MINUTES
ENOCH CITY COUNCIL
May 6, 2026 at 6:00pm
City Council Chambers
City Offices, 900 E. Midvalley Road

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Mayor Jim Rushton
Council Member David Harris
Council Member Shawn Stoor - Excused
Council Member Debra Ley
Council Member Kimberlee Trower
Council Member Jacob Miner

STAFF PRESENT:
Ryan Robinson, City Manager
Ashley Horton, Treasurer
Lindsay Hildebrand, Recorder
Jackson Ames, Police Chief
Justin Wayment, City Attorney
Hayden White, Public Works Director

Public Present: Tyler Melling, Delaine Finlay, Tom and Donna Phoenix, Jonathan Wilson, and Bill Grimshaw

1. **CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING**
    a. **Pledge of Allegiance-** Led by Ashley Horton
    b. **Invocation (2 min.)-Audience invited to participate-** Given by Council Member Trower
    c. **Inspirational thought-** Given by Council Member Trower
    d. **Approval of Agenda for May 20, 2026- Council Member Harris made a motion to approve the agenda. Council Member Trower seconded and all voted in favor.**
    e. **Approval of Minutes for May 6, 2026 – Council Member Harris made a motion to approve the minutes. Council Member Trower seconded and all voted in favor.**
    f. **Conflict of Interest Declaration for this agenda-** None Stated

2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
There were no public comments.

3. **SET A PUBLIC HEARING FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2025-2026 BUDGET FOR JUNE 3, 2026**
Council Member Harris made a motion to set a public hearing for adjustments to the 2026-2026 budget for June 3, 2026. The motion was seconded and all voted in favor.

4. **PUBLIC HEARING FOR EXECUTIVE STAFF COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS**
Ashley said the only compensation is the 5% COLA and the 1% Step which is across the board for all employees.

Council Member Harris made a motion to close the regularly scheduled City Council meeting and move into a public hearing for executive staff compensation amendments. Council Member Ley seconded and all voted in favor.

There were no public comments.

Council Member Trower made a motion to close the public hearing and reconvene the regularly scheduled City Council meeting. Council Member Ley seconded and all voted in favor.

5. **PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE 2026-2027 TENTATIVE BUDGET**
Council Member Harris made a motion to close the regular council meeting and move into a public hearing for the 2026-2027 tentative budget. Council Member Trower seconded and all voted in favor.

There were no public comments.

Council Member Harris made a motion to close the public hearing and reconvene the regular City Council meeting. Council Member Trower seconded and all voted in favor.

6. **CONSIDER RESOLUTION NO. 2026-05-20-A, A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30TH 2027**

Mayor Rushton asked if there were any changes from what had been discussed in previous budget sessions. Ashley Horton raised an important issue: Lynn Nelson, the building inspector, had sent an email (to Robinson and Horton) requesting additional funds in the budget for a part-time building permit technician or inspector, along with associated costs. His estimate was at least $60,000.

Horton explained that she had not yet sat down with Lynn to review the details thoroughly. She suggested that, because the request had not been discussed in great detail and the budget was already slightly in the negative, it might be prudent to leave this expense out of the current budget. She recommended seeing how the year progressed, noting there were many unknowns about whether the intern they had would work out and whether she would be hired permanently. The intern was currently shadowing Lynn on inspections and was in the process of passing tests to become licensed. Horton suggested they could perform a mid-year budget adjustment once they had more concrete information about staffing direction, rather than making assumptions about who would be hired and what their wage would be.

Council Member Harris emphasized that, generally, the building department should be more or less self-sustaining, so if they hired someone, they would need to adjust the fee structure to ensure it was paid for through building fees rather than general funds. He wanted to ensure it would be a net-zero impact on the budget.

City Manager Robinson explained another consideration: Currently, Enoch, Parowan, and Brian Head had arrangements to cover for each other with building permits. Lynn was the official building inspector for Parowan and Brian Head, and they were working on making him Enoch's official building inspector as well (though he already performed those duties; it was just a title formalization). Parowan's building official had recently taken a job in Cedar City, leaving Parowan without coverage. As the only licensed inspector able to perform certain inspections for Parowan, Lynn was covering a significant portion of their work. Parowan had asked if Enoch would contract Lynn out to perform inspections for them. While Parowan was not growing as rapidly as Enoch, they still needed regular inspection services. This arrangement would involve Parowan paying Enoch for Lynn's services, which could help offset the cost of a part-time assistant. In the meantime, Mindy Kropf in the Enoch office was working on obtaining additional requirements and licensing tests.

Council Member Trower asked if the revenue from Parowan could help pay the salary for the part-time position. Robinson confirmed that if they moved forward with that arrangement, Parowan would pay Enoch a certain percentage, and the specifics would be worked out in an agreement. He noted this development had occurred within the past week, and with Parowan's city manager out that week, they had not gotten far in negotiations.

Ashley Horton noted that if they hired someone and discussed it with the Council beforehand, they would probably need to do a budget adjustment in December when they opened the budget anyway, to ensure they would not be in the negative by year's end.

Council Member Harris made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2026-05-20-A, A resolution adopting the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30th 2027. Council Member Trower seconded and a roll call vote was held as follows:

Council Member Stoor – Absent	**Council Member Harris – Yes**
Council Member Ley: Yes	**Council Member Trower: Yes**
Council Member Miner: Yes	

7. PUBLIC HEARING TO DISCUSS POTENTIAL CHANGES FOR ALL WATER IMPACT FEES

Council Member Harris made a motion to close the regular city council meeting and move into a public hearing for the potential changes to all water impact fees. Council Member Trower seconded and all voted in favor.

Tyler Melling explained that he had been reading through meeting minutes where there had been considerable discussion about moving away from meter size-based impact fees toward equivalent residential units (ERUs) or some other metric. He expressed strong support for this approach, explaining it was a major problem encountered in many jurisdictions. He elaborated that meter size is governed by plumbing code requirements for fire flow and fixture count, but it does not reflect actual water impact, especially for commercial and industrial applications. In many cases, meter size overstates the impact by as much as tenfold. He encouraged the Council to equip staff with discretion to match impact fees to actual impact on the system rather than strictly using meter size, which is based on factors other than water consumption. He noted there were good comparables available—if someone was building a Wendy's restaurant, there were other Wendy's locations to examine for actual water usage data. The same applied to convenience stores, industrial parks, and other commercial uses. This data could be used to reduce the fee down to equivalent residential units rather than basing it strictly on the maximum flow capacity of the meter size, which often reflected fire flow requirements rather than actual system impact. Melling noted that this issue significantly impacts economic development, and as a resident, he would prefer to see more of the tax burden shift to commercial users coming to Enoch rather than falling on residents.

Billy Grimshaw explained his unique situation. He owned just over two acres with nine acre-feet of water rights, but was only using one meter. He questioned how he was supposed to use all that water through just one meter according to current resolutions. He asked whether he was expected to sell the water or if the city would give the water rights back, seeking clarity on how this situation would be handled.

City Manager Robinson asked for clarification about whether Grimshaw had given nine acre-feet to the city. Grimshaw confirmed that he had given the water to the city and was using only a small amount for his dwelling. Robinson explained that he did not believe this impact fee change would affect what Grimshaw was currently doing.

Robinson clarified that the residential impact fee changes had been made back in January. The current discussion was about everything else—multifamily housing, commercial, industrial, and similar uses. This was essentially a catch-up for those categories and would not necessarily affect individual residential properties.

Mayor Rushton further explained the fundamental change: instead of paying an impact fee based on water meter size, the fee would be calculated based on equivalent residential units (ERUs). For an apartment building, for example, they would look at how many bathrooms and other fixtures were present to calculate water usage equivalent to residential homes, and the impact fee would be charged based on that equivalency rather than meter size. Grimshaw asked about the upcoming tiered water rate structure, and Mayor Rushton indicated they would address that later.

Mayor Rushton then asked Grimshaw whether he was talking about building more residences when he mentioned adding meters. Council Member Ley sought clarification about what Grimshaw meant by "paying more for this." Council Member Harris explained that if Grimshaw built another residence, there would be another impact fee charged. If Grimshaw had given nine acre-feet to the city, he might have banked water rights that he could apply to building more units. Harris acknowledged he did not fully understand Grimshaw's water situation, particularly why he had given nine water shares for one residence.

Grimshaw explained that his property was in "old Enoch," and the water rights had all gone to the city. Council Member Harris reiterated that if another house were added to the system, there would be another impact fee because the city would be providing water for that home, which was the nature of the impact. However, Grimshaw should not have to pay any impact fee if he was not developing anything. If he added another meter merely to monitor a portion of his pasture, that would not require an impact fee, only if he was developing new structures.

Mayor Rushton sought confirmation about whether they would assign an ERU to a meter based on its intended use. Hayden White suggested that Grimshaw should come to the office to discuss his specific situation in detail. Council Member Harris assured Grimshaw that his banked water was tied to his property and he would not lose it.

Mayor Rushton noted a benefit of banking water with the city: it could be held with fewer restrictions on losing it compared to continuously farming it. Robinson added that the impact fee discussion would not affect Grimshaw at all. If he ever decided to develop the property with nine homes, each home would have an impact fee, but that was standard for any development. He clarified that the current discussion did not really impact residential development since those changes had been made in January.

Council Member Harris made a motion to close the public hearing and reconvene the regular city council meeting. Council Member Trower seconded and all voted in favor.

8. CONSIDER ORDINANCE NO. 2026-05-20-A, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE WATER IMPACT FEE

Council Member Harris confirmed the ordinance was amending the calculation method (to ERU instead of meter size) rather than changing the fee amount itself

Council Member Harris made a motion to approve Ordinance No. 2026-05-20-A, an ordinance amending the water impact fee. Council Member Miner seconded and a roll call vote was held as follows:

Council Member Stoor – Absent **Council Member Harris – Yes**
Council Member Ley: Yes **Council Member Trower: Yes**
Council Member Miner: Yes

9. PUBLIC HEARING TO AMEND THE WATER RATE STRUCTURE AND USER FEE

Council Member Harris made a motion to close the regular city council meeting and move into a public hearing to amend the water rate structure and user fee. Council Member Trower seconded and all voted in favor.

Delaine Finlay asked if the Council could explain what the water rate structure amendments entailed. City Manager Robinson brought up a presentation on the screen showing the current fee structure and began explaining the proposed changes.

Robinson explained the analysis process: the city had used a financial modeling system called Waterworth from a fee group that helped with the calculations. Waterworth took into consideration Enoch City's projected 3% growth rate over approximately 20 years (modeled through 2045), including growth projections, infrastructure needs, and planned projects. The consultants indicated the modeling was probably quite accurate for the next 10 years, but beyond that timeframe, predictions became unreliable. The city could experience explosive growth or slow growth, making long-range forecasting difficult. Therefore, staff focused primarily on the next 10 years of projections and incorporated major projects planned during that period.

Ensign Engineering had provided cost estimates, and Robinson explained the state required communities to charge a minimum water rate, based on water costs equaling about 1.5% of average household income (Enoch's average was roughly $60,000), to qualify for certain grants and demonstrate local cost-sharing. Robinson reported Ensign had initially proposed a five-tier rate structure, but the Water Board recommended simplification to a three-tier model (four tiers including the base fee), revising the first usage band from 20–40,000 gallons to 0–20,000 gallons with a base fee and charging incrementally above that; the Board rejected assumptions in the Waterworth and Ensign models that highest-tier users would not change behavior. Robinson noted that planned projects were considered and that Public Works and Finance staff were conscientious about minimizing waste.

Harris reviewed valley-wide water challenges, explaining that long-term over-allocation of roughly 31,000 acre-feet of water and a declining water table since the 1970s–80s, compounded by poor water years, had driven current curtailments; he clarified that overall acre-feet use had not increased since those decades but had shifted from agricultural to residential use. Harris and Trower emphasized the risks of groundwater fissures and irreversible aquifer damage, noting Iron County's reliance on groundwater rather than surface water, and that state groundwater management and encouragement of tiered rates aimed to curb overdrafting and qualify municipalities for grants. Robinson clarified rate revenue would maintain existing infrastructure while impact fees would fund growth-driven expansions, and Harris concluded that proposed rates sought to balance water stewardship without unduly stifling needed economic growth, mentioning longer-term solutions such as bringing West Desert water to the valley.

Tyler Melling raised two major concerns for consideration. First, regarding existing water customers and residents who had either themselves or through their developer/builder given an acre-foot of water to the city, while he understood the need to factor that in, the tier structure needed to contemplate that situation carefully. However, when customers exceeded their allotment, the city was not charging nearly what it actually cost to deliver that additional water.

Melling explained that just as growth had an impact on the system, so did overuse. If someone was using more than their allotment, more than 30,000 or 40,000 gallons in a month, that represented additional source capacity needed in wells, additional transmission lines, and additional water tank capacity in the culinary system (unless they were on secondary water). All of that infrastructure had real costs. While the proposed change was a step in the right direction, wherever the city drew the line for high usage, it needed to be much higher than currently proposed, unless the Council was comfortable with other ratepayers subsidizing overuse.

Harris fully intended for the Council to visit water rates every single year, along with a number of other fees. He would much rather see 3-5% increases annually to keep up with inflation than wait 10 years and implement a 50% increase all at once. He agreed with Melling that they should consult with engineers more to get closer to the hard cost figure.

Melling said one number he would be curious about, which he had just read in the memo and found illustrative from other areas he had examined, was what percentage of the city's total system use fell into those top tiers. That excess capacity had not been accounted for in impact fees (which legally could not be charged for it). It was not accounted for in the base rate or lower tiers either. That usage represented a system subsidy to those users from other ratepayers or from taxpayers generally. Melling shared data from Cedar City about six years prior: roughly half of all culinary water went to the top usage tiers, consumed by about 5% of users. In the Enoch report, he had noted that 17% of users were in the top tier, but it did not state how much volume those users consumed. Council Member Harris confirmed that staff had looked at high users and had some understanding of usage patterns. Melling acknowledged it was likely a significant portion of total water consumption.

Melling's second major issue concerned new development. He stated he did not think it was wise or sustainable policy for Enoch to continue assessing an acre-foot per connection, acknowledging the city was looking at changes in that area. He referenced a report from Cedar City's system about a conservation tier they had implemented for new construction a few years ago. Data had now been gathered showing results: Cedar was assessing 0.37 acre-feet per connection for new users in the conservation tier, but those users were tending to use closer to 0.18 to 0.2 acre-feet. Cedar charged very high rates if users exceeded 12,000 gallons per month.

New users agreed to the conservation tier going in with full disclosure. They could always buy up if they wanted more water. What this accomplished was helping reduce the waste element. About 5% of users on the conservation tier still exceeded their allotment, but they paid a hefty rate for that excess and were not subsidized by other ratepayers. This meant growth was helping pay for system improvements rather than drawing resources away from the system. Melling strongly encouraged the city to take a closer look at these aspects. While he thought the current proposal was a good baby step, over the next couple of years (perhaps phased in), the city could be in a much better position.

Melling shared that Cedar had increased their cash position in revenues by a little over $1.5 million annually while using the same amount of water they had used six years ago.

They achieved this without really changing rates for existing homeowners who were already paying into the system. It came mostly from those overusing their allotment and from new growth.
Council Member Harris confirmed they were looking at conservation rates for new development and had been considering that approach for PUDs as well. Everything Melling described was things they had been discussing and working on. Harris acknowledged that Enoch typically had bigger lots and had a secondary water system (which helped offset culinary water use), so their numbers would probably work out somewhat differently from Cedar's situation.

Delaine Finlay noted that she had been reading in the newspaper and wanted clarification. She asked if the Water Conservancy Board was recommending a $5 increase on water. She asked if this was correct and if it had been taken into account in the city's rate calculations. Both Harris and Council Member Trower (both serving on that board) indicated they were not aware of such a recommendation yet. Trower explained that while there were rate discussions based on the Pine Valley Water Supply Project, she had not seen anything concrete. They had not actually discussed specific numbers at the water board meetings.
Trower clarified that there would be a Water Conservancy District meeting the following Thursday (the 28th) where rate discussions might occur. Any rate changes at the Conservancy level would not affect Enoch's current rates because the city paid a wholesale rate to the Conservancy, and that wholesale rate would be determined through a different process.

Mayor Rushton added that Enoch was not yet buying water from the Conservancy. At some point, when they were purchasing water from the Conservancy and selling it at retail rates, that would be a different conversation. But currently, the Water Conservancy changing their rates would have no impact on Enoch's retail water rates.

Billy Grimshaw questioned why the billing was structured on a monthly basis instead of annually, since the water year was annual but only three months experienced heavy use. During the rest of the year, people were hardly using anything. He felt customers should get rollover gallons to the next month's bill since it was a water year, not a water month.
Someone asked if Grimshaw was on the culinary system or secondary system. He confirmed he was on the culinary system. Council Member Harris acknowledged understanding Grimshaw's point, people using water for irrigation in summer were using much more heavily, but only for a couple of months. However, that was precisely when the city was running all of its wells, experiencing the most wear and tear on equipment. They did not have all wells running in winter. The city had to structure billing month-to-month because that provided a more direct correlation to expenses and upkeep. Averaging it out over the year would result in everyone paying less, but the city would still experience heavy usage and expenses in summer months when all wells were running.

Harris explained that a significant part of the tiered structure was to encourage people to be wise about water use. The city had some people using 400,000 gallons per month because they had huge lots, planted entirely with grass and trees, watering all night every night. They did not need to do that. Part of the tiered system was to encourage people to be smart about usage. Enoch still had some of the cheapest water in the entire west, and people moving to the area realized how cheap it was and tended to overuse it significantly. Much of the rate structure was about curbing behavior and helping people be wise with water. If they averaged over the year and brought costs down, Harris did not think it would change behavior, which was necessary.

Grimshaw made a comment about the city pumping every gallon they could legally pump if they needed it. Harris clarified as far as the system would allow it. They would pump what was needed but would not pump unnecessarily. Council Member Ley asked about the cost for residents not currently on secondary water to get connected if they wanted to add it. Hayden White explained that if there was a secondary line in front of a residence, the property owner could pay the city $1,900 and the city would install the connection. That price was just the cost of parts.

Council Member Harris made a motion to close the public hearing and reconvene the regular City Council meeting. Council Member Miner seconded and all voted in favor.

10. **CONSIDER RESOLUTION NO. 2026-05-20-B, A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE ENOCH CITY FEE SCHEDULE –** Water rate structure and user fee

    Council Member Harris agreed that conservation rates should be considered; Harris noted that customers on conservation rates typically used less water (for example, about 8,000 gallons per month) and that outdoor watering increased usage significantly. Ley observed that more homes created greater expectations for parks and contributed to heat, a point Harris agreed with, while adding that trees could help and that planning additional parks was reasonable. They noted changing household preferences. Older and younger families were less interested in yards, so offering smaller, less expensive options preserved choice. Mayor Rushton raised whether conservation requirements (and future owners who might add grass) would need to be enforced through an HOA. Tyler Melling explained the difference between CC&Rs and HOAs, that CC&Rs allowed private legal action by lot owners and did not always imply an HOA, and that conservation-rate status would have to be noted in CC&Rs and monitored at the meter. Harris clarified the city would not enforce HOA guidelines, and Trower asked whether customers could opt into a conservation rate; Tyler said some jurisdictions offered rebates for that.

    Council Member Harris made a motion to approve Resolution 2026-05-20-B, amending the Enoch City fee schedule (water rate structure and user fee), clarifying that the base rate would be $30.30. Council Member Trower seconded and a roll call vote was held as follows:

    Council Member Stoor – Absent **Council Member Harris – Yes**
    Council Member Ley: - Abstained **Council Member Trower: Yes**
    Council Member Miner: Yes

11. **CONSIDER RESOLUTION NO. 2026-05-20-C, A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF ENOCH CITY, UTAH, RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 2026-04-01-B AND WITHDRAWING APPROVAL AND AUTHORIZATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR PINION SPRINGS ESTATES, AND AUTHORIZING RELATED ACTIONS**

    Council Member Harris made a motion to approve Resolution no. 2026-05-20-c, a resolution of the mayor and city council of Enoch City, Utah, rescinding Resolution NO. 2026-04-01-B and withdrawing approval and authorization for the development agreement for Pinion Springs Estates, and authorizing related actions. Council Member Trower seconded and a roll call vote was held as follows:

    Council Member Stoor – Absent **Council Member Harris – Yes**
    Council Member Ley: - Yes **Council Member Trower: Yes**
    Council Member Miner: Yes

12. **CONSIDER ORDINANCE NO. 2026-05-20-B, AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND ENOCH CITY ORDINANCE 12.500.504 - NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES AND 12.1200.1204 -1205 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR SINGLE FAMILY PUD HOUSING –** See Planning Commission Rec.

City Manager Robinson explained the proposal from Velocity Homes to amend the city's parking standards, noting the Planning Commission had asked staff to review regional PUDs and that Cedar City had recently made similar changes; Robinson initially stated the changes would apply only to PUDs. Tyler Melling corrected that the ordinance language would affect areas outside PUDs as well and described Velocity's experience at Cedar Bend, noting parking shortages were due more to driveway length and configuration than sheer stall count and that Cedar had since required longer driveways. Melling explained the proposed reclassification of townhomes and condominiums from single-family to multifamily standards (shifting from a flat two stalls per unit to parking calculated by bedrooms or 1.5 stalls per bedroom for garage models, versus one per bedroom for congregate lots), and he provided survey and study data supporting higher requirements for certain designs. Council members raised concerns about increased on-street parking, narrow street widths (particularly in the Penny property PUD), and fire and public-safety access; Robinson said an unlawful parking ordinance addressing overnight and emergency-access restrictions would be brought forward. Melling emphasized that market forces and enforcement were important to ensure the use of the provided parking. Mayor Rushton warned that leaving the ordinance unchanged could recreate Cedar Bend–type problems.

Council Member Harris made a motion to approve Ordinance No. 2026-05-20-B, an ordinance to amend Enoch City Ordinance 12.500.504 - Number of Parking Spaces and 12.1200.1204 -1205 Development Standards for Single Family PUD Housing. Council Member Trower seconded and a roll call vote was held as follows:

Council Member Stoor – Absent | **Council Member Harris – Yes**
Council Member Ley: - Yes | **Council Member Trower: Yes**
Council Member Miner: Yes

13. **CONSIDER AT LEAST TWO APPOINTMENTS TO THE APPEAL AUTHORITY BOARD**

City Manager Robinson explained the Appeal Authority Board's role in hearing variance requests and appeals, clarifying variances were tightly governed by state law, required five specific standards, and applied only to unique, natural property conditions (not man-made issues or use changes); the Board's decisions were final administratively but could be appealed to district court. He reported a quorum problem: the ordinance required three members and eight alternates, staff had unsuccessfully contacted most appointees, and only one of eight responded, leaving the Board unable to hear a pending variance for the Phoenix family. Robinson noted Council members and Planning Commissioners could not serve due to conflict-of-interest concerns, and staff had explored alternatives (single-member boards or contracting outside professionals) but preferred retaining a three-member panel; contracted professionals could be paid by the city or through applicant fees. He explained the purpose of many alternates to avoid conflicts, confirmed training would be required before service, and described the appointment process (Mayor's appointment with Council consent, confirmations to be returned at the next meeting). Council members suggested potential volunteer names (Colin Nielsen, Bob Tingey, Jolene Perkins, Reed Erickson, Tricia Collars) and discussed spouse/residency issues; Robinson emphasized the immediate need for reliable members who would respond to contact, that no action could occur until three members were appointed, and that staff would return confirmed names for formal appointment so the pending variance could proceed.

14. REVIEW BOOTS-FREI DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

City Manager Robinson presented the latest draft development agreement and accompanying master plan, explaining the materials were conceptual, developers could still rearrange layouts, and staff had used the Pinion Springs agreement as a template. Council reviewed property location and road connectivity, noting developments needed at least two access points and expressing a preference for connections to major collectors such as Highway 91 or Bulldog Road while cautioning about relying on adjacent undeveloped projects for access. City Attorney Wayment identified density as the central policy issue, reporting the draft contemplated roughly 1,139–1,160 lots on about 280 acres (approximately 4.04 units per acre), which exceeded Pinion Springs' roughly 3.07 units per acre and represented a notable shift from Enoch's traditional patterns; members discussed how higher density could support affordability and water conservation but also reduce individual lot sizes once streets and rights-of-way were accounted for. A lengthy parks and open-space discussion followed: Robinson noted the agreement required 55 acres of open space but the current master plan showed far less; Council debated options including numerous HOA-maintained pocket parks, phased park construction tied to unit buildout, or the city accepting and building a larger centralized park (options discussed ranged from one-acre pocket parks up to a 25–40 acre major park), with trade-offs considered between maintenance burden on the city, attraction of outside users, and developer feasibility. Members raised concerns about using drainage basins as counted parkland, requested firm phasing language so parks would be constructed as neighborhoods developed, and suggested formulas such as one acre of park per certain number of units as a possible standard. Wayment cautioned against over-prescriptive long-term requirements that could stall a 15–20 year project, recommended flexible but enforceable agreement language, and offered to draft proposed park and phasing language for Council review; staff agreed to correct map boundary errors, consolidate Council comments, obtain developer input on park configuration, and return revised agreement language at the next meeting.

Justin said he will put something together. If it's all a consensus, they will send it to the Fries and see what they think.

15. COUNCIL/STAFF REPORT

Hayden White

Anderson Well Project:

- Surface seal was installed on the Anderson well last week
- Drilling was progressing at approximately 80 feet per day1
- Hit a boulder patch during the day of the meeting, which would likely slow progress
- Well had reached 200 feet in depth, already deeper than the original well

Memorial Day and Road Maintenance:

- Preparing for Memorial Day activities
- Road chipping season starts in two weeks
- Crews hauling chip material and street sweeping to prepare roads for chipping

Landfill Operations:

- Landfill is experiencing heavy usage, busy throughout the day. He had received numerous public comments requesting extended hours. He was considering raising fees to extend hours—possibly adding two extra hours daily or an additional Saturday per month. The proposal would include a 50-cent fee increase for extended service

Highway 91 Construction:

- Construction scheduled to start in August (as of current timeline)

Snow Damage and Tree Maintenance:

- Tree damage from recent snow was minimal. They had a couple of tree issues at Parks.
- One neighborhood tree fell on a car—police called Public Works to bring a loader. Fortunately, the operator walked around and inspected before using the loader—discovered the car underneath before pushing the tree, preventing damage.
- Current work primarily focused on trimming trees—snow broke some branches, making trees look unsightly

Community Cleanup Discussion:

- Council Member Trower suggested community cleanup options as an alternative to extended landfill hours
- Traditional approach: residents place items curbside, city picks up over a week or a month period. Hayden White preferred running a dumpster rotation system instead. The dumpster system would require only two staff members and could clean the whole city in months, versus shutting down operations for two months solid with curbside pickup.
- Proposed model: Purchase 10 dumpsters, place them on one street for two days, then rotate to the next street. Some cities offer free dumpster service via a waiting list—a dumpster is dropped at the residence for three days, then moved to the next person on the list. This approach requires only one staff member running dumpsters continuously versus shutting down entire city operations. City Manager Robinson suggested placing dumpsters at City Hall and other locations throughout town. Hayden explained county landfill rules: stationary dumpsters must be manned to prevent improper disposal (which results in city being charged fees)1
- Strange rule: rotating dumpsters through neighborhoods doesn't require manning, but stationary locations do require staff presence.
- Council Member Trower suggested rotating dumpster locations at City Hall (moving from one parking area to another) to potentially bypass the manning requirement

Dumpster Purchase Costs:

- Estimated cost to run dumpster program: approximately $200,000. He would need a new truck—currently using a used truck to avoid spending $150,000 on new equipment. If running the dumpster program extensively, we would need a new truck for reliability. There is a possibility of CIB grant funding for equipment. Mayor Rushton questioned using taxpayer money to pay private companies for this service.
- The mayor asked Hayden to research options and provide cost estimates to the Council

UDOT and Minersville Highway:

- Council Member Trower requested city reassess the situation with UDOT regarding Minersville Highway improvements. UDOT claims insufficient traffic volume to justify improvements. Staff members meet with UDOT monthly and raise this issue at every meeting. UDOT indicates that once the Lins facility is operational, there might be sufficient traffic to justify improvements. Mayor Rushton confirmed that widening Minersville Highway to five lanes to the roundabout is in UDOT's plan. City wants the interchange constructed first, before the widening project.

<u>Ryan Robinson</u>

America 250 Grant Funding:

- Received $1,500 stipend from the America 250 organization for 4th of July festivities. Those funds will be used within the next two weeks.
- Requirements: display the America 250 logo on materials and acknowledge them publicly.

- Money will fund bounce houses for 4th of July celebration

4th of July Parade:

- Submitted request for National Guard or Color Guard participation
- National Guard already committed for Pioneer Day (July 24th)
- Due to high demand, might receive Color Guard instead of National Guard
- Confirmed one of those groups will participate in Enoch's parade
- UDOT approved having stages on roads for National Guard participation

Lins Facility Tour:

- City staff toured the Lens manufacturing facility.
- We are working with Joans and DeMille for a stormwater district.

City Website:

- We've got a project going with the website. We have someone cleaning it up for us, and there will be training for staff for the maintenance.
- He met with Roger Carter, who is the city manager for Washington City. We have two student projects. Cleaning up social media and they will do an audit of our code to see if we need to make things more efficient.
- Trower asked about the social media requirements. Justin said its not required by law but its suggested that employees put on social media that their opinions are not coming from the city. By putting that disclaimer on it that this is their own opinion and can speak freely. Robinsons said we are working on that as well.

<u>Lindsay Hildebrand</u>

- She asked the council if they would prefer to list a public hearing on the same agenda item as the corresponding resolution or ordinance. Harris said it doesn't change much. Miner asked, to speed the meeting up, could we do all public hearings together as one agenda? Justin said no it's better to keep it clean.

<u>Council Member Ley</u>

- She showed the Iron County America 250's 13 days of celebration. On June 28th, there is a day where everyone in the county should illuminate their homes, businesses, and city halls with lights. They should decorate with red, white, and blue colors.

<u>Jacob Miner</u>

- He noted there will be a one-page advertisement in the Pioneer Legacy handout. Bailey did a wonderful job in creating that.

16. CLOSED SESSION TO DISCUSS ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING: THE CHARACTER, PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OR PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH OF AN INDIVIDUAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING; PENDING OR REASONABLY IMMINENT LITIGATION, THE PURCHASE, EXCHANGE, OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY, INCLUDING ANY FORM OF WATER RIGHTS OR WATER SHARES; DEPLOYMENT OF SECURITY PERSONNEL, DEVICES OR SYSTEMS; INVESTIGATIVE PROCEEDINGS REGARDING ALLEGATIONS OF CRIMINAL MISCONDUCT.

Council Member Harris made a motion to close the regular city council Meeting and move into a closed meeting for the buy sell or trade of real property, imminent litigation or personnel matters. Trower seconded and a roll call vote was held as follows:

Council Member Stoor – Absent	**Council Member Harris – Yes**
Council Member Ley: Yes	**Council Member Trower: Yes**
Council Member Miner: Yes	

17. ACTION FROM CLOSED MEETING –

18. ADJOURN – Council Member Ley made a motion to adjourn. Council Member Trower seconded and all voted in favor.

▪ 06/05/2026

Lindsay Hildebrand, Recorder **Date**