



COPPERTON TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

FEBRUARY 18, 2026, 6:30 PM
BINGHAM CANYON LIONS CLUB
8725 HILLCREST STREET, COPPERTON, UTAH 84006

****DRAFT MINUTES – UNAPPROVED****

COPPERTON TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES FEBRUARY 18, 2026

Council Members Present:

Sean Clayton, Mayor
Tessa Stitzer, Mayor Pro Tempore (via Zoom)
Kathleen Bailey, Council Member (via Zoom)
Linda McCalmon, Council Member
Jonathan Pratt, Council Member

Council Members Excused:

Staff Present:

Nathan Bracken, Legal Counsel
Diana Baun, Town Clerk
Sarah Leavitt, Deputy Town Clerk (via Zoom)
Madison Warner, Emergency Planner (via Zoom)
Daniel Hoffman, Senior Accountant (via Zoom)
Dan Torres, Economic Development Manager
Chief Nathan Bogenschutz, UFA
Det. Ruby Lechuga, UPD

Others Present:

1. REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

Mayor Sean Clayton presiding, called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM and noted a quorum was present.

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 LINDA MCCALMON,
COUNCIL MEMBER JONATHAN PRATT

b. Unified Fire Authority (UFA)

Chief Nathan Bogenschutz reported on activity for Unified Fire during the month of January. He stated that there were nine calls within Copperton, five of which were medical incidents. The remaining four calls involved the department's rehabilitation vehicle responding to fires in other areas across the valley. He also described a notable incident that occurred the previous week in Herriman, where a four-alarm fire required assistance from multiple stations. Crews from the local station responded to support the effort, and more than 100 firefighters were present at one point working to control the fire. He stated that the crews performed very well during the response and then invited questions from the council.

Council Member Jonathan Pratt asked about a recent incident involving a power pole that caught fire during a power outage that had occurred a couple of nights earlier. He stated that a transformer had blown and caused the pole to catch fire and asked whether anything could be done to prevent similar incidents in the future.

Chief Bogenschutz responded that he was not aware of the specific incident and had only known that the power had gone out earlier that morning. Chief Bogenschutz stated that if a transformer had blown, the issue would likely fall under the responsibility of the power company. He was unsure of the exact cause but offered that they could attempt to find out more information about the situation.

Mayor Sean Clayton made a brief remark about fires and insurance rates and then reminded attendees that due to the recent snowfall, it was important to ensure that fire hydrants remained clear of snow so that firefighters could access them if needed.

c. Unified Police Department (UPD)

Detective Ruby Lechuga reported that recent police activity included a theft classified as a family offense, explaining that the incident involved a package theft. Detective Lechuga stated that there had been nothing particularly unusual or serious during the reporting period and expressed appreciation for the work being done by the town council and community members.

Council Member Jonathan Pratt asked for clarification regarding terms used on the report, stating that the report listed total cases and no cases and that he wanted a better understanding of what those categories meant.

Detective Lechuga explained that "total cases" referred to the number of calls received. She noted that some calls are documented as initial reports while others may be shortened or logged without a full report. She gave the example of a traffic stop, explaining that a full report is not always created for that type of call, which results in the call being categorized as a "no case."

Council Member Pratt confirmed his understanding that the "no cases" category referred to calls that did not result in a full report. Detective Lechuga also addressed the patrol allocations portion of the report, explaining that the figure represented how many calls were handled per officer, while control allocations reflected the number of officers assigned to the area.

Mayor Sean Clayton noted that the town currently had three FTEs. Detective Lechuga also mentioned that some unusual numbers appearing at the top of the report, specifically 4114, did not make sense and appeared to be a system issue. She stated that those numbers should be ignored for the time being and that she would work on identifying and correcting the problem within the reporting system.

3. WORKSHOP DISCUSSION

a. Copperton Town Days and 100 Year Celebration

Mayor Sean Clayton introduced a workshop discussion regarding plans to commemorate Copperton's upcoming 100-year anniversary in the summer of 2026. Mayor Clayton explained that he had spoken informally with several council members and community members about recognizing the milestone. While recently walking through the park, he observed that the park currently featured a decorative archway on the northwest corner and an older wooden sign on the northeast corner that had likely been installed by the county approximately 20 years earlier and was now in poor condition. He proposed replacing the deteriorating wooden sign with a new structure designed to match the existing archway, potentially including commemorative wording such as "1926 to 2026." He explained that the design could replicate the current arch using wrought iron across the top and masonry sides. He also reported that \$70,000 had been secured through the Municipal Services District to fund the project as part of the anniversary celebration and asked the council for input on the proposal.

Council Member Tessa Stitzer stated that she supported the concept and believed it would be a positive and engaging project for the community. Council Member Stitzer said the project could also provide an opportunity to hold a formal dedication ceremony during the 100-year celebration, allowing the council to interact more personally with residents attending the event.

Mayor Clayton responded that, since the idea appeared to have support, he was interested in moving forward with the planning process. He asked whether the council would be willing to make a motion authorizing them to proceed with developing the project.

Council Member Stitzer asked a clarifying question before any motion was made. She asked whether the 100-year celebration was still expected to coincide with Copperton Town Days, which had been discussed previously. She was informed that the events were expected to be combined. She then asked whether the proposed archway project would require the entire \$70,000 allocation or if some of the funding might remain available for other improvements or activities associated with the celebration.

Mayor Clayton explained that the \$70,000 originated from leftover TRC grant funding that had previously been used for converting tennis courts into pickleball courts. He stated that the remaining funds were designated for park improvements and were required to be spent by March 31. He explained that the town would likely need to request an extension to complete the archway project. He reported that he had already spoken with two members of the TRC board who indicated support for granting a six-month extension, though he believed the project might be completed within three months. He also noted that some engineers from the

Municipal Services District had expressed concerns about the complexity of the project, but he believed replicating the existing archway design would not present significant difficulty.

Council Member Stitzer asked whether using those funds for the archway would affect other park improvement projects that had previously been discussed, including potential electrical upgrades to the pavilion.

Mayor Clayton clarified that those improvements would be funded through separate budget sources and would be addressed during future budgeting discussions. He also reported that funding had already been allocated for ADA accessibility improvements in the park, including ramps and sidewalk improvements, and that work on those projects was already underway.

Council Member Stitzer noted that electrical upgrades near the pavilion would likely need to occur soon if the town intended to use electrical service during future Town Days events. She explained that the electrical system had not been used in recent events because it was outdated and that understanding the funding sources for each project was helpful.

Council Member Jonathan Pratt asked whether, if the archway project did not require the full \$70,000 grant amount, the remaining funds could potentially be used for additional park improvements, such as installing a welcome sign at the park entrance.

Mayor Clayton explained that because the funding came from a specific grant source, any unused funds would need to be returned rather than redirected to other projects. He noted that the TRC had already granted one extension for the funds and that requesting a second extension would require additional approval. He stated that they planned to contact the Mayor of Taylorsville, who served on the TRC board, to request support for the extension. Mayor Clayton added that although some funds might ultimately need to be returned, he expected the archway project to remain within the available budget. He further explained that other funding sources could sometimes be reallocated if savings occurred, but certain funding, such as the \$3.2 million the town was receiving in federal funding for storm drain improvements, was restricted to specific purposes and could not be used for unrelated projects.

Council Member Kathleen Bailey informed the council that the recreation board was currently seeking additional members and suggested that it would be beneficial to have representation from the west side of the valley.

Mayor Clayton responded that the matter might be raised during discussions regarding the grant extension request but noted that he could not personally serve due to a conflict.

Council Member Bailey also stated that approximately \$500 would be needed to purchase a new backboard for the basketball court in the park.

Mayor Sean Clayton acknowledged the request and asked whether there were any additional comments.

Council Member Stitzer agreed that maintenance was needed for the basketball court. She explained that both hoops and backboards required replacement and that the painted court lines had faded. She also suggested installing additional benches near the basketball court to provide seating. Council Member Stitzer proposed including these potential improvements in discussions with the TRC board when requesting the grant extension, in case any remaining funds might be eligible for those purposes.

Mayor Clayton stated that those possibilities could be discussed with the TRC board but emphasized that the primary justification for requesting the extension would be the construction of the 100-year commemorative archway. He added that the town likely had other budget resources available to address the basketball court improvements if grant funds could not be used. He estimated that the work would primarily involve electrical adjustments, repainting court lines, and replacing two backboards.

Council Member Bailey added that the recycling program that produces park benches from donated plastic bags might already have another bench available that could potentially be placed in the park.

Council Member Stitzer clarified that her earlier suggestion specifically referred to placing benches near the basketball court.

Council Member Bailey responded that the recycled bench could be placed anywhere in the park but recalled that someone had mentioned enough materials had already been collected to produce another bench.

b. Community Council Current/Future Intent and Responsibilities

Town Attorney Nathan Bracken explained that there had been recent changes in state law affecting entities that receive funding from governmental bodies, particularly nonprofit organizations. Mr. Nathan Bracken noted that these changes had emerged in another context but were relevant to Copperton's relationship with the Community Council. He stated that since the town last amended its code following Copperton's incorporation, the Community Council had been listed as a volunteer organization and received some funding from Copperton, although Mayor Sean Clayton clarified that the council did not receive all of its funding from the town.

Council Member Tessa Stitzer responded that the Community Council did not receive 50% or more of its funding from Copperton. Council Member Stitzer recalled that when Copperton first incorporated as a municipality or metro township, the council discussed preserving the Community Council's autonomy partly because it did not receive a majority of its funding from the town. She explained that the situation changed when park permits became involved, which had been discussed in the previous month's meeting. She stated that because Copperton was now taking ownership of the park and the Municipal Services District handled many of the related requests, the Community Council no longer needed to manage responsibilities such as park permits, which had been the council's primary concern.

Mr. Bracken explained that the legislature's auditor had issued a best management practices report several years earlier outlining expectations for nonprofit organizations that receive public funding. He said the report recommended several procedures, many of which the Community Council might already be following. He noted that Copperton had historically governed its relationship with the Community Council through the town code rather than a formal contract, but moving forward a contract might be advisable. He further stated that recent statutory changes could require certain nonprofit organizations funded by local governments to complete accounting and reporting to the state auditor depending on the services provided. He explained that he and the Town Clerk, Diana Baun were researching these requirements more closely. He also referenced an informal opinion issued in the fall by the Utah Property Rights Ombudsman regarding Millcreek's Community Councils, which suggested that such councils should comply with the Open and Public Meetings Act when conducting official city business. He stated that if Copperton's Community Council was no longer involved in permits and instead operated independently, the Open and Public Meetings Act likely would not apply. Mr. Bracken emphasized that the legal landscape had changed somewhat since Copperton first began working with the Community Council and said they wanted the council to keep these developments in mind while considering the future relationship between the town and the organization. He offered to send the council additional information after the meeting and noted that these issues had also been a significant focus at the auditor's office in the past.

Mayor Sean Clayton agreed that the issue had previously been a major focus at the auditor's office and remarked that staff there had been frustrated about it at the time. Mayor Clayton stated that the council could revisit the matter and suggested that Council Member Stitzer decide whether to place the topic on the agenda for the following month or wait a few months before revisiting it.

Council Member Stitzer stated that she agreed with the concerns raised by Nathan Bracken and recalled that compliance with the Open and Public Meetings Act had been a significant part of the council's earlier discussions. She also informed the council that the Community Council had not recently held meetings. She did not believe the Community Council was currently performing governmental functions that would require compliance with those meeting requirements, especially since the group had never been able to carry out the permitting responsibilities originally anticipated. She described her vision for the Community Council as continuing its recent role of organizing Town Days, hosting bingo events for seniors, assisting with service projects, and supporting the community when needed. She suggested that restructuring the organization or possibly renaming it could help avoid confusion between the Community Council and the town's governing council. Council Member Stitzer said the matter required further review and requested additional time to examine the information mentioned by Nathan Bracken and any additional details discovered by Nathan Bracken and Diana Baun before bringing the issue back for further discussion.

Mr. Bracken added that as the council evaluated the future relationship, it should consider that the Community Council might have separate funding sources and resources that the town did not possess. He advised against duplicating the organization's work if it was already contributing valuable resources to the community. He suggested that if certain activities triggered governmental auditing or reporting requirements, the town might consider

establishing a city committee to handle those specific functions. He explained that the Community Council could continue operating as a community organization while the city handled official functions through its own committees, possibly even involving some of the same individuals. This approach could simplify accounting and reporting and create clearer distinctions between community-led activities and official municipal responsibilities. He concluded by reiterating that he would provide the auditor's report and relevant statutes to the council and suggested that the town might also consult with Seth Overson at the auditor's office to ensure any future arrangement complied with state requirements.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Approve Council Meeting Minutes
 - i. December 17, 2025
 - ii. January 21, 2026

Only the January 21, 2026 minutes were available for review, and therefore were the only ones approved.

Council Member Stitzer moved to approve the January 21, 2026 Council Meeting Minutes as published. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

- b. Fiscal Items
 - i. Approval of expenditures
 - ii. Acknowledgment of Monthly Financial Report

Mayor Clayton asked for approval of \$3,819.50 in legal fees for January, along with multiple other smaller amounts for credit card statements and council computers/technology.

Council Member Bailey moved to approve the Consent Agenda Fiscal Items above as discussed. Council Member Pratt seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

5. PRESENTATION ITEMS

- a. Quarterly Financial Report

Daniel Hoffman joined the meeting remotely and apologized for not attending in person due to hazardous road conditions. He presented the town's financial report and displayed a chart summarizing the performance of Copperton's main fund. He reported that revenue was approximately \$271,000, which represented about 52% of the \$525,000 budgeted amount, placing revenues roughly on track for the halfway point of the fiscal year. He stated that expenses totaled approximately \$203,000, or about 39% of the budget. The financial statements covered activity through December 31, which marked the first half of the fiscal year, and noted that expenses are typically lower during the first half because many summer-related costs—such as park operations and Town Days—occur later in the year. He also highlighted that Copperton's cash balance in the main fund was approximately \$526,000,

indicating the town remained cash positive. Mr. Hoffman briefly reviewed revenue sources, reporting that Copperton collected approximately \$84,000 in sales tax during the first half of the year, about \$8,000 from SB 136 revenue, roughly \$25,000 in road fund revenue, approximately \$1,500 in permit fees, and about \$9,000 in interest earnings. He explained that the financial statements listed total revenues of \$412,000 because they included the full annual contribution from the Municipal Services District, but the chart reflected the adjusted midyear amount of \$271,000 to more accurately represent the halfway point of the year. He also summarized expenses, noting approximately \$1,000 in administrative expenses and about \$73,000 in contributions, which represented roughly 40% of the related budget and remained within expected levels. He said some individual categories exceeded projections slightly but stated that overall expenses remained within budget. Little activity occurred in the cemetery fund during the first half of the year aside from one or two grave opening charges, although more activity had occurred in January that would appear in the next quarterly report. There was also minimal activity in the ear tax fund. He added that the comprehensive council-designated fund currently held approximately \$21,000 in deferred revenue from PARIS and noted the council should consider how that money might eventually be used.

Council Member Jonathan Pratt asked about Copperton's general fund reserve and whether that information was documented in the financial report, referencing discussions from the Utah League of Cities and Towns about maintaining reserve balances. Mayor Sean Clayton explained that Copperton's accounting structure differed from most cities because it operated as a proprietary fund rather than a traditional governmental fund. Mayor Clayton explained that funds moved between the Municipal Services District's general fund and Copperton's administrative fund as needed to balance budgets. He pointed to the town's fund balance, which showed approximately \$526,000 in total assets and approximately \$564,000 in total net position or fund equity belonging to Copperton. He stated that much of this balance represented unspent administrative budget funds accumulated over several years. He explained that the town could use its fund balance to pay for projects such as improvements to the basketball court. He added that the town's operating budget was typically approved and funded by the Municipal Services District each year, and although the council tried to request only necessary funds, projects occasionally extended across multiple years and required use of the fund balance. He noted that Copperton's structure differed from typical cities represented by the Utah League of Cities and Towns because the Municipal Services District maintained the primary general fund.

b. Preliminary Capital Budget Presentation

Engineering Manager Tamaran Woodland then discussed the preliminary capital budget. She first addressed ADA ramp improvements that had recently been reviewed with the Municipal Services District. The total bid for the project was \$36,000, including \$30,000 for ADA ramps and \$6,000 for benches and bench pads. She explained that the ADA ramps could be funded through contracted maintenance funds from the Municipal Services District, leaving only the \$6,000 for benches and pads unresolved. They would follow up with the mayor to determine whether the benches should move forward and how they might be funded. She noted that potential funding sources could include remaining grant funds, CARES II funds, or other options, and the benches could also be removed from the project if desired. She then

explained the capital budget process. In January staff asked each council they worked with to submit potential capital projects. She described how projects from each community are ranked locally and then combined with submissions from all Municipal Services District communities, after which they are ranked collectively and funded from approximately \$3 million in available capital funds. She reported that Copperton currently had two projects listed. The first was Copperton Storm Drain Phase Two, which she said would remain on the list indefinitely until it was funded either through the capital program or another source such as legislative funding. Mayor Clayton stated that the last update indicated the project had been included in a federal budget bill but had been delayed because it could not be funded under a continuing resolution in Washington, D.C. Mayor Clayton said he would contact a federal representative for an update.

Ms. Woodland then discussed a potential transportation utility fee study that had been proposed as part of the region's transportation master plan. She explained that consultants recommended studying transportation impact fees only for Kearns and Magna due to development patterns, but suggested that a transportation utility fee could potentially apply to the five communities served by the Municipal Services District. Copperton had been listed as a "maybe." She explained that the study would analyze the possibility of a monthly fee, similar to a stormwater utility fee, which would fund road maintenance and transportation improvements. The study would cost approximately \$35,000 for Copperton, with slightly higher costs for larger communities.

Mayor Sean Clayton questioned the return on investment of the study, estimating that with roughly 250 residences it could take approximately 20 years to recover the study cost through fees. Based on that estimate he did not believe the study was worthwhile. Council Member Jonathan Pratt asked why Copperton had been listed as a "maybe." Ms. Woodland responded that the designation came directly from the consultant's spreadsheet without additional explanation. Mayor Clayton suggested that the consultants likely believed the community's small size would generate insufficient revenue to justify the program. He stated they opposed pursuing the study, and Ms. Woodland agreed to change Copperton's designation from "maybe" to "no."

Ms. Woodland asked whether any additional projects should be added to the capital list. Mayor Clayton requested that general park improvements be added, including pavilion electrical upgrades, new basketball backboards, repainting basketball court lines, and additional tree planting. He estimated that \$35,000 to \$50,000 would likely cover those improvements. Council Member Kathleen Bailey asked about park irrigation system work already underway, and Mayor Clayton confirmed that irrigation improvements were already being addressed. Council Member Bailey also noted that the playground surface treatment might require maintenance to maintain the manufacturer's warranty, possibly costing about \$20,000. Mayor Clayton said he believed the treatment had been completed the previous year but asked Council Member Bailey to verify whether it must occur annually and inform Ms. Woodland if the expense needed to be included in the capital list.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS - None

7. COUNCIL BUSINESS

a. Discussion and Potential Action Regarding Creation of a Finance Committee to work with the MSD and Payroll System Options

Daniel Hoffman explained that the Municipal Services District was considering creating finance committees within each municipality to improve financial communication between the district and the towns. Daniel Hoffman said each council would appoint two members who would meet with Municipal Services District staff to review financial information and discuss budget planning, particularly during the early months of the year when budgets are prepared.

Mayor Clayton asked how often those meetings would occur. Daniel Hoffman stated that during budget preparation the meetings might occur monthly and then less frequently throughout the remainder of the year. Mayor Clayton questioned whether the committee would duplicate work already performed by the Municipal Services District Board of Trustees during budget review. Mr. Hoffman responded that the committee was intended to improve communication and allow earlier discussions with municipalities. Mayor Clayton expressed concern that a separate committee would repeat discussions already held by the trustees and that the committee would not have authority to approve budgets. He stated that creating such a committee could undermine the trustees' role and lead to unnecessary meetings.

Daniel Hoffman clarified that the meetings would occur separately with each municipality rather than bringing multiple communities together. Mayor Clayton suggested that instead of creating a new committee, the council could incorporate financial discussions into the workshop portion of its regular council meetings. He explained that the council already included a workshop discussion item on each agenda and could use that time to review financial information with Municipal Services District staff. Council Member Tessa Stitzer agreed, stating that the council had historically worked effectively as a full group and that it would be beneficial for all members to participate in financial discussions rather than limiting them to two representatives. She also said they did not want to duplicate the work of the Municipal Services District trustees..

Council Member Stitzer moved to include finance and budget discussions as a recurring workshop agenda item until the budget was presented for approval with the MSD Board. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

Daniel Hoffman then introduced a second item regarding payroll services. He explained that Copperton currently used National Payroll Service for payroll processing, with himself acting as an intermediary who reviewed payroll information before submission. He noted that the company had recently changed representatives and adopted new payroll software. He explained that the Municipal Services District had also adopted a new payroll system called Paylocity, which other municipalities were already using, and the council could choose whether to remain with National Payroll Service or transition to Paylocity.

Mayor Sean Clayton asked whether switching systems would create any cost savings. Mr. Hoffman responded that the costs were approximately the same. Mayor Clayton asked

whether the council had experienced any problems with the current payroll service. Council Member Tessa Stitzer stated that in nearly ten years of service there had only been two instances when payroll deposits were delayed, both of which were corrected within about thirty minutes after notification. She added that they had never experienced problems with tax documents such as W-2 forms. Mr. Hoffman acknowledged that the current system had generally worked well.

Mayor Clayton asked whether switching systems would simplify Mr. Hoffman's administrative responsibilities. Mr. Hoffman replied that although it might provide some efficiency, they recommended keeping the current system for several months before reconsidering a change. Council Member Jonathan Pratt asked whether the Municipal Services District was essentially acting as a middleman between Copperton and the payroll provider. Mayor Clayton explained that when the system was originally established, the council wanted payroll checks issued under Copperton's name rather than the Municipal Services District, since council members were elected officials serving the town and not employees of the district. He also explained that Copperton maintained its own employer identification number and tax accounts, which were necessary for payroll reporting. Mr. Hoffman confirmed that if the council switched to the Municipal Services District system, Copperton would still have its own separate profile rather than sharing the district's account. After discussion, the council agreed to continue using National Payroll Service for the time being.

b. Resolution R2026-03, Adopting the Updated 2025 Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

Madison Warner joined the meeting virtually and explained that weather conditions had prevented her from attending in person. She began by briefly informing the council that she was available to assist the town with creating an event action plan for upcoming community events. Such plans address emergency response and safety considerations for events and are optional but recommended. She offered to assist anyone in the community or Community Council who might be organizing events and asked the council to share their contact information with those individuals if needed. She then returned to the primary agenda item concerning the Hazard Mitigation Plan. Ms. Warner reminded the council that approximately six months earlier she had presented the countywide Hazard Mitigation Plan, which includes a jurisdictional annex specific to Copperton. The plan identifies hazards affecting the area, outlines local capabilities, describes how Copperton coordinates with other jurisdictions, and establishes goals and guidelines for mitigating hazards specific to the community. She noted that the full document is extensive, totaling roughly 500 to 600 pages. When the council previously adopted the plan, FEMA was still reviewing it. FEMA had recommended that local jurisdictions begin adopting the plan even though their review had not yet been finalized. However, the original adopting resolution did not include language allowing FEMA to make changes without requiring additional council action. She explained that because this flexibility language had been omitted, the council now needed to formally readopt the plan after FEMA completed its review. The changes made by FEMA were minimal and included minor updates to information regarding floodplain areas, one mitigation action related to earthquakes, and a few small additions in other sections.

She explained that the slide presented during the meeting listed the specific areas where edits occurred so that council members who had previously reviewed the document would not need to reread the entire plan unless they wished to do so. She concluded by requesting that the council readopt the plan incorporating FEMA's revisions and offered to answer any questions.

Mayor Sean Clayton asked whether the council had any questions. Council Member Jonathan Pratt asked if there was a deadline for adoption. Ms. Warner responded that the plan must be adopted by the end of the calendar year unless Copperton chose to create its own independent hazard mitigation plan. Mayor Clayton then asked Town Attorney Nathan Bracken whether he had any comments. Nathan Bracken asked Ms. Warner whether the requested change involved language in the adopting resolution allowing FEMA revisions. Ms. Warner clarified that the missing language allowed FEMA to make additional changes without requiring the council to readopt the plan each time. Mr. Bracken stated that the council had used a template when it originally adopted the plan and that he had approved the prior resolution as to form. He also noted that the mitigation plan itself was primarily a technical document rather than a legal one, so he had not reviewed the full document but had reviewed the resolution language.

Mayor Clayton stated that he had reviewed the changes and believed they were acceptable, noting that FEMA was the agency responsible for reviewing the plan and ensuring it met federal requirements. Council Member Jonathan Pratt then asked whether the council could table the item for a future meeting to allow additional time for review. Mayor Clayton asked whether the plan had been included in the council's meeting packet. Town Clerk Diana Baun explained that the entire 400–500 page document had not been distributed, but the Copperton annex had been shared. Ms. Baun also noted that the resolution language came from recommended templates provided by emergency management agencies and that adoption of the plan was necessary to remain eligible for FEMA funding and grant opportunities. She added that the council had already adopted the entire plan months earlier and that the current action only incorporated FEMA's minor revisions.

Council Member Pratt reiterated that he wanted to fully understand what he was voting on. Council Member Tessa Stitzer explained that if Jonathan Pratt felt uncomfortable voting on the item, he could abstain from the vote.

Council Member Stitzer moved to approve Resolution R2026-03, Adopting the amended Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as discussed above. Council Member Bailey seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor with Council Member Pratt abstaining from the vote.

Mayor Clayton noted that in the future, council members could review the one-page summary of changes referenced in the resolution rather than reading the entire plan. Ms. Warner added that she would be happy to provide the original presentation or discuss the plan further with Council Member Jonathan Pratt if desired and asked that their contact information be shared for follow-up. Council Member Stitzer also offered to

assist Council Member Pratt with reviewing agenda items in the future, explaining that when she first joined the council similar discussions had been helpful. She said she would be available by phone, email, or group discussion if additional clarification was needed on future council matters.

c. Resolution R2026-04, Adopting a Resolution Expressing Appreciation for Council Member Kevin Severson

Mayor Sean Clayton read a resolution expressing the Copperton Town Council's appreciation for Council Member Kevin Severson. Mayor Clayton stated that Kevin Severson had joined the Copperton Town Council in 2018 and had represented At-Large Seat C since that time. Mayor Clayton noted that Kevin Severson completed two terms on the council, with his second and final term ending on December 31, 2025. He also stated that during Kevin Severson's service, he represented Copperton on the Salt Lake Valley Animal Services Advisory Committee, served as the council's liaison to the Copperton Planning Commission, and played an important role in guiding Copperton through the restatement of its land use ordinance in Titles 18 and 19 of the Copperton Code. Mayor Clayton then read the formal resolution language, which expressed the town's sincere appreciation for Kevin Severson's faithful service, valuable advice, and significant contributions, and extended the council's gratitude for having worked with him as a friend and colleague while wishing him well in his future endeavors. Mayor Clayton stated that the resolution was effective immediately as of February 18, 2026, and had been signed by Mayor Sean Clayton and attested by Town Clerk Diana Baun. After reading the resolution, Sean Clayton invited Kevin Severson forward to shake hands and receive recognition.

d. Transfer of Copperton Park from the County to the Town

Town Attorney Nathan Bracken explained the ongoing issue regarding ownership of Copperton Park. He stated that when Copperton incorporated, Salt Lake County held title to portions of several parks, including parts of Copperton Park. The county initially offered to transfer those portions to Copperton and the other Municipal Services District communities that had previously been metro townships. However, the proposed deed included a reversionary clause stating that if the property were ever used for anything other than a park, ownership would revert back to the county. He explained that Copperton and the other communities objected to that clause and declined to accept the deed because they believed the park should remain fully under local control without such restrictions. It had been unclear what legal basis the county had for insisting on the reversionary clause. Over the previous month, however, they had learned that county staff believed federal funds may have been used historically to develop some parks in unincorporated Salt Lake County. He explained that if federal funding had been used, the funding conditions could require the property to remain a park, and the county could potentially be required to repay the funds if the land were used for another purpose. There appeared to have been confusion within the county regarding which parks had actually received federal funding. According to Mr. Bracken, the one park clearly known to have received federal funding was Big Bear Park in White City. He

explained that Copperton Park appeared to have been originally developed by Utah Copper, later maintained by Kennecott Copper, and then deeded to the county in the 1960s. Their office reviewed the title history for Copperton Park and found no recorded evidence indicating that federal funding conditions applied. He acknowledged that while there could theoretically be an unrecorded agreement somewhere, restrictions of that nature are typically recorded in the property title chain. He also noted that Salt Lake County Council Member Laurie Stringham had been assisting Copperton and other communities in discussions with the county. The mayor had been kept informed and that staff had been communicating with county officials, including Marla Howard, to resolve the issue. Based on the information available, he did not currently see a clear legal basis requiring the reversionary clause and hoped the matter could soon be resolved.

Mayor Clayton stated that if the county removed the reversionary clause, the title transfer for the portion of the park currently held by the county could proceed. He explained that this would allow the town to finalize ownership of the park property, including completing arrangements related to the remaining portions owned by Rio Tinto. He described the issue as an eight-year discussion and noted that the county had only recently claimed the clause was necessary because of federal funding. The town had asked county officials to identify the specific federal funding source, but no one had yet been able to provide details. The county had suggested the town might need to repay federal funds if the clause were removed, but they had not been able to specify the amount or the funding program involved. Mayor Clayton expressed frustration with the lack of documentation supporting the claim.

Council Member Kathleen Bailey added that federal land and water conservation grant funds had been widely used in the 1970s, but Copperton Park did not appear to qualify because it had been owned by Utah Copper or Kennecott at the time. She explained that when the property transferred to Salt Lake County, no funds were exchanged for the land, meaning there was no clear basis to claim that grant funding had been involved.

Council Member Stitzer stated that the current situation reinforced the council's earlier decision to refuse the deed containing the reversionary clause. She expressed satisfaction that the council had insisted on resolving the issue rather than accepting the restriction.

Mayor Clayton stated that he believed the matter was moving toward resolution and that the town would continue working with county officials. He hoped the council might be able to approve a revised agreement at the March meeting if the county agreed to remove the clause.

Council Member Bailey asked whether the town could stop paying insurance for the park while the ownership issue remained unresolved. Mayor Clayton responded that the town still needed to maintain insurance coverage, even though the county technically held title, and noted that the county itself was self-insured. He stated that if

the county continued to delay the transfer, the town could potentially pursue reimbursement for the cost of maintaining the park over many years. They had informally estimated those maintenance costs over the past decade. Sean Clayton also questioned the county's argument that federal funds had been used for park improvements, noting that many improvements such as the playground and buildings were located on property owned by Rio Tinto rather than the county.

Mr. Bracken added that while the town had no intention of developing the park for other uses, maintaining flexibility was still important. He explained that a reversionary clause could restrict future options, such as allowing economic uses like concessions or potential property exchanges if circumstances ever changed. Other communities are facing similar issues with parks that were expensive to maintain but not widely used, and restrictions like this could prevent them from exploring alternative uses.

Mayor Clayton concluded by stating that the town would continue pushing for a resolution and would keep the council informed as discussions with the county progressed. He also mentioned speaking with an individual planning to run for district attorney, who had indicated that if the issue remained unresolved in the future, it appeared straightforward and could potentially be addressed quickly. He reiterated that the town would continue seeking clear documentation regarding any federal funding claims and work toward completing the park title transfer.

e. Appointment of Representative to Jordan Basin Improvement District

Council Member Bailey moved to appoint Council Member Jonathan Pratt as the town's representative to the Jordan Basin Improvement District and for staff to prepare a letter indicating the above appointment. Council Member Stitzer seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

f. Appointment of Representative to Salt Lake County Animal Services

Council Member Pratt moved to appoint Council Member Tessa Stitzer as the town's representative to Salt Lake County Animal Services and for staff to prepare a letter indicating the above appointment. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

g. Discussion and Potential Action Regarding Council Board/Committee Assignments and/or Changes

Mayor Sean Clayton reviewed the current assignments, noting that Council Member Jonathan Pratt and Mayor Sean Clayton served on the Utah League of Cities and Towns legislative policy committee. He stated that legal updates were handled by Town Attorney Nathan Bracken. Mayor Clayton also noted that Council Member Tessa Stitzer served as the liaison for the cemetery board and the Copperton Community Council. He further stated that the Planning Commission liaison position had previously been held by former Council Member Kevin Severson. He then asked whether council

members wished to make any changes to their current assignments. He asked Council Member Tessa Stitzer if she wanted to continue serving as the liaison for the cemetery board and the Community Council. Council Member Stitzer confirmed that she wished to continue in both roles. Mayor Clayton also noted that Council Member Kathleen Bailey generally served as the council's primary contact for park-related matters, although the council handled park issues collectively rather than through a formal parks committee.

Council Member Stitzer added that she would also continue serving as the council's liaison with Rio Tinto, noting their prior work with the company. She also stated that she had been serving as the liaison to the Trans-Jordan Landfill and would continue in that role.

Mayor Clayton then explained that the Planning Commission liaison position remained vacant following Kevin Severson's departure and stated that the Planning Commission met infrequently, sometimes once a year and sometimes not at all. He asked whether any council member would be willing to take on that assignment. Council Member Linda McCalmon volunteered to serve as the Planning Commission liaison.

Mayor Clayton moved to appoint Council Member Linda McCalmon as the Council's Liaison to the Planning Commission. Council Member Stitzer seconded the motion; vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor.

Council Member Jonathan Pratt offered guidance to Council Member Linda McCalmon regarding the role of serving as the council's liaison to the Planning Commission. He explained that the Planning Commission is established by statute and is therefore required by law. The commission's primary responsibility is to handle work related to land use matters and the town's land use code. He noted that each year the legislature increasingly assigns more responsibilities to planning commissions and removes some of those responsibilities from city councils. The Planning Commission functions in a quasi-judicial capacity when reviewing land use applications and other planning matters. He said that because of this role, the commission must provide a fair and objective environment for applicants and community members to discuss proposals before decisions are made. He advised that the council liaison should generally observe the proceedings rather than participate in or influence the commission's discussions. Council Member Pratt referenced former Council Member Kevin Severson's approach to the role, stating that Mr. Severson typically attended meetings, listened to the discussions, and provided information only if the commission had questions related to the council. Council Member Pratt said that Mr. Severson avoided directing the commission on how to handle specific issues and allowed members to conduct their discussions independently. Council Member Pratt recommended that Council Member McCalmon follow a similar approach by observing the meetings, remaining aware of the issues being discussed, and reporting back to the council when necessary while allowing the commission to deliberate freely.

8. COMMITTEE/BOARD UPDATES

a. Utah League of Cities and Towns Legislative Policy Committee

Town Attorney Nathan Bracken provided a legislative update to the council regarding activity at the Utah Legislature. He explained that since the previous council meeting, the legislative session had still largely been focused on budget matters, which meant relatively few bills had been passed at that time. Only about 40 bills had passed earlier in the session, although the number had likely increased since then because a record number of bills had been introduced. He explained that most legislation typically moves quickly during the final weeks of the session, after the first several weeks are spent moving bills through committee. He noted that near the end of the session the legislature sometimes suspends procedural rules to accelerate passage of bills, which can allow controversial proposals to move forward quickly with less public discussion. Significant land use legislation often appears late in the session under those circumstances.

Mr. Bracken then discussed a bill being developed with Representative Verona Mauga Peruchi that Council Member Jonathan Pratt and himself had been monitoring with the Utah League of Cities and Towns. Mr. Bracken explained that the bill relates to the acquisition of surplus school properties. Under current law, “eligible entities” have priority to acquire unused school buildings, but the definition of an eligible entity requires a municipality to have at least 3,000 residents per square mile. Copperton does not meet that threshold, although it comes relatively close because of its small geographic size. He explained that the bill was originally drafted to remove the priority from municipalities and give it to charter schools. The proposal had since been revised to remove the population density requirement and place municipalities and charter schools on equal footing when competing to acquire unused school properties. He noted that while Copperton does not currently have a school within its boundaries, other Municipal Services District communities such as Kearns and Magna are interested in acquiring closed schools for redevelopment that could increase retail activity and property tax revenue across the broader region. Mr. Bracken also discussed a bill related to the Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service Area and the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling District. He explained that a bill sponsored by Representative Verona Mauga Peruchi originally included language that would have allowed Salt Lake County to withdraw from the Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service Area without conducting a feasibility study. This proposal had raised concerns because it would alter the current withdrawal process for special districts. The portion of the bill addressing the Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service Area had already been removed. However, the bill still contained language allowing the City of Herriman to withdraw from the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling District. He explained that the Utah Association of Special Districts opposed that provision because there is already an established statutory process for withdrawing from a special district. He noted that discussions were underway to determine whether Herriman and the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling District could negotiate an agreement instead, which would eliminate the need for the legislation. He noted that similar legislative conflicts regarding district withdrawals had occurred for years in communities such as White City before the current statutory compromise was adopted. The bill had passed the House without the law enforcement service area provision but still included the recycling district provision.

Mr. Bracken also provided an update on a proposed “starter home” bill that had been

discussed during the previous council meeting. He reported that the bill, which would have allowed developers certain exemptions from existing land use regulations for starter home developments, had failed in committee earlier that day. He said the bill was effectively dead for the session but predicted that similar legislation related to starter housing would likely be introduced again in the future.

Mr. Bracken then discussed House Bill 501, which relates to water funding. He explained that the state currently spends approximately \$2 billion annually on water-related needs. Instead of funding that amount directly through state appropriations, the proposed bill would require local water providers to impose a fee based on the median income of the community they serve. He explained that water providers would multiply the community's median income by a percentage to determine the fee, which would then be assessed to water system connections. Preliminary estimates suggested the fee could range from approximately \$1,400 to \$2,500 per connection annually depending on the area. The bill was originally written to make the fee mandatory for water providers seeking state funding assistance. However, the Utah League of Cities and Towns had negotiated revisions that made the fee optional. He explained that even with the change, water providers might still need to impose similar fees if they wished to qualify for state funding programs. Many water providers might instead choose to self-fund their projects rather than impose the fee, but either approach would likely result in increased water rates. He confirmed that the bill had passed the House Natural Resources Committee and was moving forward in the legislative process.

Council Member Jonathan Pratt asked whether the bill had advanced out of committee. Mr. Bracken confirmed that it had passed the committee vote by approximately ten to two, and added that the Utah Association of Special Districts opposed the bill, while the Utah League of Cities and Towns had shifted to a neutral position after negotiating amendments.

Council Member Pratt also referenced Senate Bill 197, which addresses transportation governance. Mr. Bracken explained that the bill would restructure the governing board of the Utah Transit Authority. The current board consists of three full-time members nominated by county governments and formally appointed by the governor. He explained that the proposed bill would expand the board to seven members. Under the proposal, the existing three members would become part-time board members, and four additional members would be appointed directly by the legislature, with two appointed by the Senate and two by the Speaker of the House. The legislature's interest in the change likely reflects the possibility of increased state funding for transit projects. However, he noted that some local governments were concerned that the change could reduce local influence over transit decisions, since the additional members would not be nominated by local governments. He added that for smaller communities such as Copperton, which already receive limited transit attention, a larger board could make it more difficult to secure support for local transit needs.

Mayor Sean Clayton thanked Mr. Bracken for the update and asked if there were any additional legal updates. Nathan Bracken responded that the council had already covered the remaining legal matters earlier in the meeting during the discussions about the park property and the legislative issues.

b. Legal Updates

No updates at this time.

- c. Bingham Cemetery Board
- d. Copperton Community Council

Council Member Tessa Stitzer provided updates regarding the Community Council and the cemetery board. She stated that the council had already discussed matters related to the Community Council earlier in the meeting. Regarding the cemetery, She reported that the town had officially received the donation from Rio Tinto and that the funds had been placed into the appropriate account. She also noted that several interments had taken place during the early part of the year. She explained that the related activity would likely appear in the financial reports during upcoming budget discussions.

e. Planning Commission

No updates at this time.

9. COPPERTON COUNCIL REPORTS

- a. Mayor Sean Clayton
 - i. Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District (GSLMSD)
 - ii. Council of Governments (COG)

Mayor Sean Clayton explained that the meeting had been relatively brief and consisted primarily of legal and legislative updates. He stated that much of the discussion involved reviewing numerous legislative bills that could affect special districts, noting that approximately 25 bills were discussed during the legal update portion of the meeting. Many of the bills were more relevant to districts than to individual municipalities and therefore were different from the legislative items Town Attorney Nathan Bracken had presented earlier, which focused more directly on municipal concerns. Mayor Clayton highlighted one proposal that generated significant discussion among district representatives. The bill would allow individuals undertaking construction projects to hire their own plan reviewers or building inspectors rather than relying solely on the jurisdiction's designated inspectors. He gave the example of a homeowner building an addition to a garage who could potentially hire a private plan reviewer to approve the project. Mr. Bracken added that some version of this proposal tends to appear during most legislative sessions.

Mayor Clayton stated that beyond that issue, the remaining bills discussed at the district meeting were largely unrelated to Copperton's specific concerns. He also reported that the board approved several routine transactions, including funding for sidewalk improvement projects in White City and Kearns. He explained that those projects were partially funded through grants, with the district contributing matching funds. He noted that he intentionally

supported those projects, explaining that supporting improvements in other communities helps maintain cooperation when Copperton seeks support for its own projects in the future.

b. Council Member Linda McCalmon

i. Unified Police Department (UPD)

ii. Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service area (SLVLESA)

Council Member Linda McCalmon provided updates regarding the Unified Police Department and the Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service Area. She reported that at the beginning of the year the board completed its election cycle and welcomed new representatives from Holladay, Kearns, and White City to the Unified Police Department board. She explained that board members also received new committee assignments as part of the transition. She informed the council that the Unified Police Department was offering a program called “UPD 101,” which would provide council members with an overview of how the department operates. The class would cover topics such as budgeting, operational structure, and other aspects of the department, and would provide an opportunity for council members to ask questions. The department intended the program to increase transparency and was willing to schedule the session at a time convenient for the council. She estimated the session would last approximately one to two hours and asked whether the council would like her to arrange it. She also reported that the Unified Police Department board had approved a new position titled Associate Director of Information Technology Infrastructure Architect. She then provided an update from the Salt Lake Valley Law Enforcement Service Area. She stated that the board had welcomed new members and had selected a new board chair, Carolyn Keegley, along with a vice chair, Phil Cullimore. She added that the board also reviewed routine recruiting and expenditure reports for November and December.

Mayor Sean Clayton asked whether any council members were interested in participating in the UPD 101 training. Several council members indicated interest. He then asked Council Member McCalmon to pass along the information and coordinate with Chief Craig to arrange the training session for the council. He clarified that Chief Craig serves as the police chief responsible for the department that provides law enforcement services to Copperton, and he is stationed in Magna.

c. Council Member Kathleen Bailey

i. Unified Fire Authority (UFA)

ii. Unified Fire Service Area (UFSA)

Council Member Kathleen Bailey reported on recent discussions from the Unified Fire Authority board meeting. She explained that the board completed its annual ethics training, which is typically presented by Brian and provides an overview similar to the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act. The training focused on ethical responsibilities for board members. The meeting was largely a housekeeping session. She noted that approximately 20 legislative bills were being monitored that could potentially affect the Unified Fire Authority, but none were considered serious enough at the time to warrant immediate action by the board. She did

mention one proposal aimed at protecting first responders who provide assistance under governmental immunity provisions. She explained that the existing protections had previously applied only to large-scale events, and the legislation would extend protections to broader circumstances involving emergency assistance. She also described a discussion regarding the cleaning of firefighter turnout gear. Turnout gear used during active fires becomes contaminated with carcinogens and must be thoroughly cleaned after use. The board discussed a specialized cleaning system that uses liquid carbon dioxide to clean the gear. No fire department in Utah currently has this system, and contaminated gear must currently be shipped to external providers for cleaning, resulting in additional shipping costs and delays. The board discussed whether acquiring the system locally could be cost-effective, potentially through grant funding, and expected that further information would be gathered before a decision was made. She then raised a concern brought to her by a community member regarding homeowner's insurance availability in the area. Some residents were reportedly having difficulty obtaining or changing homeowners insurance policies because insurers were identifying Copperton as a higher wildfire risk area. She said they were unsure what actions the town could take to address the issue but suggested the council might want to investigate possible options. She also shared a personal experience in which they attempted to change insurance providers but were unable to obtain coverage from another company due to wildfire risk concerns.

Council Member Tessa Stitzer confirmed that similar issues had occurred in her household, stating that their previous homeowner's insurance provider had dropped their coverage because of wildfire risk and they were required to obtain a new policy.

Mayor Sean Clayton noted that Town Attorney Nathan Bracken had information regarding the issue and Mr. Bracken explained that the issue stems largely from House Bill 48, which required the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands to update statewide wildfire risk maps. Mr. Bracken stated that insurance companies are now using those maps to determine wildfire risk when deciding whether to insure properties. He explained that as part of the same legislation, insurers must now follow stricter procedures before denying or canceling coverage. Under the law, homeowners located in high-risk areas will have the opportunity over the next two years to obtain an official wildfire risk assessment for their property. He explained that homeowners can take mitigation steps—such as modifying landscaping, replacing siding, or otherwise improving fire resistance—to lower their risk score. He said those assessment results will be shared with local governments and insurers and could help homeowners obtain insurance coverage. He also explained that property owners may choose not to participate in the assessment process, but after the two-year period a fee may be imposed based on the wildfire risk score. If a homeowner declines the assessment, the highest possible risk score could be assigned automatically, but the amount of that fee has not yet been determined. He clarified that the wildfire risk maps used by insurers are separate from the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) map adopted by the town. The state wildfire maps determine insurance risk ratings, while the local WUI map adopted by Copperton governs building code requirements for new construction. When the council adopted the WUI map, it intentionally limited its application primarily to undeveloped areas surrounding the town rather than applying it to the

already developed portions of Copperton. He explained that residents can voluntarily upgrade their properties to meet WUI standards if they want to reduce wildfire risk, but existing homes within the town are generally not required to comply under the local code.

Mayor Clayton confirmed that the WUI map adopted by the town applied mainly to areas outside the existing developed parts of Copperton and would primarily affect future development rather than current homes. Mr. Bracken added that the state wildfire map currently rates much of Copperton as a level five or six risk area, which likely contributes to the insurance issues residents are encountering.

Mr. Bracken also noted that another legislative proposal may require municipalities to adopt a newer version of the WUI code, potentially the 2021 version rather than the 2006 version previously adopted. He explained that if that legislation passes, the town may need to revisit its WUI ordinance. He further noted that the proposal would prevent municipalities from applying WUI requirements to areas rated lower risk by the state map, as some jurisdictions had previously extended WUI regulations more broadly than intended. He concluded that while the town has limited authority to influence insurance company decisions, one potential approach could be educating residents about wildfire mitigation measures and WUI requirements that might help lower property risk scores. He also observed that some WUI standards can be difficult to apply in urban environments with smaller lot sizes, noting that many requirements were originally designed for large rural properties rather than compact neighborhoods. Mayor Clayton reiterated that the insurance issue primarily originates from state wildfire mapping rather than the town's local land use decisions.

d. Deputy Mayor Tessa Stitzer

i. Wasatch Front Waste and Recycle (WFWRD)

Council Member Tessa Stitzer provided an update regarding the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling District. She stated that Nathan Bracken had already addressed most of the current issues related to the district, particularly the legislative discussion concerning how municipalities may withdraw from special districts and the situation involving the City of Herriman leaving the Wasatch Front Waste and Recycling District. She explained that the district had determined Herriman's withdrawal would not affect the services currently being provided to other communities, including Copperton.

Council Member Stitzer also reported on a change to the district's billing system. She explained that the district has transitioned from quarterly billing to monthly billing, this change had previously been discussed with the council during an earlier meeting. The adjustment was implemented to improve the district's cash flow because previously the district relied on quarterly tax certifications before receiving revenue. She explained that monthly billing allows revenue to be collected more consistently throughout the year, which helps stabilize operations and may help keep service fees lower. She advised council members and residents to watch for the new monthly statements and clarified that customers still have the option to pay quarterly or annually if they prefer, but statements will now be issued monthly. She added that late fees and other penalties may apply if payments are not made on time.

e. Council Jonathan Pratt

No updates at this time.

10. OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Public Comment

Kevin Severson - stated that he wanted to thank the council members he had served with, as well as other current and former council members. He said that his time on the council had been a valuable learning experience and that he appreciated the opportunity to serve alongside the individuals involved in town leadership. He also expressed appreciation for their experience working with the Salt Lake Valley Animal Services advisory committee, noting that it was a strong committee and that he would miss working with its members. He concluded by thanking everyone for the opportunity to serve.

Mayor Clayton thanked Kevin Severson for his remarks and commented that it had been a positive experience working together. Mayor Clayton also stated that Kevin Severson was always welcome to return and jokingly suggested that after taking a short break, Kevin Severson could come back in the future.

Laura Ingersoll from Rio Tinto Kennecott addressed the council regarding recent trespassing issues near company property behind the Lions Club building in Copperton. She explained that the company had recently observed several instances of individuals entering the area through a gate near the Lions Club and walking down the stairs into the property. The lock on the gate may have been cut, and that at one point the gate had been left without a lock for about a month. She reported that employees working nearby had taken photographs after noticing people walking in the restricted area. She also noted that the company currently does not have cameras installed there but planned to install some in the future. She explained that the property contains multiple hazards and that the company was concerned about safety as well as ongoing trespassing. The company had experienced other security issues in the area as well, including fences being cut. She asked council members to inform residents that the area is restricted and to discourage anyone from entering if they hear people discussing going there.

Mayor Clayton responded that there had recently been individuals on the Lions Club property behind the building and that they had been asked to leave. Ms. Ingersoll said the company was unsure whether the individuals were Copperton residents or people coming from outside the area. She added that historically the site had experienced trespassing from individuals attempting to steal materials such as wire or poles. She noted that most of those incidents did not appear to involve local residents.

Mayor Clayton mentioned that one individual had reportedly entered the area because Google Maps listed a lake in that location. Ms. Ingersoll responded that some recent incidents also appeared to involve people simply walking or exploring the area without realizing it was restricted.

Mayor Clayton suggested that additional warning signs might help deter people from entering the property. Ms. Ingersoll stated that locks had been reinstalled on the gates and that signage was already in place.

Council Member Jonathan Pratt asked about a dirt road near his home where people sometimes walk along the fence line. Ms. Ingersoll explained that the official position of the company is that the property is private and the public should not be there, although the company does not typically enforce restrictions as strictly in that area. She clarified that the company is more concerned about areas closer to operational facilities, such as near the concentrator, where hazards are present.

Ms. Ingersoll explained that operational areas are subject to safety requirements enforced by the Mine Safety and Health Administration, including the requirement for personal protective equipment. When trespassing occurs in those operational areas, the company takes the issue more seriously and coordinates with the Unified Police Department to file reports and address the situation. She concluded by reiterating that the company wanted residents to be aware of the hazards and asked that people be encouraged to stay out of restricted areas.

b. Announcements

Nathan Bracken informed the council that in the past a personnel policy had been drafted for Copperton when the town was considering hiring a shared assistant position. Mr. Bracken explained that the position was never ultimately hired, so the personnel policy was never formally implemented. After discussing the matter with Clayton Preece, an attorney at their firm who specializes in human resources matters, it was recommended that all of their client cities adopt personnel policies regardless of whether they currently have employees. Mr. Bracken explained that adopting the policy and providing training would help protect council members by establishing clear procedures and demonstrating that the council had received appropriate HR training if an issue were to arise. He said the policy was already drafted and only required minor updates before being brought back to the council at the next meeting.

Mr. Bracken also provided an additional legislative update that had not been included earlier. He explained that Representative Tyler Clancy had introduced a proposal to create a committee composed of mayors from west-side communities that border Rio Tinto property, including Copperton and Magna. Mr. Bracken stated that the purpose of the committee would be to work collaboratively with Rio Tinto to develop a long-term framework for potential annexations of Rio Tinto property in the future. He emphasized that the proposal would not require Rio Tinto to annex into any specific municipality but would establish a planning process to determine where annexations might occur if Rio Tinto eventually chose to pursue them. Mr. Bracken reported that he had already spoken with Laura Ingersoll and Rio Tinto's lobbyists regarding the proposal. He stated that both the Utah League of Cities and Towns and Rio Tinto had expressed some concerns about the legislation, which led Representative Clancy to slow efforts to advance the bill during the current legislative session. He said discussions would likely continue during the legislative interim, but explained that the broader goal behind the proposal was to continue the long-term effort to transition Salt Lake County away from providing municipal services through the Municipal Services District and to eventually have

most west-side areas governed by incorporated municipalities rather than the county. Mr. Bracken noted that while some unincorporated areas on the east side of the valley may remain unincorporated indefinitely, much of the west side is expected to eventually annex into surrounding cities. The proposal was intended to create a more structured and cooperative process for those future annexations rather than leaving the process open-ended.

Council Member Tessa Stitzer then asked whether Laura Ingersoll was still present at the meeting. After confirming that Laura Ingersoll was present, Council Member Stitzer asked if it would be acceptable to send an email to discuss the trespassing issues mentioned earlier and share some ideas. Ms. Ingersoll agreed to connect with Council Member Stitzer.

11. 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))

12. ADJOURN

Mayor Clayton moved to adjourn the February 18, 2026 Town Council Meeting. Council Member McCalmon seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

The February 18, 2026 Town Council Meeting adjourned at 8:40 P.M.

This is a true and correct copy of the February 18, 2026 Town Council Meeting Minutes, which were approved on March 18, 2026.

Attest:

Diana Baun, Town Clerk

Sean Clayton, Mayor