

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

PRESENT:	DJ Bott	Mayor
	Dave Hipp	Councilmember
	Dave Jeffries	Councilmember
	Matthew Jensen	Councilmember
	Ryan Smith	Councilmember
	Robin Troxell	Councilmember

ALSO PRESENT:	Tom Cooper	Power Director
	Nicole Cottle	City Attorney
	Tom Kotter	Finance Director
	Derek Oyler	City Administrator
	Tyler Pugsley	Assistant City Administrator
	Kristina Rasmussen	City Recorder
	Chief Reyes	Police Chief
	Chief Thueson	Fire Chief
	Aaron Wade	Gilmore Wade – <i>via Zoom</i>

Mayor Bott called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The invocation was offered by Bishop Thomas Rust, Brigham City Mountain View Ward. The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Bott introduced two consent items:

1. Approval of the November 18, 2025 Election Canvass and November 20, 2025 City Council Meeting Minutes.
2. Approval For Updates To Employee Policy & Procedures Chapter 9 – Full Time Employee Benefits, Regarding Leave Payout Calculations.

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

EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION

Mayor Bott recognized Kaylor Golightly as a part time Wasterwater Grounds Maintenance worker.

PUBLIC HEARING

Consideration Of Resolution For The Creation Of Avian Shores Public Infrastructure District As An Independent District, Authorizing and Approving A Governing Document, Appointing A Board Of Trustees, and Authorizing Other Documents In Connection Therewith; and Related Matters

The Mayor turned the time over to Mr. Aaron Wade of Gilmore & Bell, who joined the meeting remotely.

Mr. Wade explained that the governing document functions as a “charter” or “constitution” for the PID. Together with state law, it sets out how the PID will be governed, including:

- Establishing the initial district boundaries and a defined annexation area within which the district may expand or contract in the future.

- Clarifying that any boundary changes require the consent of the current property owner, so properties can only be added or removed if the owner requests it.
- Allowing the district to impose property taxes and special assessments, with the requirement that any special assessment on residential property be prepaid before the homes are conveyed to ultimate homeowners.
- Providing for the appointment of an initial board of trustees consisting of property owners or their agents, which will thereafter be self-appointing rather than appointed by the City Council.

He further noted there was still a blank in the governing document regarding the concept of an “approved development plan.” Based on discussions with the applicant, it appeared the applicant was primarily interested in a development agreement, while the City’s primary focus was on the zoning overlay. Mr. Wade recommended clarifying that approval of the zoning would constitute the “approved development plan,” and he emphasized it was his understanding that the City was not requiring a development agreement for this project. He stated that, upon Council approval, staff and legal counsel would be authorized to make any final adjustments needed to align the document with the Council’s direction.

Mr. Wade then addressed details related to debt limits. In response to a question from the Council, he explained that while the governing document includes a maximum mill levy, there had also been a blank for the maximum debt amount. The applicant proposed filling in a maximum limited tax debt limit of \$20 million.

The Council then engaged in a series of clarifying questions.

One councilmember asked, with a \$20 million cap, who is responsible if costs exceed that amount. Staff clarified that any overruns beyond the \$20 million would be borne by the developer, not by the city or the district’s taxpayers.

A councilmember then confirmed that the proposed PID would apply only to the Avian Shores property. Mr. Wade stated that the district encompasses only the property covered by the petition and that all property owners within that area have consented to inclusion in the district. He emphasized that no one elsewhere in the city would be subject to this PID tax unless they later chose to move into the development.

The Mayor also asked for clarification on what happens to the PID tax once the bonds are paid off. Mr. Wade explained that the PID property tax levy is expected to remain in place only until the bonds are paid off or discharged. After that point, the tax would go away and the district would take steps to dissolve, since there would no longer be a purpose for the district.

Another councilmember raised a question about the phasing of the development. Because the homes would not all be constructed at once, the councilmember asked how taxes would work for a homeowner who buys in Phase 1 versus someone who buys in Phase 4, and whether they would be responsible for “back” obligations. Mr. Wade explained that, like other property taxes, the PID tax is based on the assessed value established by the county assessor and billed annually on the standard November tax notice. During early phases, the developer pays taxes on the vacant land, which is assessed at a lower value. When a homeowner moves in, that homeowner becomes responsible for the taxes going forward, not retroactively..

At this point, staff requested permission from the Mayor to briefly explain what the PID funding would specifically build, particularly for the benefit of the larger audience present at this meeting compared to two weeks prior. The Mayor agreed that would be helpful.

Staff then outlined that the up to \$20 million in PID debt must be 100% spent on public infrastructure. Key components include:

- 1200 West roadway improvements from near Forest Street south to the current dead-end of 1200 West, consistent with the City's general plan showing a 106-foot right-of-way and constructed to City standards.
- A regional sewer lift station, needed because wastewater from development west of 1200 West cannot flow back to the existing sewer line on 12th West. This lift station would be fully funded by the PID.
- Installation of storm drain, sewer, and water infrastructure, and the public rights-of-way and roadways necessary to serve the project.
- A public trail network as part of the development.
- Potential pocket parks or regional parks, subject to how the development and any related agreements come together through the future approval process.

Councilmembers then continued with additional questions.

One councilmember asked what would happen if, after construction of only 20–30 homes, the market “bottomed out” and further development stalled for perhaps 15–20 years. Mr. Wade explained that the PID bonds are structured as limited tax general obligation bonds, which differ from traditional general obligation bonds (often issued by school districts, cities, or counties). In a traditional general obligation bond, the issuer pledges its full faith and credit and must raise taxes as necessary to meet its obligations. In contrast, the PID bonds are limited tax bonds, meaning there is a cap on the tax rate and the PID cannot increase the rate beyond the approved ceiling.

Mr. Wade also noted that the statute allows for a longer tax “runway” to help mitigate this risk:

- The district could issue bonds with maturities up to 31 years, and
- The maximum tax term is 40 years from the date of imposition for that bond.

This allows taxes to continue to be levied past the bond's maturity to help make investors whole. After 40 years, however, the district is no longer authorized to impose the tax and the bonds would be deemed discharged, even if investors have not recovered all their investment. He emphasized that this structure provides protections for property owners, including:

- A cap on the tax rate (mill levy) that cannot be exceeded, and
- A definitive end date after which the tax must cease and the obligations are treated as discharged.

A councilmember then asked whether parcels owned by Brigham City Corporation within the district would be subject to the PID tax. Staff clarified that City-owned parcels retain their tax-exempt status and would not be subject to the PID levy, and Mr. Wade confirmed that nothing about this district changes the City's exemption.

Another question from the Council asked whether there were any timelines built into the documents for completion of infrastructure. Mr. Wade replied that there are currently no specific completion deadlines in the PID documents; the timing would generally be driven by the developer, since it is their bond and project. Staff then explained that, regardless of the PID structure, existing City codes and development standards still apply. Requirements for public infrastructure necessary for a Certificate of Occupancy, final plat approval, and other normal development processes remain in full force.

Councilmember Smith made a motion to open the public hearing specific to the Creation of Avian Shores Public Infrastructure District. Seconded by Councilmember Jeffries and approved unanimously.

Paul Robertson – expressed concern about water and soil conditions in the proposed district area. He noted existing springs and irrigation lines between the railroad and freeway, possible wetlands/subbing areas, active water rights, and the potential for liquefaction in a major earthquake. He urged the City to

carefully define water rights and streambeds, and to coordinate with state water officials to ensure rational, safe development.

Ben Soholt – said he prefers this PID structure over others but raised several questions:

- How many children the project will add to the school system.
- Whether the school board has been consulted and if this growth could require higher school taxes.
- Whether new residents will cover ongoing costs for parks, police, and emergency services, or if taxes might need to rise citywide.

He also voiced concern about growing faster than the community can absorb, though he stated he believes this is a better development than some prior approvals.

Staff and the Mayor later noted:

- Impact fees (for parks, police, fire, etc.) apply here the same as elsewhere.
- Property and sales tax from higher-density residential help support ongoing services.
- The school district has been meeting with Brigham City and Tremonton for 18–24 months and is aware of Avian Shores, but it is a separate elected body that makes its own decisions and must react to growth.

Julianna Larson – urged the City to work closely with the Army Corps of Engineers and be very thorough about water and safety before placing hundreds of homes in the area. She also questioned how successful PIDs have been in situations comparable to Brigham City and encouraged the City to push its analysis “as far as we can” to ensure the project is viable and safe.

In response, the City Administrator explained:

- Brigham’s first PID (an industrial area) has not moved forward because the company backed out, not because the PID tool failed.
- PIDs are increasingly used across Utah; staff has consulted with other cities (e.g., Cedar City) and legal counsel to structure this one properly.
- PIDs provide a way for new development to pay for its own infrastructure rather than relying on existing taxpayers.

Jake Barker – said he supports needed housing and is familiar with PID-funded projects like Firefly in Eagle Mountain. He asked how the City can leverage this PID to provide strong community assets, especially parks, that benefit both those inside and outside the district. His questions included:

- Whether parks and recreation impact fees are the same inside the PID.
- Whether the developer builds the parks and then deeds them to the City.
- Why multifamily park impact fees are lower than single-family, given higher likely park usage
- Whether there is a real opportunity here to provide a true regional park, not just retention basins or minimal green spaces.

The Mayor and staff responded that:

- Impact fees build parks, but ongoing maintenance falls on the City’s operating budget
- For that reason, the City leans toward smaller pocket parks, though a regional park is identified conceptually.
- The development will also deliver major public benefits: full-width construction of 1200 West, utility infrastructure, and a trail system available to the entire community.

Councilmember Jensen made a motion to close the public hearing. Seconded by Councilmember Hipp.

Motion: Councilmember Smith moved to approve the resolution For The Creation Of Avian Shores Public Infrastructure District As An Independent District, Authorizing and Approving A Governing Document, Appointing A Board Of Trustees, and Authorizing Other Documents In Connection Therewith; and Related Matters. Seconded by Councilmember Jeffries.

Roll Call:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Paul Robertson – gave his annual update on Pioneer Park Pond, reporting several duck broods disappearing and expressed concern about excess duck feeding and food left on sidewalks. He asked that a snowplow route be created from the road by the swimming pool to the Forest Street sidewalk so pedestrians don't have to walk through deep snow. He also questioned recent soccer fee increases,

Kelly Oakley – expressed concern that adding a new park in the Avian Shores area, given current limited park maintenance funds, could eventually lead to additional tax increases, which she feels are already too high when combined with recent school tax hikes. She is worried about the cumulative growth impacts of the proposed nuclear plant. She also referenced discussion of making Mantua Reservoir and Trail a state park, and expressed concern that it would bring more people and new user fees.

Jake Barker – said he values Brigham's small-town feel but recognizes growth is inevitable. He focused on the future 1200 West connection to 1100 South, noting he lives near the health department and has seen concept plans with a spur connecting into his neighborhood. He urged a thoughtful roadway layout that keeps higher-volume traffic out of residential streets.

Billy Marshall – stated that her Brigham property lies within the Avian Shores area, in the strip extending south from 400 West. She asked whether the planned widening and improvement of 1200 West will occur on the east side, west side, or both, as that will directly affect her land. She also proposed installing a large American flag on the Brigham-owned knoll above Mantua.

Lane Henderson – expressed concern about the removal of lilac bushes along the cemetery, He also asked whether the City has considered the impact on nearby property values if the cemetery is more fully exposed.

COUNCILMEMBER COMMENTS

Councilmember Troxell - announced that the Bear River Association of Governments has opened applications for the Social Services Block Grant for nonprofits in Box Elder, Cache, and Rich counties, with a deadline of January 15. She encouraged better communication between the City and residents—especially on issues that surface on social media—and said she would like to see:

- The cemetery plan for the lilac/bush removal and replacement.
- More public information on state park discussions (Mantua) and on the nuclear hub.

Councilmember Hipp - thanked the many residents who attended and commented, saying he appreciated the respectful tone and the chance for back-and-forth earlier in the meeting. He reminded residents they can always reach out to councilmembers individually for background or clarification on issues.

Councilmember Jensen - echoed appreciation for the strong public turnout and interaction. He also shared positive feedback he'd received about the Christmas Village.

Mayor Bott - The Mayor thanked residents for their participation and addressed several themes raised during public comment:

- **Taxes & Inflation:** He acknowledged concerns about tax increases, explaining that ongoing inflation in wages, materials, and infrastructure costs makes some increases unavoidable. He emphasized that the Council represents a broad cross-section of the community and takes tax decisions very seriously. He invited residents to attend budget work sessions beginning in April/May, where the proposed budget and any potential tax changes are discussed in detail.
- **Growth vs. Small-Town Feel:** The Mayor noted that if a city doesn't grow at least modestly, it effectively falls behind, because infrastructure wears out and must be replaced. He said his focus is on recruiting business and industry to broaden the tax base and help keep residential taxes lower, while staff works hard to "deconstruct" and preserve the small-town feel even as new development like Avian Shores occurs.
- **Mantua / Proposed State Park:** He confirmed that Brigham City has been in ongoing discussions about a possible state park at Mantua Reservoir, and that the City was somewhat surprised by the early public announcement tied to the Governor's budget. He explained that Brigham City currently pays significant costs to maintain the reservoir and address algae blooms, and that a state park could shift some of that burden to user fees instead of Brigham taxpayers.
- **Cemetery & Expansion:** The Mayor, noting his own deep family ties to the cemetery, said he is committed to keeping it one of the best-maintained cemeteries in the state. He explained that the cemetery is running out of space and is essentially landlocked, so the City must plan for expansion and reconfiguration (including road adjustments) to avoid needing two cemeteries in the future. He acknowledged concerns about screening and security, and said a long-term cemetery plan is in progress, with the constant being that more room is needed.

ACTION ITEM

Consideration of Updating Recreation Fee Resolution To Include Soccer Programming Fees

The Mayor invited Chris Horsley, the new Recreation Director, to present the proposal to update the recreation fee resolution to include soccer programming fees.

Chris began by reviewing national data from the Aspen Institute's "Project Play," highlighting that kids who participate in sports are much more likely to remain active as adults, and that youth sports correlate with better health, better test scores, and reduced risky behaviors. He used a couple of infographics in the slideshow to reinforce the point that strong recreation programs benefit not just individuals but the overall health and feel of a community.

From there, Chris shifted to the proposal itself. He explained that Brigham City Recreation plans to launch a city-run soccer program this spring, starting with a phased approach. Phase one would focus on TOTS and U6, generally ages three to six. The TOTS program would be a six-week, non-scrimmage skills and games format focused on fun and basic motor skills. The U6 program would be more traditional, with small-sided scrimmages so the kids get lots of touches on the ball. Over time, in future spring and fall sessions, staff would phase in U8, U10, and U12 divisions as the younger kids age up.

He emphasized that the phased rollout is intentional: staff wants to dial in quality, logistics, and coaching support with the youngest age groups first before expanding. He noted that games are planned at the Sports Complex, and that while City programs would have priority, they still intend to offer field rentals to other user groups as field conditions and space allow. He also mentioned plans to introduce an adult 7-on-7 soccer program, played on a smaller field.

Chris then showed the proposed fee schedule and walked through it briefly. He explained that when you factor in AYSO's national membership fee, Brigham's proposed rates come in slightly below what families would pay through AYSO, and that the fees are comparable to programs in nearby cities like Tremonton, Nibley, and Farmington.

At that point, councilmembers started asking questions. One question focused on the projected participation numbers on the slide: it looked like the jump from TOTS/U6 into the older age groups was relatively small. Chris explained that the projections are conservative; the model assumes only about half of the U6 kids immediately move into U8, which is why the first year numbers look modest. As the program matures, they expect fuller U8 and U10 divisions. He also reiterated that if demand is stronger than projected and staff feels confident with quality and logistics, they are open to accelerating the schedule and not waiting all the way to 2027 before adding U10 and U12.

Another thread of discussion centered on why the City is starting its own soccer program instead of just trying to attract AYSO or existing organizations back. One councilmember noted that Brigham had once had a very strong AYSO presence, and that various comp and youth programs, including football and soccer, had drifted away from Brigham fields—sometimes reportedly because of field-use fees and access. He said he'd like to see the City focus on fixing those relationships and bringing teams back, and also questioned why the rollout for older age groups was pushed as far as fall 2027 instead of capitalizing on interest around the 2026 World Cup.

Chris responded on the rollout question, returning to the quality-first approach. City Administrator Derek Oyler weighed in on the broader philosophical issue. He said the City has been talking about running its own soccer programs for longer than Mayor Bott has been in office, and this isn't a rushed idea. The staff's view is that Brigham City should be directly providing at least the recreation-level soccer program, given the City's role, its facilities, and the kind of "Brigham feel" they are trying to preserve as the community grows.

Another councilmember spoke from personal experience, saying that growing up in Brigham, city recreation programs were critical for kids in lower-income neighborhoods who otherwise couldn't afford travel or comp leagues. She said she sees City rec as the entry point for all kids, with comp organizations still playing an important role later for higher-level play. Others agreed that soccer is an easy, accessible sport—just shoes and a ball—and that the City should have a role in providing that kind of opportunity.

From there, the conversation expanded into field use fees more generally, especially for comp leagues and outside organizations. Several councilmembers noted that when field rental fees were increased in recent years, they worried about "pricing people out," and now they are seeing programs leave Brigham for fields in other communities. They expressed interest in revisiting those fees, not to eliminate them, but to make sure they're fair and competitive—especially for larger leagues that need a lot of field hours.

The Mayor and staff reminded the Council that field-use fees were based on a detailed cost study, and even now only recover roughly a quarter of the true cost of maintenance, utilities, and staff. They also stressed that staff cannot negotiate separate deals while the existing resolution is in place: City Council sets the fees, and staff must apply them consistently. A few councilmembers said they'd like updated information on maintenance costs and what neighboring cities charge so they can reassess where Brigham's fees should be. There was also some back-and-forth about not wanting case-by-case "negotiated" rates for individual organizations, but rather using those discussions and comparisons to inform a single fair fee structure that applies evenly to all leagues.

By the end of the discussion, there was a clear direction that staff should refresh the cost and comparison data and bring field-use fees back to the Council for further discussion, likely in late January or early in the new year.

A final question was asked about uniforms for the youngest kids, and Chris clarified that TOTS and U6 would receive custom t-shirts, not oversized jerseys they'd have to "grow into."

Motion: Councilmember Troxell moved to approve the amendments to the Recreation Fee Resolution to include soccer programming fees. Seconded by Councilmember Hipp.

Roll Call:

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

At 8:07 PM Councilmember Smith made a motion to adjourn into closed session to discuss real property. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Jeffries and carried out unanimously.

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

At 8:48 PM the meeting returned to open session. Councilmember Jensen made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Hipp and carried out unanimously.

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

Dated this 22nd of December, 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.