billed twelve months per year.

- ✓ A mural will be placed on the south side of the Old Main Theatre, in the alleyway, with the theme of Mental Health. It will include a QR code that connects to Bear River Mental Health Services.
- ✓ She invited individuals to participate in not using social media on the first day of each month. She will be inviting people to share stories of what they did.
- ✓ Arbor Day Declaration read and Saturday, May 10th was Arbor Day in the city for 2025.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION

Kristi Monson, Mayor

ATTEST:

Dana Lazcanotegui, City Recorder



SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION
96 South Main
Smithfield, UT 84335

AGENDA

Public notice is given that the Smithfield City Council will meet in a regularly-scheduled meeting at 96 South Main, Smithfield, Utah, on **Wednesday, May 14, 2025**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 PM.

Welcome/Pledge of Allegiance and thought/prayer by Todd Orme

1. Approval of the City Council meeting minutes from May 14, 2025
2. Resident Input
3. Youth Council Report
4. Recognition of the Arbor Day poster contest winners.
5. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-16, an Ordinance annexing Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-045-0009, 08-045-0012 and 08-049-0005. The parcels are located at approximately 800 East Upper Canyon Road. The parcels total approximately 7.2 Acres.
6. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-16.
7. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-14, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-042-0012, 08-042-0013, 08-042-0014, 08-042-0015 and 08-043-0015 from A-10 (Agricultural 10-Acre) to R-1-12 (Single Family Residential 12,000 Square Feet). The parcels are located at approximately 485 North 400 West. The request was submitted by Heritage Land Holdings, LLC.
8. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-13, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Numbers 08-222-0026, 08-222-0027, 08-222-0028, 08-222-0029, 08-222-0030, 08-222-0031, 08-222-0032, 08-222-0033, 08-222-0034, 08-222-0035, 08-222-0036, 08-222-0037, 08-222-0038, 08-222-0039, 08-222-0040, 08-222-0041, 08-222-0042, 08-222-0043, 08-222-0044, 08-222-0045, 08-222-0046, 08-222-0047, 08-222-0048, 08-222-0049, 08-222-0050, 08-222-0051, 08-222-0052, 08-222-0053, 08-222-0054, 08-222-0055, 08-222-0056, 08-222-0057, 08-222-0058, 08-222-0059, 08-222-0070, 08-222-0071, 08-222-0072, 08-222-0073, 08-222-0074, 08-222-0075, 08-222-0076, 08-222-0077, 08-222-0078, 08-222-0079, 08-222-0080, 08-222-0081, 08-222-0082, 08-222-0083, 08-222-0084, 08-222-0085, 08-222-0086, 08-222-0087, 08-222-0088, 08-222-0089, 08-222-0090, 08-222-0091, 08-222-0092, 08-222-0093, 08-222-0094, 08-222-9001, 08-222-0064, 08-222-0063, 08-222-0062, 08-222-0061, 08-222-0060, 08-222-0065, 08-222-0066, 08-222-0067, 08-222-0068 and 08-222-0069 from RM PUD(Multiple-Family Residential Planned Unit Development Overlay Zone) to RM PUD (Multiple-Family Residential Planned Unit Development Overlay Zone). The parcels are located at approximately

380 East 800 South. The request was submitted by Dan Sundstrom.


9. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-11, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 17 “Zoning Regulations”, Chapter 17.32 “Conditional Uses”, Section 17.32.100 “Special Provisions for Kennel/Cattery and Companion Animal(s) Conditional Use Permits”, Chapter 17.4 “General Provisions”. Section 17.4.070 “Definitions” and Chapter 17.120 “Use Matrix Table”, Section 17.120.010 “Use Allowance Matrix”.
10. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-09, an Ordinance amending the Smithfield City Municipal Code Title 6 “Animals”, Chapter 6.12 “Animal Control Regulations Generally”, Section 6.12.020 “For Animal Establishments”.
11. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-09
12. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 20205-05, a Resolution amending the Fiscal Year 2025 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025.
13. Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2025-05
14. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2025-15, an Ordinance enacting compensation increases for specific city officers and elected officials.
15. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2025-15
16. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Resolution 2025-06, a Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2026 Budget which is the period of July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026.
17. Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2025-06
18. Discussion and possible vote on Resolution 2025-07, a Resolution to inform the State of Utah Water Quality Board of actions taken concerning the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for 2024.
19. City Manager Report
Election Update
20. Council Member and Mayor Reports

Arbor Day Proclamation










Adjournment


****Items on the agenda may be considered earlier than shown on the agenda****
In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing unique accommodation for this meeting should contact the City Recorder at (435) 792-7997 at least three (3) days before the date of the meeting.

ArcGIS Web Map



7/1/2025, 4:33:18 PM

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
|  Override 1 |  Gravel |  Municipal Boundaries |
|  Class B Surface Type |  Dirt |  County Boundary |
|  Asphalt |  Private |  Cache Parcels |



Maxar, Microsoft

SECTION XVI - PURCHASING/CREDIT CARD POLICY

INTRODUCTION

The Purchasing/Credit Card Program has been established to provide authorized Smithfield City employees with a convenient and efficient means to purchase goods and services as needed to conduct city business.

REQUESTING A PURCHASING/CREDIT CARD

Typically only the City Manager and Department Heads may request a card. All purchasing/credit cards are approved by the City Manager.

AUTHORIZED USE OF THE PURCHASING/CREDIT CARD

The cardholder whose name is embossed on the purchasing card is solely responsible for transactions made. The purchasing/credit card may be used in support of others in the department and general departmental needs. The cardholder is responsible for the security and protection of the card and account number

CREDIT LIMITS:

Credit limits will be set by the City Manager when the card is requested. Typically, the credit limit will not exceed \$10,000.

RETURNS/CREDITS:

If an item has been returned, the cardholder must verify that the credit is reflected on the current or next statement of account. If credits are not listed on the statement of account, sales documents should be retained by the cardholder. The cardholder must contact the vendor again. If the vendor does not post a credit the cardholder must contact the bank to request a credit.

DISPUTING CHARGES:

To dispute an incorrect charge the cardholder should first contact the vendor for a resolution. If this attempt fails, the cardholder must contact the City Manager immediately to help resolve the issue.

CONSEQUENCES FOR UNAUTHORIZED PURCHASES, RESTRICTED PURCHASES, AND AUTHORIZED PURCHASES AND AUTHORIZED PURCHASES MISSING A RECEIPT.

Cardholders may be subject to disciplinary or legal action for use of the card in violation of the Purchasing/Credit Card Policy. This includes termination of employment, closing the cardholder's purchasing/credit card account, and/or civil prosecution to seek the return of funds, and/or turning the matter over to legal authorities for criminal prosecution. A cardholder who makes an unauthorized or restricted purchase must submit an Unauthorized Purchase Explanation. A cardholder who makes an authorized purchase with a missing a receipt must submit signed documentation stating the receipt has been lost, the purchase is correct, and what the purchase is

for. The cardholder will be liable for the total dollar amount of an unauthorized purchase that is a personal purchase and may be liable for any other unauthorized or restricted purchase. A cardholder's purchasing account may be closed upon making any unauthorized purchase, restricted purchase, or an authorized purchase missing a receipt. If the card is used for a personal purchase, by mistake, the cardholder must pay the city in-full for the purchase immediately upon receipt of the statement.

MONTHLY STATEMENTS

Statements must be reconciled monthly and receipts submitted along with the statement to the City Manager or designee.

12.40 MAINTENANCE OF STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY (PARK STRIP)

- A. Unused Public Right-of-Way. In all areas of the city where there exists unused Public-Right-of-Way, the immediately adjacent private property owner shall maintain the real property comprising such unused public right of way in a neat and orderly manner, equal to the manner in which the owner customarily maintains, or is required to maintain, his adjoining real property. Such unused Public-Right-of-Way shall be kept free of weeds, junk or salvage material, debris, trash, litter, or other solid waste material, and will be subject to enforcement, including but not limited to, remedies under the city's Administrative Code Enforcement procedures.
- B. Park Strip(s).
1. Park Strip Defined. "Park Strip" means that part of the public Right-of-Way set aside as a planting strip or open space and located between the sidewalk and the back of curb or edge of the roadway.
 2. In all areas of the city where there exists a park strip, the immediately adjoining private property owner shall permanently maintain the park strip in a neat and orderly manner equal to the manner in which the owner customarily maintains, or is required to maintain, his adjoining real property. Such property shall be kept free of weeds, junk or salvage material, vehicles, trailers, debris, trash, litter, or other solid waste material, and will be subject to enforcement, including but not limited to, remedies under the city's Administrative Code Enforcement procedures.
- C. Landscaping Within Public Right-of-Way. Any owner of private property adjacent to any public right-of-way who installs or maintains landscaping within a park strip or between the property and the curb or edge of the roadway shall:
1. Maintain such landscaping in such a manner as will:
 - a. not interfere with the public use of the Right-of-Way;
 - b. not cause any damage to any improvements installed in the right of way; and
 - c. otherwise comply with the requirements of this code regarding maintenance of such property.
 2. Shrubs and other plant material located within the park strip should not exceed three (3) feet in height at maturity. Potential hazardous plant material containing thorns or spikes shall be prohibited in the park strip.
 3. Poured concrete, asphalt or similar solid surface paving is prohibited within the park strip with the exception of driveway approaches and adjacent commercial uses.
 4. Street trees: trees in the right-of-way or park strip shall be to sole responsibility of the adjacent property owners to maintain. All street trees planting and maintenance shall conform the to the requirements of [SMC 12.24](#).

HISTORY

Adopted by Ord. [15-19](#) on 12/14/2016

ORDINANCE NO. 2025-07

WHEREAS, the City Council of Smithfield City, Cache County, Utah, passed and adopted the Smithfield Municipal Code on November 11, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has determined there is a need to update, repeal, amend and/or modify certain provisions contained in the referenced Municipal Code;

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of Smithfield City, Utah hereby adopts, passes and publishes the following:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SMITHFIELD CITY MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 17 “ZONING REGULATIONS”, CHAPTER 17.12 “SUPPLEMENTARY AND QUALIFYING REGULATIONS”, ADDING SECTION 17.12.235 “KEEPING PIGS”, AMENDING CHAPTER 17.04 “GENERAL PROVISIONS”, SECTION 17.04.070 “DEFINITIONS”, CHAPTER 17.14 “ANIMAL RIGHTS REGULATIONS FOR R-1 ZONES”, SECTIONS 17.14.030 “NUMBER OF ANIMALS PERMITTED”, 17.14.080 “PROHIBITED ANIMALS”, AND CHAPTER 17.48 “AGRICULTURAL ZONE”, SECTION 17.48.050 “FARM ANIMALS”.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF SMITHFIELD CITY, CACHE COUNTY, UTAH, AS FOLLOWS:

1. The following sections shall be amended as indicated. Those portions which are ~~struck out~~ shall be deleted and those that are highlighted in **yellow** shall be added.

17.12.235 KEEPING PIGS

- A. Subject to the requirements of an approved application and any other applicable provision of this code, two (2) pigs, regardless of age, may be kept on any residential (R) zone 10,890 square feet (1/4 acre) or larger. A third pig is allowed on lots 32,670 square feet or larger (3/4 acre). An amount to not exceed four (4) pigs will be allowed on lots 43,560 square feet (1 acre) or larger. Under no circumstance will more than four (4) pigs be allowed.
- B. Pigs shall be confined within a secure or fenced outdoor area.
- C. Pigs shall not be kept on a residential lot or parcel unless the person keeping a pig first obtains a permit, issued by the city planning department. A pig permit must be renewed every three years and can be rescinded at any time for non-compliance.
- D. The permittee shall acknowledge the rules set forth in this section and shall, as a condition of permit issuance, agree in writing to comply with such rules.
- E. It shall be unlawful for any person to keep any pig in a residential zone in a manner contrary to the provisions of this section.

17.04.070 DEFINITIONS

FARM ANIMALS LIMITED: The keeping of not more than two (2) horses, two (2) cows, two (2)

llamas, four (4) sheep, four (4) goats, twenty (20) rabbits, forty (40) chickens, forty (40) pheasants, ten (10) turkeys, ten (10) ducks, ten (10) geese, three (3) ostriches, four (4) emus, and forty (40) pigeons, and one (1) provided the keeping of pigs on any lot is prohibited and that not more than three (3) of the above listed species of animals or fowl are permitted at any one time.

SWINE: Includes pigs, hogs and boars. and are not permitted in any zone.

17.14.030 NUMBER OF ANIMALS PERMITTED

B. Classification: Each animal species shall be assigned one of the following classifications based on their size, and their anticipated social and environmental impact:

1. Large size animal - cattle, horse, donkey, mule.
2. Medium size animal - sheep, goat, emu, llama.
3. Large fowls - turkey, geese.
4. Small animals, fowl - pigeons, pheasants, ducks, rabbits.

Animals not listed above, and which are not considered household pets or animals which are not otherwise restricted, may be kept in accordance with this section in numbers consistent with their approximate size. Chickens (Domestic Fowl) and pigs are not included in this Section. For Chickens (Domestic Fowl) see SMC 17.12.030 "Keeping Chickens (Domestic Fowl)". For Pigs see SMC 17.12.235 "Keeping Pigs".

17.14.080 PROHIBITED ANIMALS

It is prohibited, whether on a temporary or a long-term basis, to keep the following either under the provisions of this chapter or as household pets:

~~A. Hogs or pigs.~~

- A. Alligators and crocodiles.
- B. Bears (Ursidae). All bears including grizzly bears, brown bears, black bears, etc.
- C. Cat family (Felidae). All except the commonly accepted domesticated cats, including cheetah, cougar, leopard, lion, lynx, panther, mountain lion, tiger, wildcat, etc.
- D. Dog family (Canidae). All except domesticated dogs, including wolf, fox, coyote, dingo, etc.
- E. Ostrich (Struthionidae).
- F. Peacock (Pavo crisatus).
- G. Porcupine (Erethizontidae).
- H. Primate (Hominidae). All subhuman primates.
- I. Raccoon (Prosynnidae). All raccoons including eastern raccoon, desert raccoon, ringtailed cat, etc.
- J. Skunks.
- K. Venomous fish and piranha.
- L. Venomous snakes, lizards or other venomous reptiles.
- M. Weasels (Mustelidae). All including weasels, martens, wolverines, badgers, otters, ermine, mink, mongoose, etc. Additionally, all furbearing animals in "fur farms" are also prohibited, except ferrets which are allowed as a household pet.
- N. Any otherwise prohibited wild animals such as big game animals which are restricted by state or

federal law.

17.48.050 FARM ANIMALS

Those agricultural areas within six hundred feet (600') of a commercial, single- or multiple-family residential, or manufacturing zone, and within three hundred feet (300') of a residential agricultural zone shall be limited in the number of farm animals allowed to the following: not more than two (2) cows, two (2) horses, two (2) llamas, four (4) sheep, four (4) goats, twenty (20) rabbits, forty (40) chickens, forty (40) pheasants, ten (10) turkeys, ten (10) ducks, ten (10) geese, three (3) ostriches, four (4) emus, and forty (40) pigeons per acre or portion thereof. Not more than three (3) of the above listed species of animals or fowl are permitted at any one time. ~~Swine (includes pigs, hogs and boars) are not permitted in any zone.~~

2. Should any section, clause, or provision of this Ordinance be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, in whole or in part, the same shall not affect the validity of the Ordinance as whole, or any other part thereof.
3. All ordinances, and the chapter, clauses, sections, or parts thereof in conflict with provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed, but only insofar as is specifically provided for herein.
4. This ordinance shall become effective after the required public hearings and upon its posting as required by law.

THIS ORDINANCE shall be attached as an amendment to the Smithfield Municipal Code above referred to.

Approved and signed this 9th day of July, 2025

SMITHFIELD CITY CORPORATION

Kristi Monson, Mayor

ATTEST:

Dana Lazcanotegui, City Recorder