



MINUTES
Springville City Council Work/Study Meeting - July 21, 2026

MINUTES OF THE WORK/STUDY MEETING OF THE SPRINGVILLE CITY COUNCIL HELD ON TUESDAY, JULY 21, 2026, AT 5:30 P.M. AT THE CIVIC CENTER, 110 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SPRINGVILLE, UTAH.

Presiding and Conducting: Mayor Matt Packard

Elected Officials in Attendance: Karen Ellingson
Logan Millsap
Jake Smith
Mike Snelson
Mindi Wright

City Staff in Attendance: City Administrator Troy Fitzgerald, Assistant City Administrator/City Attorney John Penrod, Assistant City Administrator/Finance Director Bruce Riddle, City Recorder Kim Crane, Administrative Services Director Patrick Monney, Community Development Director Josh Yost, Internal Services Director Scott Sensenbaur, Library Director Dan Mickelson, Parks and Recreation Director Stacey Child, Power Director Jason Miller, Public Works Director-Brad Stapley, and Public Safety Director Lance Haight.

CALL TO ORDER - Mayor Packard welcomed everyone and called the Work/Study meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

COUNCIL BUSINESS

1. Calendar

- Jul 24 - Observance of the Pioneer Day Holiday (Civic Center Closed Friday)
- Aug 04 - Work Study Meeting 5:30 p.m., Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.
- Aug 18 - Truth in Taxation Regular Meeting 7:00 p.m.

Mayor Packard asked if there were any additions to the calendar.

2. DISCUSSION ON THIS EVENING'S REGULAR MEETING AGENDA ITEMS

- a) Invocation - Councilmember Smith
- b) Pledge of Allegiance - Councilmember Snelson
- c) Consent Agenda
 - 1. Approval of the minutes for the July 07, 2026 work meeting and regular meeting

Mayor Packard asked if there was any discussion on the consent agenda. It was noted on the regular agenda item #2, consideration of an ordinance adopting the Springville Station Area Plan would need to be postponed.

3. WORK MEETING DISCUSSIONS/PRESENTATIONS

a) Discussion regarding an Interlocal Agreement with Provo City - Troy Fitzgerald, City Administrator

Administrator Troy Fitzgerald reported on a proposed interlocal agreement with Provo City regarding property near the Springville boundary at 1400 North. He explained that Clyde Companies is interested in developing a Provo parcel adjacent to Springville and that discussions with Provo have focused on sharing certain property and sales tax revenues because Provo believes Springville will receive greater economic benefits from the development. He stated he had been working with Provo's Economic Development Director for several months and noted that the Provo Planning Commission voted on July 8, 2026, to support a density change. He said the Provo City Council would consider the matter the following week and that additional information would likely be available in the coming months based on Provo's action and the Springville City Council's feedback.

Mr. Fitzgerald explained that the proposed agreement would apply only to future development, with neither city receiving credit for existing or past development. He stated that discussions had included sharing property and sales tax revenues on specific properties, addressing certain expenses, and establishing an agreement effective through 2042, with negotiable terms. He noted that the anticipated land uses differed, with Springville expected to include food and beverage uses while Provo may include mixed residential development.

In response to questions, Mr. Fitzgerald stated that any boundary adjustments would require approval from both cities and were considered unlikely. He said utilities had been discussed and the developer believed they could remain separate. He also explained that the proposed agreement would include provisions for resolving future disagreements and would be presented to the City Council for review before approval. He stated that while he did not believe the agreement was materially necessary for Springville, Provo considered it important. He added that the arrangement could reduce risk for both cities and allow the developer to move forward. When asked about potential shared expenses, he identified public safety as Springville's highest anticipated cost.

Councilmember Karen Ellingson asked whether the proposal involved moving municipal boundaries. She also inquired about utility considerations if boundaries were adjusted.

Councilmember Wright asked whether the agreement would involve annual exchanges of shared revenues between the cities and how future disagreements would be handled. She also asked what types of expenses, including roads and snow removal, might be included in the agreement.

Mayor Matt Packard commended Mr. Fitzgerald for initiating discussions with Provo City and working collaboratively to develop a proposed interlocal agreement.

b) Dog Training and Boarding Business License - John Penrod, Assistant City Administrator/City Attorney; Carla Wiese, Planner/Economic Development

City Attorney John Penrod reviewed the current city ordinance limiting residential properties to two dogs and presented information on how other municipalities regulate residential kennels. He explained that some cities allow residential kennel permits for up to four dogs and permit services such as boarding, pet sitting, grooming, and dog training. He asked the City Council whether it wished to consider amending the ordinance to allow additional dogs in residential areas.

Mr. Penrod clarified that service animals are regulated under separate laws and are not subject to the city's dog limit. He presented the staff recommendation to retain the current two-dog limit while allowing up to four dogs through a residential kennel permit. He added that if the Council wished to allow more than four dogs, staff recommended requiring an excess dog residential kennel permit with a maximum of eight dogs.

Councilmember Karen Ellingson asked whether service animals were included in the ordinance and later expressed concerns about enforcement. She questioned whether the City had the resources to

respond to complaints and asked whether temporary situations could be accommodated. She requested input from the Police Department regarding enforcement.

Mayor Matt Packard questioned the appropriateness of allowing business activities in residential neighborhoods when similar businesses could operate in commercial zones. He later asked the Council whether additional information should be gathered before proceeding.

Councilmember Snelson asked what prompted the discussion. After learning it originated from a citizen request that staff had researched over several years, he stated he was not opposed to some commercial activity in residential areas but did not support expanding the number of dogs because of potential noise and nuisance concerns. He indicated a preference for keeping the current ordinance.

Councilmember Wright stated she supported leaving the current ordinance unchanged.

Councilmember Millsap said he did not object to allowing limited commercial activity in residential areas if it operated under a permit process without reducing existing standards.

Police Chief Haight stated that the Police Department would respond to complaints as they were received and emphasized that any ordinance should be clear and enforceable, noting that the issue can be emotional.

Councilmember Smith asked whether there had been significant public interest in increasing the dog limit. After staff confirmed there had been a citizen request, he expressed support for allowing up to four dogs under stricter standards.

Administrator Troy Fitzgerald confirmed that the discussion stemmed from a citizen request.

At the conclusion of the discussion, City Attorney Penrod stated he would conduct additional research and return to the Council with more information for consideration.

MAYOR, COUNCIL, AND ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Mayor Matt Packard invited additional discussion from the Council. He later asked Police Chief Haight to report on the State Forester's recommendations regarding fireworks. Following the discussion on transportation improvements, he expressed concern that traffic conditions could become congested at the new high school if the nearby roundabout and traffic signal were not completed before school began. During discussion of the HomeOwnership4U project, he commented that it could become the first project of its kind in the state.

Councilmember Smith asked for clarification regarding the materials processing overlay item on the regular meeting agenda. During discussion of license plate reader technology, he also asked about the vendor's access to third-party information.

City Attorney John Penrod explained that the proposed ordinance would remove the materials processing overlay from the city code while allowing the existing overlay for WPI to remain in place under current state law. He noted that removing the overlay would avoid potential issues if state law changed and the City sought to apply the overlay to additional properties. In response to questions about Flock license plate reader technology, he stated staff would review the vendor's data practices and determine what information the company could and could not access.

Councilmember Snelson asked why the materials processing overlay was being removed from the code. He also requested an update on the traffic signal at 400 South near the new high school and later asked about the use of Flock license plate reader cameras after receiving questions from a resident. At the conclusion of the discussion, he asked about safety concerns at the intersection of 1500 West and 1000 North.

Police Chief Haight reported that the State Forester had returned to using municipal fireworks restriction maps and recommended that Springville follow the state's guidance. He also described Flock license plate reader technology, explaining that it captures images of vehicle license plates and vehicle descriptions without photographing occupants. He stated the system has assisted law enforcement in solving thefts and locating homicide suspects, allows participating Utah County agencies to share

information, requires a case number to access data, and is covered under a multi-year agreement that locks in pricing. He expressed support for the technology as a valuable investigative tool.

Public Works Director Brad Stapley reported that installation of the traffic signal near the new high school was awaiting action by UDOT and that the foundations and conduit work had already been completed. In response to concerns about visibility at the 620 South intersection, he stated staff had reviewed the required sight distance and found the wall to be compliant but would conduct another review. He also said the Streets Department would evaluate the intersection at 1500 West and 1000 North to determine whether any needed improvements were on City or private property.

Councilmember Millsap asked about the wall affecting visibility at the 620 South intersection and requested an update on the HomeOwnership4U project.

Administrator Troy Fitzgerald reported that the HomeOwnership4U project was continuing through the review process and that a formal review was anticipated in August.

ADJOURNMENT CLOSED SESSION IF NEEDED - TO BE ANNOUNCED IN MOTION

The Springville City Council may temporarily recess the meeting and convene in a closed session as provided by UCA 52-4-205.

Motion: Councilmember Ellingson moved to adjourn the work meeting at 6:48 p.m. Councilmember Smith seconded the motion. Vote Yes: Councilmember Ellingson, Councilmember Millsap, Councilmember Smith, Councilmember Snelson, and Councilmember Wright. The motion **Passed Unanimously, 5-0.**

This document constitutes the official minutes for the Springville City Council Work/Study Meeting held on Tuesday, July 21, 2026.

I, Kim Crane, do hereby certify that I am the duly appointed, qualified, and acting City Recorder for Springville City, Utah County, State of Utah. I do hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate, and complete record of this meeting held on Tuesday, July 21, 2026.

DATE APPROVED: August 04, 2026



Kim Crane
City Recorder