

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
NOVEMBER 18, 2025**

Members Present:

Wes Estep
Beau Lewis
Bret Rohde
Brandon Vonk
Blair Westergard
Lyle Holmgren, Mayor
Linsey Nessen, Interim City Manager
Cynthia Nelson, City Recorder

CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP

Mayor Holmgren called the November 18, 2025 City Council Workshop to order at 5:59 p.m. The meeting was held in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Those in attendance were Mayor Holmgren, Councilmembers Estep, Lewis, Rohde, Vonk, and Westergard, Interim Manager Nessen, and Recorder Nelson. The following Department Heads were also present: Community Development Director Jeff Seedall, Public Works Director Carl Mackley, and Police Chief Dustin Cordova.

1. Presentation by the Main Street Steering Committee—Chairman Jared Lewis and Co-Chairman Cassandra Merrill

Mr. Lewis said I appreciate the opportunity to present. Our report is in your packet and is a more in-depth version of what you will see tonight. We are summarizing two years of public engagement from the Steering Committee. We will present key findings and outline a funding path to accomplish what we recommend with some action ready steps based on your approval. Our purpose was to assess the current Main Street environment through observation, public input and discussion, and to make recommendations to the Council in order to create a functional and inviting Main Street. Our vision is to create an inviting, vibrant, functional Main Street that emboldens active citizenship, supports business vitality, and preserves Tremonton's heritage. Research and studies have shown that organized and concerted efforts to improve downtown districts improve retail sales and creates a better tax base. Ms. Merrill shared how her hometown has done something similar. They have been working on a revitalization project for 10 years and have noticed a huge increase in sales tax, from their revitalization. While visiting, I was able to talk to their revitalization committee chair. He helped me understand how it can help the city become more welcoming and to prosper in a way that it cannot without that financial background. Mr. Lewis said in addition to her hometown, there are organizations like Main Street USA that have done extensive studies on their main streets and found significant results.

Mr. Lewis said we did a survey in 2024 and consulted with City staff to come up with a lighting and landscape analysis through Landmark Design. Residents also provided input through the Main Street Showcase. In August of 2024 we had 646 responses. During the

Main Street Showcase, fall of 2025, we had 300 participants, 900 votes, 60 plus written comments, and 10 committee members taking notes on conversations. Former Councilmember Lyle Vance performed a survey, inviting business owners to give feedback. In the City Vision 2024 survey, 72% of the 700 participants supported some sort of revitalization effort. Top priorities included indoor and outdoor dining (83% support), sidewalk replacement and safety (82%), storefront beautification and tree replacement (70%), decorative lighting (86%). Respondents emphasized improvements should proceed without property tax increases. A lot of our feedback dealt with parking concerns. There is fear of losing storefront access. What our businesses said was largely regarding trees and storefronts. During that survey, 75% of businesses supported removing old trees and 75% of those did not opt to replace the trees. Visibility and damage concerns were the main reason.

Mr. Lewis then explained how the RDA would help capture money for projects on Main Street, along with potential grants. Basically, we can use funds like that to get grants and multiply those funds. These are the funding mechanisms we recommend. For these improvements we recommend you weigh all the options and make a decision based on what you think is best. These are in no particular order with pros and cons. First, there is an option with bump out planters and bulb outs. These are in the middle of the street. Pro, these support healthy trees with adequate soil. This allows for larger trees and that canopy effect to provide shade and color. It is visually distinctive and improves pedestrian comfort and safety. If we want retail space, we have to gear Main Street toward the pedestrian, not the vehicle. Bump outs provide safety for people parking in them and makes sidewalks wider and more walkable. This actually extends the parking stall length from 20 to 23 feet. Tree mess is captured in the planter. The cons are higher upfront construction costs and potential roadway narrowing. These require formalized maintenance for irrigation, pruning and snow removal. Business owners remain cautious about tree reintroduction due to prior damage. Next is planters only. We would redo the sidewalks and install planters. With no root infrastructure conflicts there is minimal long-term maintenance costs, flexible design and are adaptable to business frontage. A con is that this provides aesthetic improvements only. There are no environmental or shading benefits, limited visual cohesion unless regularly maintained and lacks the canopy effect that many residents desire. If trees are reintroduced on Main Street, the Courageous Crabapple was chosen by the public during the Main Street Showcase as the tree of choice for its color. He then reviewed the lighting recommendations from residents and business owners, which is pretty cut and dry. However, they did look into special lighting that would make a better display for holidays and special events. Mr. Lewis then reviewed plant options. This look is called Country Garden and was preferred by about 60% of the votes. These will need to be drought and salt tolerant with a timeless look. The elephant in the room is parking. Many of our business owners have expressed concerns about the lack of parking on Main Street. We recommend working directly with businesses to create shared or rear parking lots and install wayfinding signage. Over 150 parking spaces exist within one block of Main Street. Most are within 100 feet of storefronts, but signage and striping are insufficient. We have gathered public opinion and responses. We had no other intention other than to inform the Council and went to great lengths to get public opinion. We believe the public has been heard.

Mr. Lewis said in summary, we would recommend the Country Garden Design theme, double luminaire lighting, crab apple trees and planters, parking improvements, and RDA funded implementation. These are some action ready next steps. We can authorize the continuation of these engineering plans when the Council decides what streetscape to go with. Parking and wayfinding could be developed immediately. We can allocate funds from the RDA. We can also start applying for grants. All of this will come back to a final design review when you are ready. We have developed a data-driven, publicly supported, fiscally responsible path. It is time to move forward confidently. The worst decision is indecision. We have dedicated a lot of time and energy to this and believe we have come up with the information to help you make decisions going forward.

2. Review of the agenda items identified on 7:00 p.m. City Council Agenda

Recorder Nelson explained two ordinances for discussion. This first says we will follow the State on conflict of interests and the wording comes from our attorney. The second one says we will change it to read, “the household,” and also comes from our attorney. He did not offer a recommendation either way. When asked if he saw any reason not to follow the State, he said no. Those are the two options. The next one is regarding the conflict of interest for the Planning Commission and DRC. He said, whatever you do for the City Council, you need to mirror for those other committees.

When asked about the library fee amendment, Recorder Nelson said they are wanting to remove them. This is something they are doing across the State. They said it takes a lot of staff time to track these and talk to patrons. A lot of times patrons will not come back if they have a late fine and they lose patrons. It was only \$700 collected in late fees for the whole year, so it was not a big amount. If they lose a book or DVD, then they will have to pay for the replacement. This is just removing late fees. We had a cap of \$5 max on late fees so it was not a big fiscal difference.

3. ***CLOSED MEETING: No Closed Meeting held at this time.***

- a. ***Strategy session to discuss the purchase of real property when public discussion of the transaction would disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration or prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms; and/or***
- b. ***Strategy session to discuss the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual; and/or***
- c. ***Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; and/or***
- d. ***Discussions regarding security personnel, devices or systems***

The meeting adjourned at 6:43 p.m. by consensus of the Council. Motion by Councilmember Estep to close and go into the Board of Canvas meeting. Seconded by Councilmember Estep.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Mayor Holmgren called the November 18, 2025 City Council Meeting to order at 6:59 p.m. The meeting was held in the Tremonton City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street,

Tremonton, Utah. Those in attendance were Mayor Holmgren, Councilmembers Estep, Lewis, Rohde, Vonk (left at 9:54 p.m.), and Westergard, Interim Manager Nessen, and Recorder Nelson. The following Department Heads were also present: Community Development Director Jeff Seedall, Public Works Director Carl Mackley, and Police Chief Dustin Cordova.

1. Opening Ceremony: Prayer – Councilmember Beau Lewis and Pledge – Student Nora Anderson
2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.
3. Approval of Agenda:

Motion by Councilmember Estep to approve the agenda of November 18, 2025. Motion seconded by Councilmember Westergard. Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

4. Approval of minutes – October 21, 2025

Motion by Councilmember Lewis to approve the minutes of October 21, 2025. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rohde. Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

5. Presentations
 - a. Tremonton City Citizenship Award to Elementary and Intermediate Students

Mayor Holmgren said this is our favorite part of the whole meeting. This has been a tradition for a couple of years. We appreciate you for coming. These students are our future leaders and we appreciate their example. They are showing they are respectful, responsible, and safe. He also thanked the principals of the schools. The students were presented with their awards.

6. Public comments:

Tiffany Purcell said I want to talk about the planned development on the hill and the rezoning. I think planned development is a really good idea. I have come to the meetings and there are still some big issues. One of the issues I have is, we are planning one more outlet for 600 more homes. Utah Fire Code recommends about 30 per outlet. That is 700 homes for two outlets. If you count how many times that hill has been on fire, that seems like a hazard. I love that there are roads planned, but I do not know how long that is going to take. It seems irresponsible to have that many homes. Also, who are we attracting when we build townhomes? We just announced this nuclear power plant. That is fantastic. I love the jobs and diversity it will bring. I want to be in a community where people are staying. Townhomes do not promote the kind of community that I love about Tremonton. It promotes people who are here and using us as a stepping stone. Please do not make my neighborhood a stepping stone. Also, the developers have all of these promises. I love the plans they have for sidewalks and water, but I also know developers often claim bankruptcy. I want some kind of reassurance they are going to uphold these

promises. Rent prices are starting to go down in Salt Lake. I think we are flooding the market with multi-family homes. Can we really support this? I understand the need for attainable housing, but how many do we already have planned? Do we really need more or can we pause to see how it fluctuates? I like single-family homes. Kids do better when they can run outside. It is better for their mental health. It is better for the future if we can do more smaller, single-family homes. I think we could get creative in other solutions on ways to get those needs met on the hill without sacrificing zoning and density.

Viola Anderson said on September 16 I voiced a concern or two and I want to tell the Council and City thank you because they responded and took care of the hazards that were out there by the North Park Park. There is no more rebar and stuff for kids to fall on. I finally feel like I got heard, the problem got taken care of and I want to say thanks.

Casey Allred said could we ask you to table the discussion on Main Street until January, let us get through our holiday sales and the change of the elected officials. I do not know what good it would do or if we are ready to make a vote, but we are concerned. I would like to be able to take a breath and talk to a lot of you personally about some of these concerns without wondering if I need to hold down a chair every Council meeting. Is that something you would be willing to do? Mayor Holmgren said there will be one more meeting in December. There is a lot of information. I am not going to speak for the Council, but I think they need time to digest everything that has been presented. The chances of a decision being made before the end of the year are slim.

Bill Roosma said that was a good presentation on Main Street. I do not like the idea of putting trees back. I was happy when the trees came down. The line of sight is better. You can see the traffic flow better and down the road further. I do not like the idea of planters either because it takes up sidewalk space. I like nice, wide sidewalks for people to walk on.

Jean Richard said I live up on 1000 North. The zoning committee approved the Overlook subdivision several years ago. It was supposed to be all single-family homes, but that has changed. There is multi-family and townhouses. Unfortunately, young people cannot afford single-family homes and have to go to townhomes and apartments. I need to thank the Council and Planning Commission. You guys have heard a lot of negative responses with very few positives. You have put a lot of thought into this and I think you are trying to do the best you can for the whole community. The contractors have been very informative and upfront on their plan. I just want to thank all of you. No matter what your decision is, you are going to get negative and positive responses. I want to thank you all for hearing those.

Debbie Brandtner said first, I want to talk about the hill. I went up there just one time and actually got lost because I could not remember how to get out of there. My big concern is that we put more houses and apartments in there and if we do have a fire, that is going to be total chaos. I think you need to have more egresses for people to get out of there. The other thing is on Main Street. From being a past snow plower, I think those pop-outs would be pretty horrible to deal with. It would raise havoc on your plow and then it would just be bad. That will take away parking. I think option three would be the best. Let them decide how to decorate their storefronts. You keep talking about parking in the back and I think about my poor dad who is 88 years old. We are going to make that poor guy park in the back and walk how far to get to a store? He will likely just stay home and not shop locally.

Mayor Holmgren called a Public Hearing to order at 7:23 p.m. to receive public input on a rezone. There were 48 people in attendance.

7. Public Hearing

- a. Public Hearing to consider proposed rezoning from R1-12 to R1-10 for the Overlook Development, parcels 06-059-0082 and 05-175-0030 at approximately 3700 W 1000 N, Tremonton, Utah

Laura Ware said I live on the hill and have come to a lot of these meetings. The meeting with the developer was very educational. I did come away a little disheartened. It was frustrating to see the trade-offs we had to make as a City in order to get the infrastructure we needed with roads and water. I felt like we had to give a lot. In that meeting it was mentioned that the change in zoning would amount to an increase in 90 homes, which does not sound like a lot when you are talking about hundreds of homes, potentially thousands, but in our neighborhood, there are really only 73 homes. That is more than doubling. Even with the improvements I think this development will strain the roads. I live outside of the water loop that was mentioned and I still worry about my water. I feel that the R1-12 zoning should not allow townhomes and things like that. With the PUD that the City does allow, we already are giving the developer so many more homes up there. We are already allowing them to circumvent the zoning that is already there. I wanted to voice that I am against rezoning. We have already given the developer more than the current R1-12 zoning with the PUD.

Joshua McDonald said I live above 1000 North in the neighborhood. Big open spaces are one of the things that attracted me to that place. That is the beauty of it. I know some level of growth is inevitable. When it comes to crowding that out, it makes me sad. I am against it.

Mayor Holmgren closed the Public Hearing at 7:27 p.m.

8. New Council Business:

- a. Discussion and consideration of approving Resolution No. 25-54 amending the fees and fines schedule including, but not limited to, changes to Library fees

Motion by Councilmember Estep to approve the resolution. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rohde. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- b. Discussion and consideration of approving Resolution No. 25-55 authorizing the Chief of Police to approve off-duty employment of police officers and to execute agreements with third-party entities for security purposes

Chief Cordova said most police departments already have this. It is allowed by State statute and incentivizes guys to work for us because we allow secondary

employment opportunities. We will run it through the attorney and approve it if it makes sense for all parties. This is basically just secondary employment. This allows them to use the certifications and their expertise to work in security jobs on their days off. This will not affect their primary duties. I will be the mediator to make sure it makes sense for everybody involved and make sure they are going to cover our guys if something escalates. Almost every department has some type of secondary employment like this. One of my requirements for the businesses involved is that they do not hold the City legally liable if anything happens and they are insured. This alleviates any responsibility on the City. It would truly just be a secondary employment opportunity for our officers. A lot of them have second jobs. It is pretty normal in our profession. This would allow them to do something more related to their field.

Motion by Councilmember Westergard to approve the resolution. Motion seconded by Councilmember Lewis. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- c. Discussion and consideration of approving Resolution No. 25-56 appointing Colby Page to serve on the Library Board

Motion by Councilmember Lewis to approve the resolution. Motion seconded by Councilmember Estep. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- d. Discussion and consideration of approving Ordinance 25-21 rezoning parcels 06-059-0082 and 05-175-0030 located at 3800 West 1000 North, from Residential District (R1-12) to Residential District (R1-10) Pat Burns and Chris Cave

Councilmember Lewis reported on the open house. There was a lot of discussion. I want to thank the citizens who came. It was good to hear your feedback. That really helps us as a Council to understand your concerns. There was a long discussion on roads. The Transportation Master Plan has a lot of diagrams for the roads and where they are anticipated. There was concern about timing. When the development and those roads would actually go in. Director Seedall explained some of that connectivity in the Transportation Master Plan. With the amount of focus we are receiving for residential development on the hill, I am working on contacting landholders to see if they would be willing to sell or grant an easement for that road to tie in. We have three of the four property owners on board to help tie that road in. That would provide a way to get everything over to 2000 West and bring people off the hill. In terms of the water tank, anything above that line will have to be serviced off a new one. They will not be able to build north of that line until a new tank is there. We have been in discussions with the engineer and property owner for that. We will figure out what size is enough to service, not just this development, but everyone on the hill. The other thing that will help is expanding and creating more loops on the water line. That will help create redundancy in the system for this area, which will help alleviate service problems

we currently have. There will be an outdoor reservoir to pump secondary water. It will feedback down through the system into the hill. The hope is as we build up, we will have enough reservoirs to handle a vast majority of the City's secondary needs into the future. Councilmember Lewis said the rights they currently have with R1-12 and the current zoning, would allow them to put that townhome section down below. The trade-off is that for the additional 90 doors, the City is getting infrastructure. A lot of the current infrastructure problems would be solved by that additional 90 units.

Director Mackley he reviewed the City's water supply and water use for the past 12 months. The part that concerns me is how much it peaks in the summer. There is still a lot of outdoor use on culinary water. If we could get the whole City on secondary and convince people to use that, we can knock it down significantly. A city that has 100% availability for secondary water should be able to knock that peak down. I am confident we can do that within a couple years. You would then have that much additional development or future use for the culinary supply. We are losing 42% of our culinary water. There is a discrepancy between what our master meter readings are and all of our customer use added up. That is really significant. We want to hunt down all unmetered uses and meter them. That information is critical and translates into dollars. Replacing that 4.4 miles of old pipes should help with that effort. If we can hunt down what we do not have metered and replace what we know is problematic already, that will help our culinary supply. Developing a permanent ASR project could add 300 gallons per minute for six months during peaking period. Additionally, we could purchase more water. Bear River Water Conservancy District has 500-acre feet a year available, which would add another 310 gallons a minute. My first recommendation is to reduce the excessively high, water loss by replacing key water lines and eliminating all unmetered uses and connections. The second recommendation is making secondary water available to the entire City. At that point we can make some decisions on increasing culinary water rates to influence residents to use secondary water. Another recommendation is to evaluate our current ASR program, which we are going to do over the next three years and make it permanent. We could also purchase additional culinary water that is available.

Councilmember Rohde said in tying this discussion back to this subdivision, if we added all of these homes, do you see that having a negative impact on this peak or do you think we will be able to make the adjustments needed while this development is taking place to not put ourselves in trouble with water? Director Mackley said until the peaks go down, I would not approve any more than 200 gallons a minute, which would be about 950 homes. If we get industrial uses in, that could change. That is also assuming those 950 homes are on secondary water. Councilmember Vonk said this is a concept of R1-10. I want to make sure myself and the public understand what the potential benefits are from going from R1-12 to R1-10. What are the clear benefits if we were to vote to go to R1-10. Councilmember Lewis said the benefits are that the infrastructure would be paid for by the developer. They would do that with increased density. If not, then the

City is going to have to figure out how to do that. We currently have a problem up there, infrastructurally. Do we want to allow for higher density and ask the developer for that or are we going to raise property tax or do a special district to come up with ways to pay for that infrastructure. How are we going to do that? There will also be an increased demand for public safety. Do we want to increase the density to pay for infrastructure or do we want to figure out funding? That opens up Truth in Taxation and other things we do not necessarily want to do. Councilmember Rohde said it is no secret we are looking at going even further up on the hill with additional homes. We have a lot of water that comes off that hill so we will need good storm drains and basins to pull that off. Director Mackley said that is the concern I have and the sewer pipes as well. It would solve some utility concerns, but there are other utility issues we ought to look at because bringing that amount of new development will impact our existing infrastructure down below. That is a problem. We need to see some model results, not only on the water supply, but the storm drains and sewers. Our impact fees should pay for upsizing, but there is a delay between when we collect and when we have to put it in. You put it in upfront, which means we go into debt and then hope we recover that later on.

Councilmember Lewis said we are not talking about whether or not we are going to have 500 homes on the hill, we are talking about whether it is worth 20% more for the developer to pay for that infrastructure. Building permits will not be issued without these answers coming to us. What we are talking about today is the difference between this 20% increase in density to pay for infrastructure costs. I am just trying to surface the reality of what we are voting on. We are talking about infrastructure trade-offs we are asking the developer to take care of. They are asking for a 20% increase in density to do so. My concern is that if we say no then we do not get those infrastructure additions. Director Seedall said residents have expressed a need to get better infrastructure and traffic flow. With the additional 20%, there is leverage to ask the developer to pay for more. How do we not go and try to find funding to improve 1000 North after the hours of discussions we have had? Where is the money coming from for the project if the developer is not funding it? That is the trade-off. They will still have to put a water tank in, but by State code, they only have to put in one for their development, not one with enough capacity to help the rest of the residents on the hill or future residents. They do not have to do any roadway improvements except for what their frontage is. It is left in the City's pockets to pay to finish the pavement on the roadway section. All that comes to the City unless we permit 90 more doors. We can then negotiate with the development agreement on what is covered by the developer outside of what he has to do. The 20% more gives leverage for the DRC to negotiate something whereas not permitting the rezone, they would only have to meet the standards and the City would pick up the odds and ends.

Developer Pat Burns and Engineer Chris Cave joined the discussion to answered questions. Mr. Cave said the engineering costs a lot, but these guys solve all those problems. Mr. Burns said when we have an existing zone we are not going to give

anything. When I ask for something, I am going to get something out of it. I am going to give something to get that. If we do not get the rezone, our discussions are going to be 100% different. I will only do what I have to do for my development. I will follow code. If we get an increase by giving a few things then we will. If we can increase our density, we have more money to give back.

Councilmember Lewis said I do not take lightly changing R1-12 to R1-10. We have a land use plan and we need to honor our zones. This is our option to choose and a lot of it comes down to a financial decision. This decision has a lot to do with, are we as a City going to pay for the infrastructure or are we going to increase the density to let the developer pay for that? Councilmember Rohde said I am not saying this is a bad subdivision. I just am not convinced of it yet. We have done a lot of work over six months to gain public trust and I am afraid this could jeopardize that. I was hoping to put this off so the new Council could work with this issue. Councilmember Estep said I am going to go with what I feel is best for the City. These guys are going to help pay for new officers and things. I know it is not what a lot of the residents want, but I am going to go with yes for the future of our City. Councilmember Vonk said I am going to vote no. I have a real problem with the parking issues and the HOA fees and how those can be compounded with no control. I feel the constituents have stated boldly that they are not ready for this. Councilmember Lewis said people are under a lot of burden with taxation. I think we need to get the infrastructure build out or we are going to have big struggles. I vote yes. Councilmember Westergard said I vote yes. I know people hate it, but they are going to hate either one so we might as well get the infrastructure.

Motion by Councilmember Westergard to approve the rezone to R1-10. Motion seconded by Councilmember Estep. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - no, Councilmember Vonk - no, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved by a 3-2 vote.

- e. Discussion and consideration of approving Ordinance No. 25-22 amending Title 3 City Government, Part 3-707 Voting of the Revised Ordinances of Tremonton City Corporation

Councilmember Rohde said our code recluses a person from voting and discussing. That is the only difference in the two codes. If we follow the State, then someone can declare a conflict, but participate in the discussion and vote. With the other, they would reclusive themselves from that. For the other they could, but would not have to. Currently, we say they have to reclude themselves. What we added was just a definition of what a household is. We could use the State code and allow people to participate in the discussion and vote. Councilmember Westergard said if we go with the State then every time that updates then we just adopt that. Councilmember Vonk said I agree. Councilmember Rohde said we do have people with conflicts and if they do not reclude themselves, they are interjecting a lot of power and influence as they

debate over changing people's opinions. I am against that, especially if they have a true conflict. Councilmember Estep said I would make a motion to approve 25-22 and stay on the same page as the State. Councilmember Vonk said I think we should be working to have people not on those committees who have a conflict of interest, especially when there are multiple conflicts. That ought to be addressed separately. Councilmember Rohde said under State code, individuals could continue with the discussion. I would recommend they do not, but that is within their right to. With the other code, they do not get that choice. Councilmember Vonk seconded the motion. Councilmember Lewis said I would prefer to see us go with the second option. For public trust, I think it is important. Councilmembers Westergard and Rohde both said no.

Motion by Councilmember Estep to approve this ordinance. Motion seconded by Councilmember Vonk. Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - no, Councilmember Rohde - no, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - no. Motion denied by at 3-2 vote.

- f. Discussion and consideration of approving Ordinance No. 25-23 amending Title 3 City Government, Part 3-707 Voting of the Revised Ordinances of Tremonton City Corporation

Councilmember Rohde said I will make a motion to approve this ordinance 25-23. The difference is in this one you have to reclude yourself from discussion and the vote when you have a conflict.

Motion by Councilmember Rohde to approve the ordinance. Motion seconded by Councilmember Westergard. Vote: Councilmember Estep - no, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved by a 4-1 vote.

- g. Discussion and consideration of approving Ordinance No. 25-24 amending Chapter 1.04.090 Rules of Procedure and Order of the Revised Ordinances of Tremonton City Corporation

Motion by Councilmember Rohde to deny the ordinance. Motion seconded by Councilmember Estep. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- h. Discussion and consideration of approving Ordinance No. 25-25 amending Chapter 1.04.090 Rules of Procedure and Order of the Revised Ordinances of Tremonton City Corporation

Motion by Councilmember Lewis to approve the ordinance. Motion seconded by Councilmember Vonk. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- i. Discussion and consideration of approving Ordinance No. 25-26 amending Title 18 Franchise Agreements, Part 18-127 Annexation of the Revised Ordinances of Tremonton City Corporation

Recorder Nelson said with annexations we send notices to utility companies. Rocky Mountain Power does not want us sending a copy to the 201 South Main address. They want it sent to the P.O. Box. We are just amending it in our code.

Motion by Councilmember Lewis to approve the ordinance. Motion seconded by Councilmember Vonk. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- j. Discussion and consideration of allowing the discharge of Firearms within City Limits at 1086 S 1000 W Caleb Park

Mayor Holmgren said we currently do not allow for firearms to be discharged within City limits. He wants to put a target range into the berm of the freeway. Mr. Park said I live between the two freeways. Nobody else lives off 10500 North. Currently, I go to the local shooting range to test rounds. I was hoping I could get permission to discharge within City limits. I would have a pretty good sound barrier and physical barriers to stop projectiles from going anywhere undesirable. The Council agreed they would like to allow this, but feel it is in the City's best interest to deny the request.

Motion by Councilmember Rohde to deny this application. Motion seconded by Councilmembers Estep and Vonk. Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- 9. Consent Agenda
 - a. Adoption of September Warrant Register
 - b. Adoption of September Financial Statements

Motion by Councilmember Estep to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion seconded by Councilmember Rohde. Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- 10. Calendar Items and Previous Assignment
 - a. Review of calendar

Mayor Holmgren said next Tuesday is an employee get-together. Officer Gailey said the police department is doing Subs for Santa and need recommendations for families to support.

- b. Unfinished Business/Action Items: None.

11. Reports & Comments:
 - a. Council Reports and Comments

Councilmember Vonk said I want to thank you all for this opportunity. I am in support of the community's vote and think they made great choices. I feel like the friendships I have made and knowledge of you individuals has been nothing but positive. I appreciate all you have done to support me. You have all been amazing so thank you very much.

Councilmember Lewis said there have been three or four new businesses on Main Street and quite a few cool places coming in. I want to highlight that and go check them out. I think we are just warming up with that as we start revitalizing downtown and Main Street. A lot of feedback has been that "Monton" is what we want to be by not having trees. I am curious to see feedback and hear more about that and make sure we get Main Street done the way the residents want. Thank you for your service. It has been a pleasure to work with you guys. I am so grateful for all the time and effort you put into serving this community.

Councilmember Westergard said you guys have done a ton of work to get the secondary water to where it is without rate hikes. You should pat yourself on the back. All of the water we have is because of you guys. I want to commend you. I wish everybody good luck.

Councilmember Rohde said I am glad the last three months are over and want to thank the Mayor for running a good campaign. We are friends. We reminisced over some of the fun things we did in our early adult life and I want to thank the mayor for all he has done. He has been a wonderful influence and a good friend. He serves well. I would ask people to show some grace and kindness for what he has done. Also, Councilmembers Estep and Vonk, thank you. It has been an honor serving with you.

Councilmember Estep said the event at Midland was nice. That was a beautiful program. Let us finish that project whenever you get the chance. It was really nice to have people not in the road for that program. Same thing, Mayor Holmgren, you and I have had a great friendship. I know you have bled Tremonton City blood for as long as you have been here. You have taken a lot of crap for things in this City, but you have been the most devoted man. You care about this City and the City cares about you. You might not have won the election, but the City still cares and appreciates everything you have done. Councilmember Vonk, thanks for your quick stay. It is an eye-opener. Good luck to those coming in. You just put your heart into it and make hard decisions. Tonight was not an easy decision, but I have to do what is best for the City. We are where we are today because of hard decisions that were made in the past.

Mayor Holmgren said I just want to thank everybody who ran in the election this year. I want to thank my opponent. It has been a challenge and it stung, but the people have spoken, and I support all of you. I hope to still be involved with the

City in some fashion. We appreciate all of you so much and appreciate this fantastic community.

Motion by Councilmember Estep to move into closed meeting. Motion seconded by Councilmember Lewis. Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

The Council moved into a closed meeting at 9:18 p.m.

12. **CLOSED MEETING:**

- a. *Strategy session to discuss the purchase of real property when public discussion of the transaction would disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration or prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms; and/or*
- b. *Strategy session to discuss the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual; and/or*
- c. *Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; and/or*
- d. *Discussions regarding security personnel, devices or systems*

Motion by Councilmember Rohde to return to open meeting. Motion seconded by Councilmember Lewis. Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - absent, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

The Council returned to open session at 10:03 p.m.

13. **Adjournment.**

Motion by Councilmember Rohde to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Council. Vote: Councilmember Estep - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Rohde - yes, Councilmember Vonk - absent, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

The meeting adjourned at 10:04 p.m.

The undersigned duly acting and appointed Recorder for Tremonton City Corporation hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes for the City Council Meeting held on the above referenced date. Minutes were prepared by Jessica Tanner.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2025.

Cynthia Nelson, City Recorder