

**REGULAR SESSION OF THE
BRIGHAM CITY COUNCIL
SEPTEMBER 4, 2025
6:00 p.m.**

PRESENT:	Ryan Smith	Mayor Pro-Tem
	Dave Hipp	Councilmember
	Dave Jeffries	Councilmember
	Matthew Jensen	Councilmember
	Robin Troxell	Councilmember
ALSO PRESENT:	Alana Blumenthal	Museum Director
	Mark Bradley	City Planner
	Tom Cooper	Power Director - <i>Via Zoom</i>
	Nicole Cottle	City Attorney
	Paul Larsen	Community and Economic Development Director
	Derek Oyler	City Administrator
	Tyler Pugsley	Assistant City Administrator
	Kristina Rasmussen	City Recorder
	Chief Reyes	Police Chief
	Chief Thueson	Fire Chief
Excused:	DJ Bott	Mayor

Mayor Pro-Tem Smith called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The invocation was offered by Councilmember Troxell. The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Pro-Tem introduced one consent items:

1. Approval of the August 21 and August 26, 2025, City Council Meeting Minutes.

Councilmember Troxell made a motion to approve the consent item as presented. Councilmember Hipp seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Brian Connor - Requested city action to restore public access to a canyon trail closed by a property owner. He cited Utah Code 72-5-104 on public rights-of-way and offered community donations of materials and labor to rebuild a bridge. He asked the city to enforce the public's right and provide guidance on next steps.

Juliana Larsen – Voiced concerns about a proposed revolving loan fund for Main Street businesses. She cautioned against Brigham City acting like a bank, warned about loan defaults, and urged safeguards to protect taxpayers

Tom Peterson – Opposed residential development along 1100 South in the Blue Heron Crossing subdivision. He argued this land is Brigham City's only viable site for big-box retail, which would provide stronger long-term tax benefits. He urged the Council to reconsider zoning and preserve highway commercial opportunities

Jim Buchanan – Supported Peterson’s remarks, citing traffic congestion and emergency access concerns. He warned that placing residential along 1100 South could prevent future big-box commercial development and burden taxpayers

Jake Barker – Stated he was not against housing but stressed the lost opportunity cost of using prime commercial frontage for townhomes. He emphasized the need for zoning decisions that maximize tax revenues and future growth

COUNCILMEMBER COMMENTS

Councilmember Jensen – Expressed excitement for Peach Days and appreciation for public works’ cleanup efforts.

Councilmember Troxell – Reflected on the sense of community during Peach Days and how quickly the city is restored after the event.

Mayor Pro-Tem Smith – Highlighted Peach Days as a showcase for Brigham City and thanked public safety staff for ensuring safety during large events

City Administrator Derek Oyler addressed the trail access issue, explaining jurisdictional challenges (involving Brigham City, Box Elder County, and Mantua) and ongoing coordination with property owners and the Forest Service. City Attorney Nicole Cottle added legal context on prescriptive rights and statutory limitations, noting further fact-specific legal review would be necessary

Police Chief Reyes and Fire Chief Thueson thanked the Council and community for their support during recent tragic events. They emphasized how the backing from staff and residents helped their departments manage difficult circumstances.

ACTION ITEMS

Consideration of Ordinance to Amend the Blue Heron Crossing Subdivision, Amending Lot 1 to Plat the Townhome Units Located at 1075 South and 1100 West

City Planner Mark Bradley presented the request to amend the final plat of the Blue Heron Crossing Subdivision. He explained that the amendment covered Lot 1, where the applicant sought to plat 102 townhome units and 12 mixed-use commercial spaces on the ground level with residential above. The site is located near 1100 South and 1100 West.

Bradley provided background on the development:

- The property was part of the 1100 South/1100 West Planned District, previously approved by the Council.
- The subdivision process included a preliminary plat, final plat, and subsequent amendments.
- The Planning Commission had recommended approval on August 19, 2025, with conditions:
 - A pedestrian sidewalk/connection between the parking lot north of the commercial units and the building frontage.
 - Landscaping and fencing plans to be submitted for Planning Commission approval before final design and construction.
 - Compliance with staff review comments.

Bradley acknowledged the procedural question raised by councilmembers — how to amend a plat that had not yet been recorded. He clarified that approval could be conditioned upon the recording of the final plat.

Amy Johnson, representing the developer, explained the request to move the amendment forward simultaneously with the final plat. She stated that collecting the required signatures for the final plat was taking time and involved several in-person signings. She noted that the commercial portion of the project, supported by contracts already in place, was the driving force behind the development. Johnson emphasized that the developer's goal was to move quickly so infrastructure could be installed before winter and assured the Council that commercial development would occur alongside the residential.

Council Discussion:

The Council expressed some hesitation about considering an amendment before the final plat had been recorded, describing it as procedurally unusual. While it was acknowledged that concurrent approval could be allowed under certain conditions, there was concern that this process appeared out of order.

Discussion also focused on the broader implications of the development. Several concerns were raised about the potential for residential construction to proceed without the promised commercial elements, leaving the city with housing but not the tax-generating commercial spaces originally envisioned. Questions were asked about how to ensure the commercial component was delivered as part of the project, and whether documentation of commitments could be provided.

Traffic and safety along 1100 South were also discussed. Councilmembers expressed worry about additional vehicles entering and exiting the site at an already busy and hazardous roadway, where other intersections already required signals. It was suggested that input from UDOT and the city engineer would be useful in addressing how traffic improvements might accompany the project.

Ultimately, the discussion circled back to the need for additional clarity and assurances before moving forward. While recognizing the applicant's challenges and urgency, the Council felt it would be more appropriate to pause consideration until the final plat had been formally recorded and more information could be gathered about traffic and commercial commitments.

Motion:

Councilmember Jensen moved to table the ordinance until the final plat had been recorded. Seconded by Councilmember Hipp.

Councilmember Jeffries – Aye; Councilmember Troxell – Aye; Councilmember Smith – Aye;
Councilmember Jensen – Aye; Councilmember Hipp – Aye

Consideration of Approval of Updated Purchasing and Accounts Receivable Systems (PARS)

Finance Director Tom Kotter presented the updated Purchasing and Accounts Receivable Systems (PARS) for Council approval. He explained that this had been a long-term project, initially started by his predecessor, and now brought forward for adoption. The updated PARS consolidates policies related to purchasing, accounts receivable, payroll, cash handling, employee clothing allowances, and the City's P-card program.

Kotter noted that the most significant change was the adjustment of purchasing thresholds:

- Purchases under \$10,000: no formal process required beyond verifying reasonable pricing.
- Purchases up to \$25,000: require approval by the Mayor's office in addition to department oversight.

- Purchases above \$50,000: require formal solicitation, public notice, and evaluation scoring in compliance with state law.

He explained that the updates were designed to align with Utah state code and reflect best practices from other municipalities, while also creating clearer procedures for audit and oversight.

Council Discussion:

The Council generally expressed support for the revisions, noting that the changes provided needed modernization and clarified the purchasing process. There was recognition that the thresholds had not been updated in many years, and increasing them would both reflect inflation and bring Brigham City in line with state standards. The Council emphasized the importance of oversight, particularly on large purchases, but agreed that the new system maintained appropriate checks and balances.

Motion:

Councilmember Troxell made a motion to approve the updated of Purchasing and Accounts Receivable Systems (PARS) as presented. Seconded by Councilmember Jeffries.

Councilmember Jeffries – Aye; Councilmember Troxell – Aye; Councilmember Jensen – Aye;
Councilmember Hipp – Aye; Councilmember Smith – Aye

Consideration of Approval of The Historic Main Street Site Improvement Loan Program

City Administrator Derek Oyler outlined the proposed program. He reminded the Council that this item had been discussed two weeks earlier and staff had since filled in the outstanding details. Staff's recommendation was to create a revolving loan program limited to \$100,000 in total, with individual loans capped at \$25,000.

Key features included:

- Interest Rate: Based on a 12-month lookback at the PTIF rate, ensuring Brigham City would receive the same interest return as if the funds remained in its investment account.
- Repayment Term: 18 months.
- Eligible Area: Restricted to the historic downtown corridor only.
- Eligible Uses: Site improvements only, not building or façade upgrades (which are covered by the long-standing façade grant program).
- Administration: The program would be managed administratively rather than legislatively. Applications would be reviewed by a staff committee under a mayor-approved policy, similar to the façade grant process.

Oyler clarified that the program was being brought forward in part because of a specific group of downtown businesses, approximately 25 in number, seeking to repair deteriorating rear parking lots and shared spaces. He emphasized that this initiative was not developer-driven but rather a request from individual business owners, with the City also having a stake due to its own parcels in the area. Oyler also noted potential opportunities to pursue federal and state funding in the future, though those processes were lengthy.

Council Discussion:

The Council expressed appreciation for the additional details and discussed at length how to structure the program. Much of the conversation revolved around the total loan fund cap and the maximum per-loan amount. Some members questioned whether lowering the overall cap to \$50,000, with smaller per-loan limits, would still make the program viable. Staff explained that lowering amounts would reduce

flexibility and could hinder effectiveness for larger site improvement projects, but acknowledged that smaller amounts might serve more applicants.

Questions were raised about budgetary procedure, with staff clarifying that although the program would require an appropriation from fund balance, a formal budget amendment could be made later for transparency. The program would be structured so that repayments and interest would replenish the revolving fund.

There was also discussion about local sourcing requirements. Consistent with the façade grant, applicants would be expected to use local contractors and materials when possible. If work could not be sourced locally, the maximum loan would be reduced (to \$10,000 instead of \$25,000).

The Council also clarified that loans would be restricted to horizontal site improvements such as concrete, asphalt, and parking lot surfaces—not building structures or interiors, which are supported through other grant programs.

In weighing the proposal, Councilmembers noted that the program would help address long-neglected rear parking lots behind Main Street businesses, which are heavily used during large events such as Peach Days. Members debated the broader question of whether the City should operate as a lender, but generally agreed the risks were limited and the benefits to downtown revitalization were clear.

Motion:

Councilmember Jeffries moved to approve the historic downtown site improvement loan program as presented in the policy document. Seconded: Councilmember Hipp.

Councilmember Jeffries – Aye; Councilmember Troxell – Nay; Councilmember Smith – Aye;
Councilmember Jensen – Aye; Councilmember Hipp – Aye

DISCUSSION ITEM

Annual Report On The Brigham City Museum Of Art & History's Activities For FY 24-25 And Upcoming Activities

Museum Director Alana Blumenthal presented the museum's annual report. She highlighted major accomplishments from the past fiscal year, including:

- Hosting several successful art and history exhibits that drew both local and regional visitors.
- Expanding educational programming for schools, youth, and families.
- Increasing attendance and community engagement through outreach programs.
- Advancing preservation and curatorial work to safeguard Brigham City's history.

Blumenthal also outlined upcoming initiatives, such as new exhibits, expanded community partnerships, and additional educational opportunities designed to broaden the museum's impact.

Council Discussion:

The Council expressed strong appreciation for the museum's role in the community. Discussion emphasized the value of the museum in preserving Brigham City's heritage, providing cultural enrichment, and supporting education for both youth and adults. Members highlighted the importance of the museum as a community gathering space and praised staff for their creativity, dedication, and professionalism.

At 7:38 PM a motion was made to by Councilmember Troxell to move into a closed session to discuss pursuant to one or more of the provisions of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act 52-4-205(1). The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith and carried out unanimously.

Councilmember Jeffries – Aye; Councilmember Troxell – Aye; Councilmember Smith – Aye;
Councilmember Jensen – Aye; Councilmember Hipp – Aye

At 8:16 PM the meeting returned to open session. Councilmember Troxell made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smith and carried out unanimously.

Councilmember Jeffries – Aye; Councilmember Troxell – Aye; Councilmember Smith – Aye;
Councilmember Jensen – Aye; Councilmember Hipp – Aye

The undersigned duly appointed Recorder for Brigham City Corporation hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of the September 4, 2025 City Council Meeting.

Dated this 19th of September, 2025.

Kristina Rasmussen

Kristina Rasmussen, City Recorder

** These meeting minutes were generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence and have been reviewed, edited and approved by Brigham City Staff.