

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING
CITY OF CEDAR HILLS
Tuesday, May 5, 2026 6:00 p.m.
Civic Center
3925 W Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah**

Present: Mayor Denise Andersen, Presiding
Council Member Laura Ellison
Council Member Bob Morgan
Council Member Erika Price
Council Member Kelly Smith

Absent/Excused: Council Member Mike Geddes

Staff: Chandler Goodwin, City Manager
Charl Louw, Finance Director
Kevin Anderson, Public Works Director
Greg Gordon, Recreation Director
Hyrum Bosserman, City Attorney
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder
Lt. Kevin Doyl

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

1. Call to Order

The City Council meeting of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mayor Andersen.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council Member Price,

The Invocation was offered by Mayor Andersen.

2. Approval of Meeting Agenda.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to APPROVE the Meeting Agenda. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment.

Cedar Hills resident Marlow Springer expressed disappointment at seeing a water feature outside the building given current water concerns. Regarding secondary water rates, he expressed concern that increasing rates is not enough to curb usage especially among higher income residents who may be willing to pay more. He suggested the city consider warnings at 25% over allotment and turning off

service at 50% over allotment. He also asked about the proposed property tax increase and whether it would remove the public safety fee from utility bills.

Cedar Hills resident Craig Limb expressed concerns about meter accuracy. He stated his system had been completely shut off except for three test runs, yet the app showed he was using 50 gallons a day. He said he was not completely confident in the system that we have tracking at this point and asked how residents could challenge meter readings.

Cedar Hills resident Al Castillo expressed interest in understanding how water fees would be structured and how different property owners would be charged.

Cedar Hills resident David Yorkua commented on the proposed water rate structure for over watering, stating that he believed most people would support the proposal.

Jeff Richards, a 32-year Cedar Hills resident, raised several questions about meter accuracy, noting instances where meters apparently recorded usage when water was shut off. He asked whether the city's tier system was commensurate with the tariff system for the city, or are we paying more than the city pays for water. He asked if this is a revenue source. He also questioned why the city was not installing rain sensors on sprinkler systems to prevent watering during storms.

Cedar Hills resident Kristen Trelz expressed concern about the fountain running during a drought, when people see that water running when they are expected to cut back on watering. She suggested not running the fountain and reconsidering the splash pad during the drought. She requested transparency about what commercial properties and churches are paying in tiered pricing.

Mayor Andersen read a comment submitted from James Reed, a Cedar Hills resident who could not attend. Mr. Reed stated he fully supports protecting our water, especially during drought conditions. He does not support a price increase because it allows the wealthy to potentially waste the valued shared resource. He suggested that if a resident uses more water than the city has allotted based on property size, that resident's secondary water is turned off the remainder of the month.

Council Member Morgan read an email from resident Tyler Gressmen raising multiple concerns: questioning whether every secondary water meter was reading accurately with 100% certainty; referencing HB 242 which caps secondary water rate increases at 10% per calendar year; questioning fairness given that a significant portion of our city's irrigation allotment goes to the golf course, yet only a small percentage of residents actually use it; noting that residents have been asked not to water until May 15th, yet he has seen city sprinklers running on Cedar Hills Drive at night; and suggesting alternatives including a full independent meter audit, rebates, incentives for those of us who have smart irrigation controllers.

Cedar Hills resident Adam Baker brought with him 21 pages of 2 Facebook threads that have over 150 comments from several dozen Cedar Hills residents, all of whom are reporting the same kinds of meter problems. He described patterns where June and July's consumption was consistent. August shows way high, and then September is back down. He stated there are a significant number of Cedar Hills residents who do not have confidence yet in this new PI meter system and asked for a pause on using the system as basis for rate increases. He noted this cost increase would be on the top of what

is an effective cost increase from last year and mentioned that food prices are higher, and the city tonight is going to be discussing a property tax increase as well.

REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS/RECOGNITIONS

4. Presentation of awards for outstanding seniors from Lone Peak High School.

Council Member Price explained that each year the Community Outreach Committee reaches out to the high school principal to identify outstanding seniors. She then recognized and read the Lone Peak High School's principals statements for the following outstanding students: Jaren Wunder, Ethan Wunder, and James Ahlander.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Approval of the Minutes from the April 14, 2026, City Council Meeting.

MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda. Council Member Morgan seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

CITY REPORTS AND BUSINESS

6. Mayor and Council, City Manager and Staff.

Greg Gordon provided an update on the golf course project, stating that the mainline had been installed on holes 2 and 3, and tee boxes on holes 1 through 8 had been redesigned. The goal remains to have the front 9 completed by July 18th. He reported that August through September would see the back 9 closed while the front 9 remained playable.

Mr. Gordon reported current recreation programs including soccer, kindergarten soccer, second grade soccer, and street hockey. Registration was open for Family Festival events, pickleball tournament, summer golf camps, summer bowling, and sports camps. He announced that the Family Festival magazine had shipped and residents should receive it within a couple of days and thanked the American Fork Chamber for sponsorship assistance.

Kevin Anderson reported that public works had been redoing the sprinkler systems in parks, testing them, and programming them to water a couple times a week. He stated they are busy getting everything finalized for the road projects for this summer.

Council Member Smith announced a Family Festival Committee meeting on Thursday night to finalize activities for the 250-year celebration of America. She emphasized the need for volunteers and encouraged residents to consider volunteering.

Council Member Ellison reported that the Youth City Council (YCC) would meet this Thursday. They are busy getting ready for activities for the Family Festival. She said that YCC applications for the upcoming year would open July 1st through July 31st.

Mayor Andersen reported on the recent Utah League of Cities and Towns conference attended by council members, city manager, and legal counsel, where they learned about water issues, property tax issues, and legislation affecting cities.

She provided an update on the North Utah County Interfaith Council meeting, where interim Alpine School District Superintendent Rob Smith spoke about the district transition and how communities and cities could help.

Mayor Andersen proposed that Cedar Hills pursue the Get Healthy Utah designation to be awarded at next April's conference, noting we are already doing everything there and seeking council feedback on the idea.

She announced a flag-raising ceremony on May 30th (the Saturday before Family Festival week) where retired flags would be collected for proper disposal.

Council Member Price announced a patriotic program for May 31st at 5 p.m. at Heritage Park as part of the American 250 celebration. She also mentioned an essay contest and requested help connecting with homeschool families in the community.

Council Member Morgan announced the Charleston facility would hold an open house on May 20th from 3:00 to 5:30 p.m. He stated his preference is for direct communication, and urged residents to call or email him directly. He provided his contact information. He expressed his concern about negativity on Facebook.

Mr. Goodwin stated he would address issues raised during public comment, organizing them into three categories: water concerns, meter concerns, and property tax questions.

Water Supply and Drought Conditions

Mr. Goodwin displayed aerial photographs comparing snowpack on February 26, 2026 and March 26, 2026, demonstrating the severe lack of snow. He stated that we rely heavily on snowpack to get us through April, May, and June. He explained that peak water runoff typically occurs in late May or early June, but this year it occurred around March 26th and was already trending downward. He stated that we do not have another way to get water right now without putting watering abilities later in the season in jeopardy.

Fountain and Water Features

Mr. Goodwin explained it is a residential-style fountain. It cost the city \$3,000 and it holds 20 gallons. On a hot day it would only lose about 3 gallons. He noted that the hardscape and drip irrigation system installed was actually going to conserve a lot of water.

Meter Accuracy

Mr. Goodwin addressed meter accuracy concerns, noting that 5,000 meters were installed on the pressurized irrigation (PI) side. He suggested that most people do not understand how much water they are using because they have never had to monitor outdoor watering before.

Mr. Goodwin acknowledged that some meters have been found to be defective, with technicians reporting about 5 out of 100 or approximately one-tenth of one percent. He said that he has a high

degree of confidence that 99.9% of the meters are reading exactly as they should. He noted that when a bad meter is found, the city swaps it out and zeros out previous readings.

He displayed a comprehensive spreadsheet showing every lot's water usage as a percentage of allotment, with red indicating usage over 150%, yellow over 100%, and green within allotment. The spreadsheet demonstrated that the majority of residents were watering within their allotment, but some were using 800% or more of their allotment.

Water Sources and Management

Mr. Goodwin provided detailed information on the city's water sources: Pleasant Grove Irrigation Company (PGIC): The city owns 450 shares, typically yielding about 8,900 acre-feet in a normal water year. In April 2025, the city used 165 acre-feet of PGIC water. This year, usage was only 25 acre-feet, demonstrating significant conservation by residents.

Central Utah Project (CUP): The city has 710 acre-feet allocation, typically turned on July 1st when PGIC water slows down. CUP has allowed drawing down 120% of shares, but anything over 710 acre-feet used this year would come out of next year's allotment.

Canyon Well: An irrigation well on the golf course being used earlier than desired due to low PGIC flows.

Cottonwood Well: A culinary well with capability to feed the irrigation system.

Mr. Goodwin presented the water plan calling for a 20% reduction in water use throughout the city, including parks. He stated if people stay within their allotments, we have plenty of water even in a drought. But we have to stay within the confines of what we have in water rights. He emphasized, if we cannot get people to use less water we cannot guarantee there is water at the end of September.

Golf Course Watering

Mr. Goodwin explained that the grass on the greens is about one-sixteenth of an inch with sand bedding and if you do not water that every day, it burns to a crisp really easily. He noted the golf course had cut back significantly in April, but that greens and tees require daily watering. He stated the course would reduce watering on fairways and roughs, which might look a little drier sometimes.

Tiered Rate Structure

Mr. Goodwin explained the proposed rate structure would double the top three tiers (above 150% of allotment) but would not change rates for responsible water users staying within their allotment. He stated that the city does not want to collect any extra money from a homeowner. He emphasized that financial impact was the only mechanism he had seen that changes watering behavior.

He noted that tier rates 5 and 6 were not instituted until September of the previous year, so residents using excessive water in the summer did not receive full bills until October. The spreadsheet showed significant reductions in usage after those bills were received.

Public Safety Fee and Property Tax

Mr. Goodwin clarified that the public safety fee on utility bills would remain even if the property tax increase were approved. The current fee of \$12.30 per month (recently increased from \$10) generates

approximately \$360,000 annually, covering only 12-15% of the \$2.3 million annual public safety contract cost.

Splash Pad Water Use

Mr. Goodwin reported the splash pad used 7.49 acre-feet of water in 2025 and described it as some of the most efficient water that the city uses. It is used twice, the water is pumped from Harvey Well, used at the splash pad only when manually activated, collected, and then pumped back to irrigate Harvey Park.

Meter Testing and Verification

Mr. Goodwin stated the Public Works Department would test any meter upon resident request. He proposed developing a comprehensive report compiling all meter-related work orders with issues identified, dates, and resolutions. He suggested this could be supplemented with random testing throughout the city, though he did not support a full audit.

He explained that meter problems could stem from the meter itself, the node (radio transmitter), signal transmission issues, or software errors. He noted that sometimes the app shows different data than billing due to signal timing differences, but the bill is not generating that.

Church and School Watering

Mr. Goodwin reported the city had reached out to churches with excessive water use, and several were removing non-functional turf on hillsides and replacing it with xeriscaping. Schools generally did not overwater. All churches and schools are on the same tiered rate system as residents.

SCHEDULED ITEMS & PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 7. The Budget Officer intends to state that the Tentative Fiscal Year 2027 Budget includes a proposed property tax rate increase.**
- 8. Statement of the Budget Officer that the Tentative Fiscal Year 2027 Budget includes a proposed tax rate increase.**
- 9. The Budget Officer presents and makes available to the public a Property Tax Impact Schedule.**
- 10. Review/Action on a Resolution acknowledging that, pursuant to Utah Code § 59-2-919(4)(a), the Budget Officer (i) stated as a separate item from the budget and in a public meeting that the tentative budget includes a proposed property tax increase and (ii) presented a property tax impact schedule separate from other budget documents, and further directing that the property tax impact schedule shall be made available for public inspection.**

Charl Louw, Finance Director, explained that according to legislative code, the city was required to state that the tentative Fiscal Year 2027 budget includes a proposed property tax rate increase. Mr. Louw stated the proposed property tax increase is 20% to the general operations rate, which had not been changed since 2010, and includes a decrease of 26% to the golf debt levy.

Mr. Louw presented the statement of the Budget Officer and property tax impact schedule as required by Utah Code 59-2-919.

He explained that the city receives a certified tax rate each June that includes new growth from home improvements, new homes, and new commercial development. The proposal would exceed that

certified tax rate by \$150,000. The purpose of the increase is to cover increasing public safety costs. He explained that public safety in our area and throughout the Wasatch Front is increasing much more than any other inflationary part in city budgets. He noted American Fork implemented two salary increases for public safety personnel the previous year and was still struggling to retain staff.

Mr. Louw explained that historically, sales tax could offset the public safety contract, but now our contract is twice as much as our historical sales tax, which is not even close to covering the contract. He noted that without the property tax increase, the public safety fee would need to increase by \$4 per ERU (equivalent residential unit) per month, and golf operations would need to transfer \$30,000 to help cover costs. With the property tax increase, the golf debt levy would be reduced.

Mr. Louw provided detailed calculations for the average residential property: Average market value: \$678,342. Residential discount: 45% (paying 55% of market value). Average taxable value: \$373,000. Current general operations tax: \$277.95 annually. Proposed increase: \$55 annually or \$4.63 monthly. Golf debt levy decrease: results in net increase of \$2.21 monthly. He provided information on the impact on average commercial property: Average market value: \$2.4 million (detached unit). Commercial properties pay 100% of market value. Current general operations tax: \$1,800 annually. Proposed increase: \$363.24 annually or \$30.27 monthly.

Mr. Louw explained that legislative code requires the proposed \$150,000 increase to be set aside in a restricted budget account until after the August public hearing, to be placed in the general government department. He reviewed each department, stating that for all departments operational impact maintains current service levels with or without a property tax increase.

Departments reviewed included: General Government (liability insurance, legal services, litigation, financial audit, IT support, utilities, maintenance, membership fees, communication tools). Mayor and Council (community outreach, youth city council, Balloon Festival, MAG board, ULCT board). Administrative Services (city manager, planning, risk management, human resources, communication, public relations, internal audit, cash receiving, various board participation, passport services). Recorder (meeting recording, minutes, elections, notary services, Wellness Committee). Finance (accounting, revenues, payroll, treasury, financial audit, utility billing, collections, capital improvement funding). Public Safety (police, fire, dispatch, crossing guards). Community Development (zoning, building, business licensing). Public Works (streets, sidewalks, buildings, culinary water, storm water management). Solid Waste (garbage, recycling, dump passes). Parks (maintenance of buildings, trees, open space, playgrounds, irrigation, restrooms, community events, holiday lighting). Community Services (recreation, Family Festival, library, community outreach)

Mr. Louw noted that the city has a lean staff, and positions have been consolidated in prior years to minimize costs. Total general fund compensation for staff and elected officials is projected at \$1,293,358, which is approximately 23% of general fund operational costs. Service contracts increase each year with inflation, like public safety and waste management are a significant cost portion of general operations. Modifying these contracts would not guarantee cost savings or service level improvements.

The Budget Officer's Property Tax Impact Statement, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

MOTION: Council Member Morgan moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 05-05-2026A, a resolution acknowledging that the Budget Officer provided a statement that the Tentative Budget includes a proposed Tax Rate Increase and presented a Property Tax Impact Schedule. Council Member Price seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

11. Review/Action and Public Hearing on a Resolution adopting the Tentative Fiscal Year 2027 Budget (July 1, 2026 to June 30, 2027).

Mr. Louw explained that the tentative budget outlines Cedar Hills' proposed fiscal plan for FY 2026–2027, focusing on public safety funding, utility operations, capital improvements, and long-term infrastructure sustainability. The budget balances service continuity while addressing rising contractual, infrastructure, and inflationary costs.

Mr. Louw reviewed the following items:

Property tax and public safety funding: A proposed 20% property tax rate increase would generate approximately \$150,000 for general operations, primarily to absorb public safety contractual increases. A public hearing is scheduled for August 11, 2026, prior to final budget adoption in August. As a temporary measure, the interim budget uses a \$4/month public safety fee increase per ERU, a \$30,000 transfer from the golf fund.

Mr. Louw said that if the property tax increase is adopted the \$4 public safety fee would be credited back to residents. The golf transfer would be moved to reduce the property tax debt levy. He explained that Cedar Hills' property tax levy remains significantly lower than neighboring Utah County bedroom communities, both historically (2015) and currently (2025), despite similar or higher median household incomes. Median household income in Cedar Hills (\$139,008) is higher than Salem and lower than Alpine. In 2025, Cedar Hills' portion of the total property tax bill remains a minor share compared to school district and county levies.

Mr. Louw stated that the average 2025 home value was \$678,342. The proposed levy change would increase the average annual property tax bill by \$26.49, or \$2.21 per month. The change would also reduce the debt levy by approximately \$80,000 citywide. The national and state economic indicators show continued stability, with strong earnings growth and Utah job creation remaining above national trends. Sales tax revenue is normalizing toward historical averages. Golf programming continues to lead revenue growth, with green fees increasing year over year through April 2026.

Mr. Louw next reviewed the Capital Projects and City Center improvements. Significant investment is planned for City Center drainage and landscaping to address longstanding flooding, mold, and grading issues. The final awarded bid for integrated drainage and landscaping was \$254,700, with a focus on: water-efficient irrigation, retaining walls and grading correction, drought-tolerant landscaping and hardscaping. Layouts for City Center offices and furnishings support operational efficiency and future growth.

Mr. Louw explained that the utility fee changes include a 4.9% Waste Management increase (plus recycling market adjustment). The public safety fee increase is tied to contractual costs. There are no immediate changes to culinary or storm drain rates. A 15% sewer cost passthrough from TSSD is anticipated January 2027. He pointed out that the water and sewer funds emphasize debt servicing, contractual treatment costs, and long-term water sustainability and drought response. He said that

Cedar Hills is receiving \$2 million in grant reimbursements for secondary water meter installations completed between 2022–2026.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing.

Cedar Hills resident Connie Brooks stated she thinks we need to educate more. She emphasized that education takes time and repetition and encouraged the city to continue educational efforts. She stated the city was doing well but needed to persist. She said it has taken her a long time to understand all the issues.

Cedar Hills resident and HOA representative Wayne Gardner stated that HOAs do not have access to flow meters and valves for their subdivisions and cannot monitor water usage. He said no one in the subdivision has any idea what they are using and noted his 48 years of experience in flow control and the irrigation industry. He stated that he needs to be able to monitor usage on a daily basis without calling the city.

Mr. Goodwin responded that HOAs should have access to read their meters through the same app system and encouraged Mr. Gardner to meet with the Public Works Department to set up access.

Cedar Hills resident Trent Augustus echoed earlier public comments about difficulty with the water calculator and meter readings. He noted that lot size does not account for house size and irrigable area, making calculations unclear. He also noted challenges with watering times due to wind, saying we have to water at certain times because the wind is horrible.

Mr. Goodwin responded by explaining the water rights conveyance formula in City Code 10.5.16: 2.58 times the lot size in acres for outdoor water rights, plus 0.5 times the number of dwelling units for culinary water rights. He emphasized that allotments are based on lot size regardless of house size or irrigable area, as that is the amount of water rights conveyed to the city for each lot during development.

He provided a detailed calculation example: For a 1-acre lot, $2.58 \times 1 \text{ acre} \times 325,851 \text{ gallons per acre-foot} = 848,695 \text{ gallons}$. Divided by 6 months = 141,115 gallons per month, which matches the irrigation calculator result of 140,000 gallons for a 1-acre lot.

Mr. Augustus stated he had tens of thousands of dollars invested in trees that are mature, that take a certain amount of water, mature shrubs, bushes, all these things and was not willing to let those die. He noted he was using 160-200% of his allotment despite having smart controllers and removing 400 square feet of sod. He acknowledged that he is a proponent of reducing and reusing, recycling but stated it is not necessarily a choice that all of us have.

Council Member Smith clarified that only the marginal amount over each tier threshold is charged at the higher rate, not the entire bill.

Mayor Andersen closed the public hearing.

CLARIFICATION OF RESOLUTIONS

City Attorney Hyrum Bosserman noted confusion regarding item numbering. He clarified that Resolution A related to the budget officer's statement about intent to increase property tax. Resolution B (made in the wrong order) related to the city's statement and setting the public hearing date. Resolution C related to the receipt and adoption of the 2026-2027 Fiscal Year tentative budget.

MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 05-05-2026C, a resolution acknowledging receipt of and adoption of the 2026-027 Fiscal Year Tentative Budget for the City of Cedar Hills. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

- 12. The City of Cedar Hills intends to make a statement, pursuant to Utah Code § 59-2-919(4)(b), that**
- a. the City of Cedar Hills is considering levying a tax rate that exceeds its certified tax rate;**
 - b. the approximate dollar amount for the additional ad valorem tax revenue that would be generated by the proposed tax rate increase would be \$150,000.00;**
 - c. the purpose for additional ad valorem tax revenue that would be generated by the proposed tax rate increase is to cover increasing public safety costs;**
 - d. the approximate percentage increase in ad valorem tax revenue for the City of Cedar Hills based on the proposed tax increase would be twenty percent (20%); and**
 - e. if the City of Cedar Hills proceeds with the proposed tax rate increase, the City will provide notice of and conduct a public hearing at which members of the public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the proposed tax rate increase.**

Mr. Louw made the statement as Budget Officer regarding items listed in the agenda.

- 13. Statement of the City of Cedar Hills, pursuant to Utah Code § 59-2-919(4)(b), of the sub-items listed in Item 12 above.**

Mr. Louw read the required statement pursuant to Utah Code 59-2-919(4)(b):

- a. The City of Cedar Hills is considering levying a tax rate that exceeds its certified tax rate.
- b. The approximate dollar amount for additional ad valorem tax revenue from the proposed increase would be \$150,000.
- c. The purpose is to cover increasing public safety costs.
- d. The approximate percentage increase in ad valorem tax revenue would be 20%.
- e. If proceeding, the city will provide notice and conduct a public hearing where the public can comment on the proposed increase.

- 14. Review/Action on a Resolution acknowledging that, pursuant to Utah Code § 59-2-919(4)(b), the City of Cedar Hills made a statement that it is considering levying a tax rate that exceeds its certified tax rate, directing and setting the date, time, and place of the public hearing date on the proposed property tax increase, and directing the Budget Officer to send notice to the Utah State Tax Commissioner and Utah County Auditor that the city is considering a property tax increase and informing them of the date, time, and place of the public hearing.**

It was decided to make another motion on Resolution No. 05-05-2026B for item #14, so the motion was made after the budget officer's statement that the city is considering levying a tax rate that exceeds its certified tax rate.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 05-05-2026B-1, a resolution acknowledging that the City of Cedar Hills provided a statement that it is considering levying a tax rate that exceeds its Certified Tax Rate and setting a Public Hearing on a proposed property tax increase. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

15. Discussion on Water Usage.

Mr. Goodwin briefly went over the following items which were discussed earlier in the meeting: city water sources; golf course watering; behavior change and tiered structure financial impact; meter testing and verification; conservation efforts.

Council Member Smith noted the difference between residents who will need to use water just to keep their trees and their lawns alive versus keeping them lush and green. She stated that if residents are asked to accept drier parks and golf course fairways, residential lawns could also be less green. She suggested possibly starting the tiered rate increase at 200% rather than 150%. Mr. Goodwin responded that the council could choose any threshold and that staff would return with data in June to show results.

Mayor Andersen agreed that people have designed landscaping based on past conditions but noted that requirement to water might be to keep that lush and green versus just keeping it alive. She referenced USU Extension Service guidance that "once a week" watering keeps plants alive.

Council Member Price stated she fully supports protecting our water, especially during drought conditions and expressed preference for turning off water rather than just increasing prices for excessive users. She questioned whether allowing people to pay more for water would actually conserve water since the money does not buy additional water rights. Council Member Price agreed that the splash pad serves a purpose and should remain operational since it recycles water and serves the community but supported turning off the fountain.

Council Member Ellison stated she agreed with both ways regarding the fountain, understanding it uses minimal water but recognizing the optics issue. She suggested not running the fountain to demonstrate city leadership in conservation. She thinks it is about saying we as a city are willing to do what we can do because we are all in this together.

Council Member Smith stated her preference would be to turn off the fountain, while supporting keeping the splash pad operational.

Mayor Andersen noted consensus appeared to support turning off the fountain while keeping the splash pad operating.

Council Member Morgan expressed concern about whether rate increases would actually change behavior based on the previous year's data, stating that the people who were over 150, 175% did not change their habits. He questioned whether higher rates were the best solution and expressed concern about running out of water.

Mr. Goodwin acknowledged the concern but pointed to data showing many residents did reduce usage after receiving high bills, particularly in September after the highest tier rates were instituted. He noted that tier 5 and 6 rates were not implemented until September, so excessive users in summer did not see full financial impact until October.

Council Member Morgan suggested starting with tiered rates and monitoring data, potentially considering water shutoffs for the most egregious users (over 500% or 1,000% of allotment) if rates prove ineffective.

Mr. Goodwin stated he would prefer the tiered rate structure over water shutoffs, explaining other cities pursuing shutoff policies must devote significant staff time to monitoring and enforcement. Mr. Goodwin emphasized the time-sensitive nature of the decision, explaining that if CUP water must be used in May rather than waiting until July, it might be too late to guarantee water availability in September.

16. Review/Action and Public Hearing on a Resolution adding, amending, or deleting certain fees to the Official Fees, Bonds, and Fines Schedule for the City of Cedar Hills

Mr. Goodwin presented the proposed fee changes for Waste Management services. municipal solid waste (garbage), the current rate is \$12.83 per month, the proposed rate is \$13.42 per month. For each additional cart, the current rate is \$10.05 per month, the proposed rate is \$10.51 per month. For recycling the current rate is \$11.50 per month, the proposed rate is \$13.63 per month.

Mr. Goodwin explained these were pass-through costs from Waste Management with a small 15% administrative component for account management. He noted the recycling increase was driven by commodities market conditions.

Council Member Smith asked to clarify that these were pass-through costs and not revenue generating for the city. Mr. Goodwin confirmed this, noting Waste Management also provides significant community benefits including \$1,500 sponsorship for the Family Festival, providing dumpsters for spring cleanup, and responsive service.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing was closed.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 05-05-2026D, a resolution adding, amending, or deleting certain fees to the Official Fees, Bonds and Fines Schedule of the City of Cedar Hills, Utah. Council Member Morgan seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

17. Review/Action on a Resolution governing the use of Electronic Meetings

Mr. Goodwin explained that state law requires adoption of policies for conducting electronic meetings, particularly for the August property tax hearing which must allow public participation via both YouTube and Zoom. He noted the proposed resolution includes requirements for quorum, voting procedures when members are not physically present, and other operational details.

City Attorney Bosserman recommended the resolution be tabled for review, with each council member reviewing the policies before adoption at the next meeting.

MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to TABLE this item. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

18. Discussion on City Park Hours.

Mr. Goodwin explained this discussion was prompted by a resident request to extend park hours from the current 10 p.m. closing to 11 p.m. He noted American Fork closes parks from 11 p.m. to 5 a.m. He identified an inconsistency in Cedar Hills code: parks close at 10 p.m., but there is a noise restriction from 5 a.m. to 7 a.m., and amplified sound must cease by 10:30 p.m., which is after the park curfew. He suggested aligning these provisions.

Council Member Smith expressed concern about aligning park hours with youth curfew ordinances to avoid confusion. She said she does not want to be encouraging them to break curfew by allowing them in parks when they should not be out.

Mr. Bosserman noted that cities have authority to set park hours but must comply with state curfew laws for minors.

Council Member Ellison stated she would prefer to keep the noise restriction from 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 a.m. She noted concerns about vandalism later at night and questioned whether pickleball noise until 11 p.m. would be acceptable to nearby residents.

Lieutenant Doyl stated that most of the issues that we have when we deal with anybody in the park after hours is usually negative. It is typically drug-related, alcohol-related, or vandalism.

Council Member Price mentioned the Citizens Academy training where she learned that even cars parked in isolated areas often involve illegal activity. She raised concerns about noise from basketball and other activities if hours were extended.

Council Member Morgan stated he did not see a need to change current hours. He questioned why we want to change something that seems to be working the way it is.

Mayor Andersen asked about bathroom hours and whether they should close earlier to reduce vandalism. Mr. Anderson indicated that most bathrooms are not on timers and remain open.

Council consensus favored keeping current park hours of 10 p.m. closing while correcting the code inconsistency regarding the 10:30 p.m. amplified sound provision. No formal action was taken.

19. Discussion on HB 381, Electronic mobility Device Amendments.

Mr. Goodwin explained that HB 381 established state regulations for electric mobility devices on highways and gave cities authority to regulate these devices within their communities. He reviewed the classifications: Motorized scooters: self-propelled, maximum 20 mph, no age restriction under state law. E-bikes: Class 1: pedal-assist only, maximum 20 mph, minimum age 8; Class 2: throttle-assisted, maximum 20 mph, minimum age 8; Class 3: pedal-assist, maximum 28 mph, minimum age 16. Electric motorcycles: no pedals, can exceed 40 mph, require age 16+ and motorcycle endorsement on driver's license, basically street-legal vehicles.

Mr. Goodwin noted the city's current trail code has a 15 mph speed limit but does not include age restrictions or helmet requirements now mandated by state law for riders under 21. He stated the question for council was whether to mirror state code or be more restrictive. He noted being more restrictive could be complicated.

Council Member Ellison asked about helmet enforcement. Lieutenant Doyl indicated police would stop riders not wearing required helmets and contact parents but likely would not issue citations initially.

Council Member Smith stated she followed the bill closely during the legislative session. She noted the state would begin strict enforcement in mid-May, including confiscating devices from violators, with parents liable in cases involving minors. She said her inclination is to get in line with the state code for city streets and trails. Mr. Goodwin agreed, suggesting the city adopt state definitions and age requirements.

Council Member Price asked about prohibiting electric motorcycles on trails. Mr. Goodwin confirmed those should be explicitly prohibited on city trails.

Mr. Goodwin expressed concern about younger children operating Class 2 e-bikes that can go 20 mph, noting they do not know the rules of the road when approaching roundabouts and busy areas.

Council Member Price suggested going more restrictive but acknowledged that could create confusion. She stated she was solidly against electric motorcycles on trails and supported aligning with state requirements.

Council Member Ellison agreed with aligning to state code for consistency and clarity.

Mayor Andersen suggested adopting state code as a starting point and potentially becoming more restrictive later if needed.

Council consensus supported mirroring state code while explicitly prohibiting high-powered electric motorcycles on city trails. The 15 mph trail speed limit would remain in effect regardless of device capability. No formal action was taken.

20. Motion to go into Closed Session Pursuant to Utah State Code 52-4-205(1)(c) to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to go into CLOSED SESSION pursuant to Utah Code §52-4-205(1)(c) to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

The City Council was in Closed Session from 10:03 p.m. to 10:38 p.m.

21. Motion to Adjourn Closed Session and Reconvene Council Meeting.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to ADJOURN the Closed Session and RECONVENE the Cedar Hills City Council Meeting. Council Member Smith seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

22. Adjourn.

MOTION: Council Member Smith moved to ADJOURN the City Council Meeting. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Absent, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

Approved:
June 16, 2026

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC, UCC
City Recorder