



COPPERTON TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

NOVEMBER 19, 2025, 6:30 PM
BINGHAM CANYON LIONS CLUB
8725 HILLCREST STREET, COPPERTON, UTAH 84006

****DRAFT MINUTES – UNAPPROVED****
COPPERTON TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 19, 2025

Council Members Present:

Tessa Stitzer, Mayor Pro Tempore
Kathleen Bailey, Council Member
Linda McCalmon, Council Member

Council Members Excused:

Sean Clayton, Mayor
Kevin Severson, Council Member

Staff Present:

Nathan Bracken, Legal Counsel
Diana Baun, Town Clerk
Dan Torres, Economic Development Manager
Chief Nathan Bogenschutz, UFA
Chief Jason Mazuran, UPD
Chief Del Craig, UPD
Det. Ruby Lechuga, UPD
Lt. Chris Benedict, UPD

Others Present:

1. REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

Mayor Pro Tempore Tessa Stitzer, presiding, called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and noted a quorum was present with Mayor Barney and Council Member Severson excused from the meeting.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. COMMUNITY INPUT

a. Recognize Visiting Officials – None

COPPERTON COUNCIL MEMBERS

MAYOR SEAN CLAYTON, MAYOR PRO TEMPORE TESSA STITZER,
COUNCIL MEMBER KATHLEEN BAILEY, COUNCIL MEMBER KEVIN SEVERSON,
COUNCIL MEMBER LINDA MCCALMON

b. Unified Fire Authority (UFA)

Chief Nathan Bogenschutz of Unified Fire Authority reported on fire department activity for the month of October. Chief Bogenschutz stated that there were seven calls for service in Copperton during that period, with 42% classified as emergent calls. He also reported that Unified Fire Authority recently graduated a recruit academy consisting of 20 firefighters, which coincided with the opening of Station 107. Chief Bogenschutz explained that Station 107 was the second fire station opened in Kearns and was part of the service expansion previously discussed in connection with tax increases approved the prior year. He confirmed that Station 107 was now operational and that the newly graduated firefighters were actively assigned and working in the field.

Chief Bogenschutz further announced the availability of an upcoming CPR class. He noted that a previous class had been held in Herriman approximately six to seven months earlier, and the next closest opportunity would be on December 10 at Magna Station 111. Chief Bogenschutz stated that additional information and registration details were available on the Unified Fire Authority website. He also informed the council that, with the opening of Station 107, Captain Rich and the entire B-shift crew who had previously been assigned locally had transferred to the new station in Kearns. Chief Bogenschutz explained that this transfer created open positions, and that a new captain was expected to be assigned in January, at which time that individual would attend a meeting to introduce themselves and respond to any questions.

d. Unified Police Department (UPD)

Lieutenant Chris Benedict reviewed law enforcement statistics and updates and noted that Chief Mazuran and Chief Craig were present at the meeting. Lt. Benedict explained that there continued to be an ongoing issue with cell phone tower routing in West Jordan, which was affecting reported call data. He stated that the system showed 29 calls for service for the previous month, but clarified that there were actually only 15 reports. Lt. Benedict explained that calls were being misrouted and incorrectly logged as occurring in Copperton, when in reality some of those calls originated from an area located on the opposite side of 8400 South. He noted that this issue had occurred previously, including an instance in June when call data reflected 100 calls for service due to the same problem, and stated that efforts were ongoing to resolve the issue.

Lt. Benedict reported that, aside from the data discrepancy, crime trends in Copperton for the previous month were very favorable. He stated that the area was very quiet and that there were no incidents that caused concern or raised alarms for law enforcement. Lt. Benedict also reported that a Vigilant camera had been installed earlier in the week and thanked the council for assisting in securing this investigative tool. He stated that the camera was active and operational, though it had not yet generated any investigative hits, and confirmed that monitoring and tracking were underway.

Mayor Pro Tempore Tessa Stitzer asked the council if they were amenable to moving Public Comment ahead to this portion of the meeting, due to the number of residents present wishing to comment on current events.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Apollo Pazell stated that he was attending the meeting due to community concerns regarding the recently installed camera that had been mentioned earlier in the meeting. Mr. Pazell explained that he managed the town Facebook page and typically informed the community when issues arose that might be of interest. Mr. Pazell stated that he did not initiate discussion about the camera beforehand, yet received a significant volume of angry messages from residents overnight, totaling approximately 206 messages. He reported that residents expressed anger, confusion about the purpose of the camera, and interest in circulating a petition to have it removed. Mr. Pazell stated that several individuals were present at the meeting due to these concerns. He announced an intention to file an initiative petition requiring that any public or government surveillance be submitted to the public for a vote during a regular general election. He stated that while the council would decide the future of the camera, it was important for them to understand that the community was extremely unhappy about its installation.

Edward Patrick stated support for the camera and expressed disagreement with opposition to it. Mr. Patrick stated that the camera would not have been pursued unless there was a legitimate reason. He cautioned that residents opposing the camera should be careful about what they demanded, suggesting that opposition could lead to restrictions on common security tools such as Ring doorbell cameras. Mr. Patrick stated that the camera was beneficial in assisting law enforcement and expressed a desire to live in a safe community, indicating full support for the camera.

Danni Dougal stated concerns regarding the camera and requested clarification about why it was installed, what constituted a "hit," how the data was used, what data was collected, and who was responsible for securing the data. Ms. Dougal emphasized that her concern was not related to crime in Copperton, noting the town's low crime rate and personal experiences of feeling safe while living there since ninth grade. She stated that the primary concern was the camera's placement, which effectively tracked when residents left and returned home due to Copperton having only one entrance and exit. Ms. Dougal expressed concern that this data could be misused or compromised in the future, citing distrust of government use of data and potential unforeseen consequences. She stated that while she supported certain types of cameras, such as Ring doorbells or cameras in parks, she opposed a camera that tracked residents' daily movements without public consultation or a vote. Ms. Dougal stated that this lack of public input and perceived loss of privacy rights was the core issue.

Wyatt Shawstad stated that he had attended previous meetings where the camera was discussed and understood it to be a useful investigative tool for law enforcement. Mr. Shawstad acknowledged the benefits of the camera for situations such as locating stolen vehicles, but expressed concern about privacy due to the camera's placement at a choke point with only one way in and out of Copperton. He stated that the camera effectively collected data

on every vehicle entering and leaving town, allowing tracking of residents' movements. Mr. Shawstad stated that while he supported providing law enforcement with resources, he believed the camera's placement raised significant privacy concerns for residents.

Phil Brineholt stated that his primary concern was choice. Mr. Brineholt stated that the camera had been installed without residents having a choice and that it was now impossible to travel home without being surveilled. He suggested that cameras be placed in locations where residents could choose alternative routes, such as near the cemetery, or in specific areas like park parking lots rather than playgrounds. Mr. Brineholt expressed appreciation for law enforcement and crime-fighting tools but stated that Copperton's low crime rate did not justify the camera. He stated that they valued privacy and chose to live in Copperton for that reason, and expressed concern that continued surveillance would make them reconsider living in the community.

Ron Johnson stated agreement with comments made by Apollo Pazell and Danni Dougal and described the camera as invasive. Mr. Johnson stated uncertainty about whether the camera functioned as a proactive or reactive tool and expressed a preference for proactive policing. He referenced past policing philosophies focused on preventing problems rather than reacting to them. Mr. Johnson supported the filing of a petition and volunteered to assist with collecting signatures. He stated that Copperton was a safe community and expressed a desire to keep it that way, while noting that changes in policing and public safety over the past decade had been significant and not always positive. Mr. Johnson stated that the community had not been adequately informed about the camera and described this as a broader issue with councils. He cited a prior effort to communicate with residents through text messaging that did not continue. Mr. Johnson encouraged better outreach to residents through flyers, texts, or other methods, stating that Copperton's size made community communication achievable. He concluded by thanking the council for their time and participation.

Mayor Pro Tem Tessa Stitzer thanked the public for their comment. She then stated that the surveillance camera issue was not an agenda item for the night, so the council could not formally discuss or take action on it during that meeting. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer proposed adding the camera as a presentation and discussion item at the next council meeting, with the intent that it be structured as a discussion and actionable item, and stated that any action should include a public hearing. She stated that the council had "dropped the ball" on public process and community engagement, and said for the record that although she was absent from the prior month's meeting, they would have voted no at that time. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer explained that her opposition was based primarily on the lack of a public hearing and the privacy concerns raised, and stated that the council failed to provide constituents adequate information and an opportunity to voice concerns before a decision was made. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that she had previously asked questions about the camera in presentations and in conversations with Unified Police Department personnel, and that the volume of community outreach they received—phone calls, text messages, and screenshots—confirmed that the council had not communicated effectively. She also stated that residents were upset not only about the camera itself, but about not being asked or informed prior to installation.

Diana Baun asked whether the next meeting item should be handled as a public hearing. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated she was uncertain what specific action would be taken but emphasized that a format was needed that allowed Unified Police Department personnel to answer questions directly, suggesting either a public hearing or a working-session style Q&A. Nathan Bracken stated that the topic had appeared on the agenda twice previously: first, when Unified Police Department requested the camera and was asked to return later, and second, the prior month when Unified Police Department gave a larger presentation with two officers and some public questions. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer acknowledged that prior public input occurred but emphasized it was not a formal public hearing. She noted that suggestions such as distributing flyers and providing a Q&A could have been implemented to inform all residents even without a public hearing, and stated that Copperton had held public hearings for other topics such as fees even when not legally required, specifically to gather public input.

Nathan Bracken recommended that Unified Police Department personnel return to present and explain the system again, answer community questions, and then allow the council to hold a public hearing and take action afterward on whether to keep or remove the camera. Mr. Bracken referenced receiving an email from Apollo Pazell about a petition and stated that a public hearing with qualified law enforcement presenters would help address concerns before any council vote. Council Member Kathleen Bailey asked whether Apollo Pazell's proposal related to surveillance decisions going forward and whether such matters could be made public-hearing requirements. Mr. Bracken stated that Apollo Pazell's proposal appeared to involve an initiative or requirement for the camera's removal and asked Mr. Pazell to explain their intent. Council Member Bailey clarified that the intent they understood was to require public process for surveillance issues. Mr. Pazell stated that his goal was not public hearings but a requirement that any additional government surveillance be voted on by the public via the regular general election ballot, rather than decided by the council. Nathan Bracken stated that such a ballot requirement involved election procedures set largely by state law and said they would need to check with the lieutenant governor's office to confirm what Copperton could legally mandate by ordinance. Nathan Bracken stated that an attorney in their office who handled initiatives would review the email and that they were forwarding it.

Council Member Kathleen Bailey raised the possibility of an alternative community vote mechanism, such as an in-person resident sign-in and vote at a public meeting, describing it as a faster "sample survey" approach rather than waiting for a general election ballot. Nathan Bracken stated that putting something on the ballot was a more expensive process and said they did not have an immediate answer on whether an alternative process could be used. Nathan Bracken summarized that the council was facing two separate issues: first, the immediate concern about the current camera and the community's request for more information and engagement, and second, the broader policy question of whether future surveillance decisions should require community approval. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer agreed these should be treated separately and stated that the next meeting's public hearing and presentation could provide adequate information, allow residents to ask questions, gather council input from the public, and then support an actionable decision about the camera.

Apollo Pazell stated that his concern with relying on public hearings was that community turnout at hearings was typically low, noting that many residents who expressed anger online

did not generally attend public hearings. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer responded that residents had specifically told them they were upset about not being asked or informed and said that, regardless of whether residents attended meetings, the council needed to provide opportunities for input. She stated that some of her own concerns had been addressed by prior information, though they still disagreed with some aspects, and emphasized that the current discussion itself showed how much more information the community received when the topic was openly addressed.

Chief Jason Mazuran stated that Unified Police Department understood the feedback and offered that the camera could be taken down until the council decided what it wanted to do. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer questioned whether the council could authorize removal without formal action. Nathan Bracken clarified that the camera belonged to Unified Police Department and that the council's prior action was limited to granting permission to install it on city property, not passing an ordinance or executing a contract. Mr. Bracken stated that Unified Police Department could remove the camera at its discretion if it wanted to respond to community concern and that the council was not positioned to take formal action that night due to the agenda limitations. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer asked about the pole and funding, noting that meeting minutes referenced approval of nearly \$3,000 tied to Copperton. Mr. Bracken stated that Unified Police Department owned and operated the camera and that the council had only authorized installation on city property, while also acknowledging that the pole was city property. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that beyond legal authority, there was an ethical obligation to inform the public in advance.

Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer asked when the camera funding had been added to the budget and whether it occurred through the Unified Police Department board process. Chief Del Craig stated that it was added during the budget proposal process for Unified Police Department. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that this meant it would have gone through the board of trustees and that each community had to make a funding choice. Council Member Kathleen Bailey asked if the camera project was metro-wide. Chief Craig stated that each community had the opportunity to choose whether to fund cameras and that there were a number of cameras already in use across the valley. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer inferred that Copperton may not have been aware earlier because the council had not been informed promptly through its liaison and stated that this contributed to the late-stage awareness and controversy.

Ron Johnson stood from the audience to comment, stating that information and education were central issues and that the situation reflected broader challenges in communication and public participation. Mr. Johnson stated that council meetings often did not draw large crowds and suggested the city improve outreach and engagement, comparing it to a "sales process" because residents were busy and often missed meeting dates. He suggested sending teasers and clearer notices about upcoming discussions, along with explanations of how residents could participate, to encourage face-to-face input. Mr. Johnson described Copperton as a "gem" and stated that maintaining its character depended on participation, education, and information, especially amid rapid societal change. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer responded that the city could use its texting tool more effectively and agreed that the concerns raised by residents could be incorporated into improved communication efforts, stating willingness to help.

3. WORKSHOP DISCUSSION - None

4. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Approve Council Meeting Minutes
 - i) October 15, 2025 City Council Meeting

Council Member Bailey moved to approve the October 15, 2025 City Council Meeting Minutes as published. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 3-0, unanimous in favor with Mayor Clayton and Council Member Severson absent from the vote.

- b. Fiscal Items - Mayor Clayton
 - i) Approval of expenditures

Mayor Clayton asked for approval of \$2,643.00 in legal fees for October.

Council Member Bailey moved to approve the Consent Agenda Fiscal Item above as discussed. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 3-0, unanimous in favor with Mayor Clayton and Council Member Severson absent from the vote.

5. PRESENTATION ITEMS - None

6. COUNCIL BUSINESS

- a. Quarterly Financial Report

Stewart Okobia, Director of Finance for the Municipal Services District, presented the quarterly financial report to the Copperton Council. Mr. Okobia reviewed the city's balance sheet, focusing on assets, liabilities, and equity. He reported that the unassigned fund balance was \$417,980.11 and that an additional \$176,392.81 was restricted for capital purposes. Mr. Okobia explained that restricted capital funds could be used for capital items such as long-term assets, but not for day-to-day operational supplies. He stated that sales tax revenue for the first quarter of the fiscal year, covering July through September and representing 25% of the fiscal year, was trending at 23.67%. Mr. Okobia also reported that overall expenditures for the first quarter were at 21% of the budget, indicating that expenses were tracking appropriately with no issues identified.

Mr. Okobia then reviewed other city funds and cash positions. He reported an unassigned fund balance of \$67,704.50 in another fund and noted minimal activity during the quarter. Mr. Okobia stated that revenue in that fund totaled \$756, with no associated expenses. He next discussed the Copperton beer tax special fund, explaining that the county distributes beer tax revenues to municipalities for alcohol prevention and related purposes. Mr. Okobia reported that Copperton had received distributions for two consecutive years, totaling approximately \$1,000. He cautioned that if the funds were not used and the balance remained unchanged or continued to grow, the state could discontinue future distributions. Mr. Okobia stated that other municipalities had chosen to allocate similar funds to Unified Police Department or return them

to the county and requested direction from the council on how Copperton wished to use or distribute these funds.

Mr. Okobia also reviewed the council-designated fund, which included CARES-related funds and other designated items. He reported a fund balance of \$2,223, which consisted of interest earned on CARES funds. Mr. Okobia stated that Copperton held approximately \$21,000 in CARES funds and noted that there was no deadline for spending them, but encouraged the council to consider how they wanted to use those funds. He concluded the quarterly financial report and invited questions.

Council Member Kathleen Bailey asked whether the CARES funds were related to COVID-19 funding. Mr. Okobia confirmed that they were, explaining that CARES and ARPA funds were both distributed as part of COVID-19 relief funding. Council Member Bailey asked whether spending of those funds was limited to specific uses. Mr. Okobia stated that the funds could be spent on general government expenditures. Council Member Bailey added that information about expenditures, agendas, and meeting packets was available on the city's website at copperton.utah.gov.

Council Member Bailey moved to acknowledge presentation of the quarterly financial report as presented at tonight's meeting. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 3-0, unanimous in favor with Mayor Clayton and Council Member Severson absent from the vote.

b. South Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District Intent to Increase Property Tax Rate

Dan McBride, District Manager for the South Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District, addressed the council to provide notice of an upcoming tax rate increase and to introduce the district's operations within Copperton. Mr. McBride explained that the Mosquito Abatement District was a special district operating within Copperton and other municipalities, primarily responsible for mosquito control and monitoring mosquito-borne diseases. He stated that the district was established in 1952, operated with approximately five full-time staff and about 30 seasonal employees, and served roughly 20 municipalities on the south end of the valley, generally from the 201 corridor southward. Mr. McBride stated that Utah Code 17B-2a-1003 required the district to notify cities within its boundaries of a proposed tax rate increase and of the associated public hearing. He reported that the district planned to hold a public hearing on December 8 regarding the proposed increase. Mr. McBride explained that the proposed increase totaled approximately \$320,000 spread across about 500,000 households, resulting in total property tax revenue of approximately \$1.42 million. He stated that the increase would cost the average homeowner roughly \$0.60 per year. Mr. McBride noted that the district's last effective tax increase occurred in 2002 and stated that the district intentionally pursued infrequent increases while maintaining fiscal conservatism and adequate reserves.

Mr. McBride stated that Copperton did not currently have a representative on the Mosquito Abatement District board and expressed interest in having Copperton appoint one. He stated that certified letters requesting representation had been sent in prior years, most recently

delivered in February, and believed they were routed through the Municipal Services District. Nathan Bracken stated that he did not recall receiving such correspondence. Diana Baun pointed out that address changes and a prior incorrect post office box may have contributed to the communication issue. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer asked whether the certified letter had been signed for, and Mr. McBride stated that it had been noted as delivered. Nathan Bracken asked whether the sender could identify who received the correspondence. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer suggested adding appointment of a representative as an agenda item during council assignments, and Diana Baun agreed to do so.

Mr. McBride stated that having Copperton representation on the board would be beneficial and encouraged council members and residents to attend the December 8 public hearing to provide input. He shared additional operational context, noting that district staff frequently worked in Copperton, including climbing trees for monitoring, and emphasized that the district focused on prevention and minimizing spraying. Mr. McBride explained that part of the proposed tax increase would fund improved collaboration and technology related to access on Kennecott property, which had strict access requirements. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer noted the presence of a Rio Tinto representative and commented positively on partnership opportunities.

Nathan Bracken raised the timing of board appointments, noting upcoming council changes in January and asked whether the appointment should occur in December or January. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that new council members would not be sworn in until January and acknowledged that assignments might need to be reviewed then. Nathan Bracken explained that the council could make an appointment in December using current members, but also noted that councils often reconsider board assignments following elections to align with members' skills and interests. Council Member Tessa Stitzer stated openness to discussing board assignments in December if the council agreed.

Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer further noted that recent experiences with other boards highlighted the importance of understanding bylaws, term lengths, and appointment requirements, and suggested reviewing board assignments more broadly. Nathan Bracken agreed that clarifying documentation and expectations would be beneficial. Mr. McBride stated that all the district required was a formal resolution appointing a representative. Council Member Kathleen Bailey asked about representation structures in other municipalities, and Nathan Bracken explained that Kearns and Magna each had representation on mosquito abatement boards, sometimes split by district boundaries. Dan McBride added that it was common for mosquito abatement districts to divide service areas based on mosquito species.

Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer asked whether a draft resolution should be prepared in advance for the next meeting. Nathan Bracken confirmed that a resolution would be needed and that it could be prepared with a blank for the appointee's name. Diana Baun stated that such a resolution could be placed on the December agenda. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer confirmed that the item would be discussed and acted upon at a future meeting.

c. Approve the 2026 Copperton Town Council Meeting Schedule

Council Member Bailey moved to approve the 2026 Copperton Town Council Meeting Schedule as presented and published. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 3-0, unanimous in favor with Mayor Clayton and Council Member Severson absent from the vote.

7. COMMITTEE/BOARD UPDATES

a. Legal Updates – *Nathan Bracken, Legal Counsel*

Nathan Bracken stated that there were no action items for the current meeting but provided advance notice of several action items anticipated for December. Mr. Bracken explained that two of the upcoming items would require Planning Commission action and were driven by state laws passed during the most recent legislative session. He stated that implementation had been delayed because the state did not provide the necessary guidance and templates until earlier in the month.

Mr. Bracken first discussed HB 48, which required all land use authorities, including municipalities, to adopt the Wildland Urban Interface building code and to adopt a map identifying which areas of the city were subject to that code, regardless of whether the city actually contained qualifying wildland urban interface areas. He stated that concerns had previously been raised about the potential cost impacts of the Wildland Urban Interface code and confirmed, based on discussions with Municipal Services District building officials and personal experience, that construction costs under the code could be significantly higher than standard building codes. Mr. Bracken explained that the available state maps identifying wildfire risk areas were not sufficiently accurate, noting that some urban areas with low actual wildfire risk were rated higher than more exposed areas. He stated that because the maps were not refined enough to clearly define Copperton's boundaries or risk areas, staff planned to work with Unified Fire Authority and Municipal Services District staff to develop a more defensible map recommendation. Mr. Bracken stated a preference for adopting the minimum required designation until more accurate information became available from the state Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands.

Mr. Bracken explained that compliance with HB 48 was important because eligibility for state wildfire disaster assistance and cooperative agreements depended on adoption of the required code and map. He stated that the legislative intent behind the bill was to more accurately define wildfire risk areas to address insurance cost and coverage issues. Mr. Bracken noted that while improved state maps were anticipated, they would not be completed by the January 1 compliance deadline. He stated that the Planning Commission would review the building code adoption and map, after which the item would be forwarded to the council for consideration, with Unified Fire Authority recommendations serving as the primary technical guidance.

Mr. Bracken then discussed HB 444, which addressed government data privacy requirements. He stated that although data privacy requirements had existed in state code for some time, enforcement expectations had increased, and the state now required compliance by the end of

the year. Mr. Bracken explained that the state had recently provided templates and guidance, allowing Municipal Services District staff to begin preparing the required policies. He stated that the city would need to designate an officer, likely a Municipal Services District staff member, to manage compliance and submit required reports to the state. Mr. Bracken stated that this item would come before the council without a Planning Commission hearing and that policy development would continue into the following year.

Mr. Bracken also referenced a cleanup bill related to HB 368, the major land use reform legislation. He stated that this work involved aligning city code with updated state requirements and would require Planning Commission review before being presented to the council. He noted that while there was no immediate deadline, staff aimed to complete compliance by year-end.

Finally, Mr. Bracken provided an update on the city code restatement process. He stated that Municipal Services District staff had recently returned comments on Title 14, which had delayed progress on other code sections. Mr. Bracken stated that the remaining titles would now be sent for review and expressed an intention to finalize the code updates in early 2026, with participation from the newly seated council member. Nathan Bracken explained that the remaining updates primarily involved rarely used provisions, such as emergency proclamation procedures, and focused on updating terminology from county or metro township references to Copperton-specific language. Nathan Bracken stated that council feedback would be incorporated into the final draft.

b. Bingham Cemetery Board – *Council Member Tessa Stitzer*

Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that information about the cemetery and related activities was available on the Copperton.utah.gov website. She explained that Wreaths Across America was an annual ceremony held to honor veterans and fallen officers interred at Bingham Cemetery. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that sponsoring a wreath cost \$17 and that sponsorship was open to anyone, even if they did not have a loved one buried at the cemetery. She described the ceremony as well organized and stated that a local chapter conducted a flag ceremony and brief program before volunteers placed the wreaths. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that community members were encouraged to participate and that the event was a meaningful service project, particularly for teenagers seeking service hours, as well as organizations such as Rio Tinto. She stated that the ceremony would take place on December 13 at 1:00 p.m. and clarified the date after initially questioning it. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that all wreaths needed to be sponsored by Thanksgiving Day and explained the process for sponsoring through the Wreaths Across America website, including selecting the Utah Bingham Cemetery and optionally customizing a wreath for a specific individual. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer invited anyone with questions to reach out for additional information.

Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that there was no additional report for the cemetery and moved to agenda item 7C, noting that there was no report from the Community Council. Council Member Kathleen Bailey asked whether the council would be holding a Bingham lunch in December. Council Member Tessa Stitzer stated that they had not been approached about hosting one and that there had been a lunch the prior year. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that

they typically waited for Rene to communicate plans and that information would be shared if the event was scheduled.

Council Member Tessa Stitzer then returned briefly to the Bingham Cemetery discussion and added that there were currently 49 wreaths still needing sponsorship. Council Member Tessa Stitzer stated that in prior years the cemetery had covered any remaining wreaths from its own funds to ensure that every veteran and fallen officer was honored.

c. Copperton Community Council – *Council Member Tessa Stitzer*

No updates at this time.

d. Planning Commission – *Council Member Kevin Severson*

No updates at this time.

8. COPPERTON COUNCIL REPORTS

a. Mayor Sean Clayton

- i) Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (GSLMSD)**
- ii) Council of Governments (COG)**

No updates at this time.

b. Council Member Linda McCalmon

- i) Unified Police Department (UPD)**
- ii) Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service area (SLVLESA)**

Council Member Linda McCalmon reported on recent Unified Police Department and Salt Lake Valley matters. Council Member McCalmon stated that the Unified Police meeting held the prior month was brief and that all routine items were addressed and approved. She also stated that issues related to Salt Lake Valley were still ongoing, describing them as matters involving negotiations and disagreements with Salt Lake County. Council Member Linda McCalmon reported that additional meetings were scheduled for the following day and expressed hope that those discussions would lead to resolution, additional clarity, and constructive dialogue, with all parties contributing information toward potential solutions.

c. Council Member Kathleen Bailey

- i) Unified Fire Authority (UFA)**
- ii) Unified Fire Service Area (UFSA)**

Council Member Kathleen Bailey stated that she had a conflict that prevented her from attending the meeting that month. She stated that she would review the meeting minutes afterward and would provide any relevant information to the council via email.

d. Deputy Mayor Tessa Stitzer

i) Wasatch Front Waste and Recycle (WFWRD)

Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer reported on the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling meeting, for which she served as the council's representative. She stated that a public hearing was held on Monday to approve the 2026 budget. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer reported that extensive discussion occurred regarding efforts to reduce specific budget items in order to avoid a fee increase. She stated that the board reviewed reductions in detail, including administrative expenses such as office furniture, and delayed purchases like new office chairs until financial stability could be better assured. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer commended the board for its top-to-bottom approach to budget scrutiny and its efforts to ensure that no fee increase occurred unless all other options had been exhausted.

Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that another significant topic during the budget discussion was the proposed purchase of a company vehicle for administrative use. She reported that this item generated substantial discussion, particularly given that the organization already owned vehicles other than garbage trucks. She stated that no immediate action was expected on the vehicle purchase due to ongoing uncertainty surrounding Herriman's planned withdrawal from the district. She explained that there was continued discussion about Herriman leaving the district, noting that Herriman was both a growing community and the largest municipality served by Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling. She stated that the financial impact of Herriman's departure was still unknown and remained a major concern. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer reported that the board discussed whether to conduct a survey of Herriman residents, clarifying that a survey was not required but had been recommended. Mayor Pro Tem Stitzer stated that the discussion was lengthy and detailed. She also reported that broader conversations were taking place regarding how many communities could leave a local district and whether legislative or ordinance changes might be pursued to prevent further withdrawals.

e. Council Member Kevin Severson

i) Salt Lake County Animal Services

No updates at this time.

9. OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Public Comment

Dave Olson stated that he had arrived late to the meeting and was not fully informed on all prior discussion, but wished to address the council regarding the camera installed near the bridge, which had been a prominent topic on social media that day. Mr. Olson stated that he had made a sarcastic comment online that he regretted and wanted to clarify his position directly to the council. Dave Olson acknowledged that one of the main concerns raised by residents involved the lack of public input prior to the council's decision and stated that they did not dispute that concern or argue against the value of public input. He stated that their primary disagreement was with the belief held by some residents that the camera represented a form

of surveillance or tracking conspiracy. Mr. Olson stated that, in their view, Unified Police Department was not concerned with tracking individual residents' comings and goings and that such concerns were an overreach. He stated that they believed the council approved the installation of the camera with the best interests of the town and public safety in mind. He referenced public explanations about the camera's usefulness for situations such as violent incidents, AMBER alerts, and missing persons, and stated that these uses were beneficial to the safety of Copperton. Dave Olson stated that they wanted the record to reflect their support for the council's decision to allow Unified Police Department to install the camera, noting that they might not be able to attend the next meeting due to teaching commitments.

b. Announcements - None

Council Member Bailey moved to recess the Town Council Meeting and move to a Closed Session to discuss the topics highlighted below. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 3-0, unanimous in favor with Mayor Clayton and Council Member Severson absent from the vote.

10. CLOSED SESSIONS IF NEEDED AS ALLOWED PURSUANT TO UTAH CODE §52-4-205

- a. Discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual (§ 52-4-205(1)(a))**
- b. Discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation (§ 52-4-205(1)(c))**
- c. Discuss the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property (§ 52-4-205(1)(d))**
- d. Discuss the deployment of security personnel, devices, or systems (§ 52-4-205(1)(f))**

11. ADJOURN

Council Member Bailey moved to adjourn the City Council Meeting. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 3-0, unanimous in favor with Mayor Clayton and Council Member Severson absent from the vote.

The November 19, 2025 Town Council Meeting adjourned at 8:18 P.M.

This is a true and correct copy of the November 19, 2025 Town Council Meeting Minutes, which were approved on December 17, 2025.

Attest:

Sean Clayton, Mayor

Diana Baun, Town Clerk
