NOTICE AND AGENDA
BRIGHAM CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Wednesday, June 10, 2026 6:00 PM
City Council Chambers, 20 North Main
To View Live Meeting Visit:
https://www.bcutah.gov/mayor-and-city-council.htm **or**
www.youtube.com/brighamcitycorp

6:00 BUDGET WORK SESSION

- Review Property Tax Rate Information
- Evaluate Budget Scenarios
- Discuss Council Budget Priorities
- Discuss Water Rates

PUBLISHING OF THE PROPERTY TAX IMPACT SCHEDULE

This Agenda item is intended to demonstrate compliance with 59-2-919(4)(a)(i) and 59-2-924(8)(b) by providing a Property Tax Impact Schedule as attached to this Agenda

Assigned times may vary depending on discussion length or agenda alteration. ADA Notice: Individuals needing special accommodations should contact the City Recorder at 435-734-6621 at least 48 hours before the meeting. Councilmembers may participate electronically.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING
The undersigned duly appointed City Recorder certifies the above notice was posted in three public places within the Brigham City limits, and on the City and State Public Meeting Notice websites on June 5, 2026. A copy was also provided to the Box Elder New Journal.

Kristina Rasmussen, City Recorder

WORK SESSION OF THE
June 10, 2026
6:00 p.m.

PRESENT:	DJ Bott	Mayor
	Dave Hipp	Councilmember
	Matthew Jensen	Councilmember
	Ryan Smith	Councilmember
	Robin Troxell	Councilmember
ABSENT:	Dave Jeffries	Councilmember
ALSO PRESENT:	Nicole Cottle	City Attorney
	Derek Oyler	City Administrator
	Tyler Pugsley	Power Director
	Kristina Rasmussen	City Recorder
	Chad Reyes	Police Chief
	Jeff Schmitt	Finance Director – *arrived at 6:27*
	Brandon Thueson	Fire Chief

The Property Tax Impact Schedule was noticed on the work session agenda and is included at the end of these minutes

Water Rates Discussion

City Administrator Derek Oyler explained that the City had recently received the certified tax rate information from the County Auditor and staff would return to that discussion later in the meeting. At the request of the Council, discussion shifted to the proposed water rate adjustments.

Mr. Oyler reviewed the water rate analysis prepared by Jones & Associates and explained that the Mayor's proposed budget included increasing the monthly base water rate to $30. He clarified that while the $30 rate was initially proposed by the Mayor before the completion of the rate study, Jones & Associates later concurred that the increase would allow the City to maintain current operations and maintenance needs while addressing a portion of ongoing infrastructure requirements.

Tyler Pugsley and Mr. Oyler discussed the three primary categories identified in the rate study:

- Operations and maintenance (O&M)
- System replacement and rehabilitation
- Capital improvement projects

Staff explained that the proposed rates would adequately fund day-to-day operations, including personnel, treatment, testing, and routine maintenance, but would not fully fund the significant infrastructure replacement and capital improvement needs identified throughout the water system.

Council members asked for additional information regarding the capital project and system replacement categories. Mr. Pugsley explained that major deficiencies include aging 4-inch cast iron water lines located throughout older neighborhoods. Many of these lines are more than 60 years old, experience frequent winter failures, and do not meet current state standards, which require a minimum 8-inch main line. He noted that crews often perform temporary repairs on these lines, but the underlying infrastructure remains at the end of its useful life.

Staff further explained that replacing aging water infrastructure is a long-term process. Priority is given to the oldest and most deficient facilities, including:

- Aging 4-inch cast iron water mains
- Older 6-inch and 8-inch water lines
- Well rehabilitation projects
- Water storage improvements
- Transmission line upgrades
- System redundancy projects, including the planned 800 North water loop

Mr. Pugsley noted that emergency failures often require capital funds to be redirected away from planned replacement projects, delaying progress on long-term infrastructure improvements. Recent examples included repairs to the Mantua penstock system and major transmission line failures.

Councilmembers discussed whether a larger one-time investment could eliminate the infrastructure backlog. Staff explained that the study is based on maintaining a sustainable annual replacement program rather than completely rebuilding the system at once. As infrastructure ages, replacement needs continue to recur, requiring ongoing investment rather than a single catch-up project.

Mr. Oyler emphasized that the analysis indicates the City should ultimately be investing approximately $12.3 million annually in water system maintenance, replacement, and capital improvements to remain current with infrastructure needs. He noted that current revenues fall substantially short of that level.

The Council reviewed several rate scenarios, including increasing the monthly base rate from the current $23 rate to $25, $30, and $35. Staff demonstrated how each scenario affected annual revenues and the remaining funding shortfall for system replacement and capital improvements. Discussion included the impact on residents, affordability concerns, and balancing customer costs with the need to maintain reliable infrastructure.

Councilmember Troxell suggested exploring a dedicated reserve or stabilization fund for future water system replacement projects, similar to the City's electric rate stabilization fund. Staff indicated the concept could be explored further and would likely require a separate policy framework identifying how funds would be accumulated and utilized.

Staff and Council also discussed water rate tiers and conservation objectives. Mr. Pugsley explained that the current tiered structure is intended to encourage conservation and aligns with state water conservation planning requirements. Staff noted that increasing the amount of water included within the lower tiers would have minimal financial impact but could affect long-term water allocation planning and future growth projections.

Additional discussion focused on regional comparisons. Staff noted that even with the proposed increase, Brigham City's water rates would remain among the lowest in Box Elder County. Comparisons were made to neighboring communities that have recently adopted or proposed significantly higher water rates to address similar infrastructure needs.

The Council generally expressed support for continuing discussion around the proposed $30 base rate while recognizing the significant long-term infrastructure challenges facing the City's water system and the need for additional future investment.

Property Tax Rate Information

Finance Director Jeff Schmitt joined the meeting and reviewed the County's recently certified tax rate. He explained that the City's original property tax calculations were based on preliminary estimates available during budget preparation, but the certified figures reflected significantly higher new growth than anticipated. As a result, the City's certified property tax revenue increased from approximately $3.52 million to $3.85 million, including approximately $328,000 attributable to new growth.

Mr. Schmitt explained that the Mayor's proposed budget had originally included a property tax increase intended to generate approximately $455,000 in additional revenue, which translated to an estimated 12% increase above the certified tax rate. After incorporating the certified tax rate and new growth figures, staff determined that only approximately $158,000 in additional revenue would be required to balance the proposed budget, reducing the proposed increase to approximately 4.1%.

Staff reviewed the impact on taxpayers and noted that, based on an average home value of approximately $400,000, the proposed 4.1% increase would result in an increase of approximately $16–17 annually in Brigham City property taxes. Staff emphasized that the estimate applied only to the City's portion of the tax bill and did not include increases from other taxing entities.

Council members discussed potential modifications to the proposed property tax increase and reviewed the budget items driving the additional revenue request, including:

- Additional seasonal park maintenance staffing
- A proposed Police Department administrative sergeant/IT position
- Funding for the City Attorney position
- Adjustments related to employee compensation and organizational needs

Councilmember Smith expressed concern regarding the full amount proposed for seasonal park staffing and suggested reducing the increase by approximately half, lowering the additional parks allocation from approximately $110,000 to $55,000. He indicated he remained supportive of the City Attorney and Police Department requests but questioned whether the full seasonal staffing increase was necessary in the first year.

Mayor Bott responded that the majority of citizen comments he receives relate to parks, landscaping, park strips, flower beds, sprinkler systems, and other public spaces. He noted that maintaining community appearance continues to be a significant expectation among residents. Staff also described increasing maintenance demands, including unusual tree maintenance work caused by weather-related stress on the City's sycamore trees.

The Council discussed the effect of reducing the seasonal parks allocation and reviewed how such a change would lower the required property tax increase from approximately 4.1% to roughly 2.75%. Several Council members expressed interest in exploring that option while continuing to evaluate the overall budget package.

Staff also informed the Council that updated budget information from the Utah Infrastructure Agency (UIA) would provide approximately $12,000 in additional unrestricted revenue beyond what had been included in the Mayor's proposed budget. Staff noted that the additional revenue could be incorporated into future budget revisions as discussions continued.

The Council then discussed the proposed Police Department administrative sergeant position. Chief Reyes explained that the position would address both growing information technology responsibilities and supervisory needs within the department. He stated that the current arrangement relies heavily on existing personnel performing multiple specialized duties beyond their primary assignments, creating operational challenges and increasing the risk of falling behind on technology, compliance, and supervisory requirements.

Chief Reyes explained that a sworn administrative sergeant position would provide greater value than a civilian IT position because the individual would be able to:

- Supervise personnel and support departmental operations
- Manage code enforcement, animal services, and crossing guard functions
- Assist with staffing and scheduling responsibilities
- Oversee CJIS, body camera, radio, drone, and other law enforcement technology systems
- Serve in sworn law enforcement capacities when needed

He further noted that delaying or eliminating the position would require the department to continue distributing those responsibilities among existing employees, increasing workload pressures and potentially creating future compliance concerns.

Following discussion, Council members generally indicated support for retaining the proposed administrative sergeant position and the City Attorney position as included in the Mayor's budget. Discussion continued regarding the seasonal parks staffing allocation and its relationship to the overall property tax increase. No final decisions were made, but staff received direction regarding Council priorities and areas for further budget refinement prior to the Truth in Taxation hearing and final budget adoption.

Ambulance Service Cost Recovery Discussion

Councilmember Jensen asked staff to revisit ongoing concerns regarding ambulance service provided outside Brigham City limits and whether opportunities existed to recover costs associated with those services. Staff explained that the City has spent several years evaluating options for obtaining compensation from neighboring communities that receive ambulance coverage but do not currently contribute financially toward the service.

City Administrator Derek Oyler reviewed the history of the issue, noting that approximately three years ago Box Elder County commissioned a countywide fire and EMS feasibility study. One of the recommendations from the study was the use of interlocal agreements to fairly allocate ambulance and emergency service costs among communities receiving service. Following the study, Brigham City analyzed service levels, call volumes, population, and property values throughout its ambulance coverage area to determine an equitable cost-sharing model.

Staff explained that Brigham City's ambulance service area extends well beyond City limits, including portions of southern Box Elder County, unincorporated areas, and neighboring communities. Perry City currently maintains a contract with Brigham City and contributes financially toward fire and ambulance services. However, efforts to negotiate similar agreements with other jurisdictions have been unsuccessful.

Mr. Oyler stated that the City's objective has never been to subsidize capital projects or operational decisions through neighboring communities, but rather to ensure that the cost of providing emergency medical services outside Brigham City is shared fairly among all communities benefiting from those services. He noted that Brigham City residents currently bear the cost of maintaining facilities, personnel, ambulances, and readiness levels that also serve residents outside the City.

Fire Chief Brandin Thueson explained that ambulance billing is heavily regulated by the State of Utah. Ambulance providers may only bill certain state-authorized transport rates and mileage charges. The City cannot bill for non-transport responses, supplies, medications, or many on-scene medical services. As a result, a significant number of emergency responses generate no revenue despite requiring personnel, equipment, fuel, and medical supplies. Chief Thueson noted that the City collects only a portion of the amounts billed, with recent collection rates averaging approximately 38–40 percent of total billings.

Councilmembers discussed examples such as diabetic emergencies, lift assists, and other medical incidents where paramedics provide treatment on scene but no transport occurs. In those situations, Brigham City absorbs the full cost of the response without reimbursement. Staff emphasized that this occurs both within and outside City limits.

Mr. Oyler reviewed the cost-sharing methodology recommended in the feasibility study. Using factors such as call volume, population, and property tax valuation, staff estimated that communities outside Brigham City would collectively contribute approximately $800,000 to $900,000 annually toward ambulance and emergency service operations if a cost-sharing model were implemented. Staff noted that approximately 78 percent of ambulance calls originate within Brigham City, meaning Brigham City residents already support the majority of the system through local taxes and fees.

Councilmembers expressed concern that Brigham City taxpayers are funding emergency services used by neighboring communities without compensation. Several members indicated support for exploring additional measures to recover costs and improve equity between service areas. Discussion included the possibility of adopting a per-call fee for ambulance responses occurring outside Brigham City limits if voluntary interlocal agreements continue to be unsuccessful. Staff advised that such a fee structure could be adopted by ordinance.

Chief Thueson and Mr. Oyler also discussed the State Bureau of EMS licensing process. The City's current ambulance service area license expires in August 2027, with a formal review and modification window opening approximately six months beforehand. Staff explained that the City will need to determine whether it intends to continue providing ambulance coverage to all currently served areas or pursue changes to its service boundaries. Staff recommended beginning those discussions well in advance of the state review process.

The Council generally supported continuing the evaluation of cost recovery options and directed staff to prepare additional information regarding a potential ordinance establishing ambulance response fees for calls occurring outside Brigham City limits. Staff indicated they would return with a future presentation and ordinance proposal for Council consideration.

Community Grants and Senior Center Funding Discussion

Councilmember Jensen raised the topic of community grant funding as part of the Council's ongoing effort to identify budget priorities and evaluate expenditures that may not be considered essential government services. He referenced approximately $81,500 budgeted for community grants and suggested the Council consider whether those funds should remain in the budget. He noted that while the organizations receiving funding provide valuable services, the donations are ultimately made using taxpayer dollars and could be an area for future budget consideration.

Staff provided a breakdown of the proposed community grant funding, including:

- Box Elder Family Support Center – $20,000
- New Hope Crisis Center – $15,000
- Box Elder Community Garden – $1,000

- Boys & Girls Club of Northern Utah – $42,500
- A.C.E.S. Soup Kitchen – $3,000

Staff explained that these organizations were selected because they provide services benefiting a broad segment of the community and often address needs that would otherwise fall to local government or other public entities.

Council members discussed the history of the program, noting that previous community grant programs had been administered through a committee process. Staff explained that several years earlier the City eliminated the Coordinated Community Impact (CCI) grant program and narrowed funding to a smaller number of organizations providing community-wide services. Staff clarified that while some grant amounts have increased over time, the overall program has undergone restructuring and reductions since the elimination of the previous grant administration model.

Additional discussion addressed other community support expenditures, including contributions associated with Art on Main and funding provided to the Box Elder Chamber of Commerce in support of Peach Days activities. Council members noted that such expenditures reflect broader policy decisions regarding the types of services, programs, and community partnerships the City chooses to support.

Council members expressed interest in reviewing the program during future budget discussions and evaluating whether current funding levels remain appropriate. No changes were made, but the topic was identified as an area for continued consideration during future budget cycles.

Senior Center and Aging Services Funding Discussion

The discussion expanded to the funding and operation of the Brigham City Senior Center and aging services programs. Staff explained that Brigham City provides senior services for the entire southern portion of Box Elder County through a contractual arrangement with the Bear River Association of Governments (BRAG). Similar services for the northern portion of the county are provided through Tremonton City.

City Administrator Derek Oyler explained that the total annual budget for the Senior Center is nearly $1 million, while federal pass-through funding received through BRAG totals approximately $220,000 to $230,000 annually. Additional support has historically been received from Box Elder County and limited contributions from Perry City. As operating costs have increased, the portion subsidized by Brigham City taxpayers has continued to grow.

Staff noted that for the past two budget cycles, Box Elder County has not provided a historical contribution of approximately $117,000 despite the amount being included in county budget documents. Mr. Oyler explained that county officials have requested more detailed information regarding the residency of individuals receiving congregate meal services before authorizing payment. Historically, the City tracked resident and non-resident participation but did not collect detailed address information for congregate meal recipients. Staff indicated that additional tracking procedures have now been implemented.

Council members expressed concern that Brigham City residents are subsidizing services provided to individuals throughout southern Box Elder County. Comparisons were made to the earlier ambulance service discussion, with several members noting similar concerns regarding the equitable distribution of service costs among communities benefiting from City-provided programs.

Staff explained that aging services differ from ambulance services because state law places responsibility for aging services on counties rather than municipalities. Through contracts with BRAG, Brigham City voluntarily provides those services on behalf of the broader region. Staff reported that discussions have begun regarding potential contract modifications that could limit City-operated services to Brigham City residents while requiring BRAG to provide services for residents of other communities.

Councilmembers discussed the administrative burden associated with collecting residency information and expressed concern about requiring senior citizens seeking meals and services to provide extensive personal information. Staff acknowledged those concerns while noting the challenges of documenting participation levels and securing reimbursement from outside entities.

The Council directed staff to continue evaluating funding options, reimbursement mechanisms, and potential contractual changes related to aging services. Staff indicated they would continue discussions with BRAG and other stakeholders and return with additional information as needed.

At 9:01 PM Councilmember Jensen made a motion to adjourn. Councilmember Hipp seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

The undersigned duly appointed Recorder for Brigham City Corporation hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of the June 10, 2026 City Council Work Session

Dated this 22nd of June, 2026.

Kristina Rasmussen

Kristina Rasmussen, City Recorder

** These meeting minutes were generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence and have been reviewed, edited and approved by Brigham City Staff.

PROPERTY TAX IMPACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to 59-2-919(4)(a)(i) and 59-2-924(8)(b), the proposed tax rate increase is summarized as follows:

Revenue Impact

- Estimated additional property tax revenue: $455,000
- Percentage increase in total property tax revenue: 12.93%

Taxpayer Impact

- Average residential property ($400,000):
  - Prior year tax: $370.80
  - Proposed tax: $418.76
  - Annual Increase: $47.96
  - Percentage Increase: 12.93%

- Average commercial property ($1,200,000):
  - Prior year tax: $2,022.31
  - Proposed tax: $2,283.87
  - Annual Increase: $261.56
  - Percentage Increase: 12.93%

Departmental Budget and Operational Impact
The proposed tax rate increase will impact the following departments:

Mayor's Office
Budget Impact ($140,000): This change is attributable to personnel costs associated with transitioning from a contracted attorney to a full-time City Attorney position, including wages and benefits that were not previously provided under the contract arrangement.

Operational Impact: Approval of the proposed tax rate increase will allow the City to maintain consistent legal services following the anticipated conclusion of the current contract. While the City has greatly benefited from a highly effective contracted attorney, the transition to a full-time City Attorney is intended to provide dedicated, on-site legal support and ensure continuity of services moving forward.

A full-time attorney will offer increased day-to-day availability, more direct integration with City staff and operations, and the ability to provide timely review of contracts, ordinances, and policies. This position will also support ongoing legal needs related to economic development, personnel matters, and regulatory compliance.

Without the proposed increase, the City would need to secure alternative contracted legal services, which may result in variability in availability, higher hourly costs over time, or reduced consistency depending on the provider.

Parks Department
Budget Impact ($110,000): This change is due to increased temporary wage costs to address seasonal staffing needs and rising service demands.

Operational Impact: Approval of the proposed tax rate increase will allow the department to enhance service levels by adding temporary staff to better maintain the City's parks system. This includes improved mowing schedules, landscaping, cleanliness, and overall park appearance. Additional staffing will help the department keep pace with increased usage and expectations as the City continues to grow.

Without the proposed increase, the department would likely continue to fall behind on routine maintenance and upkeep, resulting in declining park conditions, reduced aesthetic quality, and potential impacts to public use and community satisfaction.

Police Department

Budget Impact ($205,000): This increase is driven by personnel costs related to adding an Administrative Sergeant position, as well as market-based wage adjustments for animal control officers and staff.

Operational Impact: Approval of the proposed tax rate increase will allow the department to enhance service levels by adding an Administrative Sergeant to oversee animal control, school crossing guards, IT functions, and key administrative responsibilities, including policy updates and accreditation standards. Adjustments to animal control wages will help the City remain competitive in the labor market and support retention of qualified staff. These changes will improve overall operational efficiency and allow sworn officers to focus more directly on core public safety duties.

Without the proposed increase, the department would likely need to delay or forego adding the Administrative Sergeant and may face challenges in retaining animal control staff, resulting in continued strain on existing personnel and reduced capacity to effectively manage administrative and support functions.