

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
JANUARY 27, 2026**

Members Present:

Raulon Van Tassell, Chairman
Micah Capener, Commission Member
Karen Ellsworth, Commission Member
Andrea Miller, Commission Member
Mark Thompson, Commission Member—excused
Ashley Phillips, Commission Member—non-voting
Jack Stickney, Commission Member—sitting in for Thompson
Kristie Bowcutt, City Councilmember
Jeff Seedall, Community Development Director
Linsey Nessen, Interim City Manager—excused
Tiffany Lannefeld, Deputy Recorder

Chairman Van Tassell called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held January 27, 2026 in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Chairman Van Tassell, Commission Members Capener, Ellsworth, Miller, Phillips, Stickney, City Councilmember Bowcutt, Director Seedall, and Deputy Recorder Lannefeld were in attendance. Commission Member Thompson and City Manager Nessen were excused.

1. Approval of agenda:

Motion by Commission Member Capener to approve the January 27, 2026 agenda.

Motion seconded by Commission Member Ellsworth. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Thompson – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.

3. Approval of minutes—November 25, 2025 & December 9, 2025

Motion by Commission Member Ellsworth to approve the minutes stated above.

Motion seconded by Commission Member Miller. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – yes, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Thompson – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

4. Public Comments:

Jonathan Gardner said I live west of the area deemed as the Harwood zone for the Inland

Port project. I am here on behalf of the residents and landowners who live and work in this area. I want to be very clear, we do not want an Inland Port in our backyard. Not here, not under the current proposal and not without honest, transparent governance and meaningful local consent. This is not an abstract planning exercise for us. This is about our homes, water, air quality, roads, property values and the rural character that brought our families and businesses here. An Inland Port brings heavy truck traffic, industrial noise, diesel emissions and long-term land use consequences that are fundamentally incompatible with this community. Equally concerning is how this process is being handled. As residents, we have been told repeatedly that no single entity is really in charge. The City says they are not driving the project and are trying to protect the area. The County says they are not leading it. State entities, including the Inland Port Authority, say they are just providing assistance. Developers say they are responding to opportunities created by others. Yet, despite all of this, the project keeps moving forward. Who is actually accountable for this project? Right now, responsibility is so fragmented that no one appears willing to own the full scope of impacts, decisions and long-term consequences. That lack of clarity erodes public trust. Planning should not feel like a game where authority disappears every time concerns are raised. We are asking for greater transparency, specifically clear identification of who is driving this project and who has the final decision-making authority, full disclosure of agreements, memoranda or commitments already made, honest acknowledgement of long-term impacts, not just projected economic benefits and a process that gives local residents a real voice before irreversible decisions are made. Economic development is not inherently bad, but development pushed forward without accountability or community buy-in is bad planning. This Commission has a duty to protect the public interest not just today, but in the future. We ask you to slow this process down, demand clarity and insist those promoting this project step forward and take responsibility. Our community deserves transparency, accountability and respect. Most of all, we deserve to be heard.

Jamie Poppleton said on the agenda, many people do not know what the initials are for the Inland Port Authority. Can we have those types of things spelled out so people know what is going on and what it is versus just initials or acronyms or vague information?

5. New Business

a. Discussion and Consideration of Preliminary Plat—Cloverfield Estates, Phase 3

Director Seedall said this is along 110 South 900 West. The property owner came in for a rezone. They are looking to use the single-family transition overlay zone. This has gone through DRC and meets all requirements. They will be about 5,000 square feet. It is zoned R1-10. Commission Member Capener said the parcel to the south is not joining? Director Seedall said they had conversations, but due to a timing issue, they could not come to an agreement so they will do cul-de-sacs instead of the through street. When asked about layout, Director Seedall said the north section has three lots and the south one has two. Commission Member Miller said it seems squishy. Could we ask to hear from the property owner who

did not come to a conclusion with the developer? I would like to know his thoughts. It is a timing issue, but could they reach an agreement? Commission Member Capener said I think stubbing the road through keeps the continuity of those roads. Someday the owner to the south may want to do something and stubbing the road is a smart idea. They would have the ability to connect. Director Seedall said that would be an alley. They were trying to figure out how to get a road to connect, but it would have to S-curve around the existing house. I do not know where the negotiations ended, but this property owner decided that instead of waiting he would continue on. He wanted to go forward with this plan that meets the zoning code. We looked at a couple options for layout and I never got both property owners in a room to discuss a route. It felt like neither of them were happy with the impact of having that road go through. The south property owner is not sure what they want to do with the property. The north property owner got tired of waiting and moved on. Commission Member Capener said can we make him connect those roads per the code? Director Seedall said we can ask him, but because he meets the public standards with the cul-de-sac and turnarounds, there is not a lot of power to force him to do that. Commission Member Capener said we should have more conversation as far as making it a real road that continues. It is R1-10 and he is asking to shrink the lots in half. I am inclined to say, if he does not connect, then he should keep those at R1-10. If he wants more density, he should do that. Less homes would have less connections. It would be way better for everybody for it to go through.

When asked about snow removal, Director Seedall said the City would plow snow on the cul-de-sac, but not on alleys or private roads. Commission Member Capener said we could end up with two dead-end cul-de-sacs which, in my mind, is a nightmare. I think we ought to table it and bring both property owners in for a discussion. If the property owner to the south has any intention to develop in the near future, we should have that conversation and see if something can be worked out or at least be stubbed to keep the continuity. If the property owner to the south is not going to develop then it is probably a moot point.

Motion by Commission Member Capener to table this item. Motion seconded by Commission Member Ellsworth. Vote: Chairman Van Tassell – no, Commission Member Capener – yes, Commission Member Ellsworth – yes, Commission Member Miller – yes, Commission Member Thompson – absent, Commission Member Stickney – yes. Motion approved.

b. UIPA Training (Utah Inland Port Authority)—Stephanie Pack Utah

Mrs. Pack said this is the Utah Inland Port Authority 101, explaining what we are doing in Box Elder County. The Utah Inland Port Authority was created in 2018 by Utah State Legislature. We were created to facilitate the creation of a traditional inland port in Salt Lake City. Through the years, the focus of the inland

port, and the tools, has shifted. We are now more focused on economic development efforts across the State. We receive requests from local legislative bodies. Tremonton City Council passed a resolution inviting the Utah Inland Port Authority to create a project area similar to an RDA where we create a tax boundary and leverage tax increment to finance infrastructure projects. This is a community first type development project. We take cues from the city on how things need to go. Taxing entities defer revenues for a time and we use those to pay for infrastructure development.

Mrs. Pack then reviewed project areas across the State, including the four project areas she manages in Northern Utah. These projects make a lot of sense for communities that have large areas zoned for development. A lot of these areas do not have infrastructure to develop, and this mechanism allows the community to defer revenues to pay for that upfront and ensure infrastructure for the growth coming in. We work really closely with these communities on project area creation and economic development efforts. We work closely to ensure we are utilizing the assets we currently have and enhance them in a way that makes sense for our growth. For example, we have great rail infrastructure in Utah that is underutilized. Every rail car can take four trucks off the road, which has a significant impact. The biggest tool we bring to the table is our public financing tools. That is really how communities are leveraging the port project areas to help finance these infrastructure projects that are going to enhance growth. We do not have land use authority within our project areas or the ability to move tax increment outside of the project into other project areas outside your community. The revenues that are generated here, stay here.

Mrs. Pack then explained how they capture tax revenue. The taxable revenue from these properties is very low. We freeze that base tax value that continues to flow to the taxing entities and any increment will be divide. After the improvements have been made, we take 25% of that new increment, which continues to flow to the taxing entities and 75% will be utilized toward improvements of that area. We can sometimes put it toward incentives for eligible companies. Our project areas have a lifespan of 25 years. With all debt payments satisfied, we then terminate the project area and all tax increment will flow to the taxing entities. We can extend the life of the project area up to 40 years. We have over 20 recruitment projects that are actively looking at Northern Utah. Any project that comes to the community, the city has that purview on permitting and allowing those companies to come in. With these tools it really does allow the City to be a little picky about what projects they want to see in their community. We will work with the City on any relevant recruitment projects coming down the pipe. We have triggered our first parcels and next year will come back with a full financial report for the Council to discuss what those implications are and how those monies are being spent. We are going to continue to market the community and the project areas. She reviewed project areas, including the Hardwood Zone on the west side of I-

84. That is currently unincorporated county and has a single landowner. The County, in partnership with the City, opted to include that in the project area boundaries. In order to get services there, the landowner will have to petition for annexation into Tremonton to receive those. The City can leverage the tax increment tool to build infrastructure to support any development that happens there. Ultimately, the City will decide how that area gets zoned and what type of growth they want to see.

Director Seedall has worked on revising the ordinances that could impact this and will be sharing it with the DRC and Planning Commission soon. We just got the first version with the changes the Planning Commission suggested. Hopefully two large items get done before this triggers. One is we will get through the zoning changes so if it was triggered, we could at least have a discussion on the zoning code we feel comfortable with. Two is updating the Land Use Plan and going through that process with the public to understand what they find acceptable. If we can get public support and the Land Use Plan is created, then we will feel comfortable sharing that with Mrs. Pack and that will be a great tool for her to use as she recruits companies. Mrs. Pack said diversifying your revenue base is always a good idea. It is very costly to bring in residential, and it really does not pay for itself so bringing in industry helps subsidize services for citizens. That is really what we are trying to do with economic development—diversify the tax revenues available and kick-starting development in areas that would have a hard time developing otherwise. There are ways we can get creative with revenue—we just have to make sure any debt service gets covered first. We are a public entity and happy to help clarify any questions or doubts. We will continue to work with staff on that Hardwood zone. Once it is annexed and that planning exercise has happened, we will be ready to get going. That planning exercise gives us, on the state level, direction as to what could fit here. You have a great workforce and the I-84 and I-15 interchange. There are a lot of reasons why this is an incredible place to do business. You are going to be a very attractive community for industrial development. You have everything you need to make that happen. This planning exercise is important to make sure you are upfront about what type of development you want here and what you do not want and be sure to build that into your code.

6. Comment and Reports:

Councilmember Bowcutt said remember we do not have to follow the status quo. It is okay to have an opinion and I encourage you to stick to your opinions. Do not cave in because someone says something is the best. Do your own research and check things out. I encourage you to think outside the box.

7. Adjournment

Motion by Commission Member Van Tassell to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by consensus of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 6:55 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 of the Planning Commission held on the above referenced date. Minutes were prepared by Jessica Tanner.

Dated this ____ day of _____, 2026.

Cynthia Nelson, CITY RECORDER

*Utah Code 52-4-202, (6) allows for a topic to be raised by the public and discussed by the public body even though it was not included in the agenda or advance public notice given; however, no final action will be taken.