MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SPRINGVILLE CITY COMMUNITY BOARD HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2026, AT 7:00 P.M. AT THE CIVIC CENTER, 110 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SPRINGVILLE, UTAH, IN THE MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM.

Board Members and Staff in Attendance: Bryan Smith, Carla Wiese, Cason Acor, Dave Cook, Deborah Hall, Councilmember Jake Smith, Jennifer Grigg, Josh Yost, Kelly Jensen, Councilmember Mindi Wright, Natalie Hollingshead, Patrick Monney, Riah Hurst, and Todd Fischio.

Excused: Kelly Norman, Mike Florence, and Chelsey Rosander

CALL TO ORDER at 7:06 pm

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes from the January 08, 2026, meeting were approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Staff Report

Carla created the agenda template, and the standard operating procedure is coming. There was mention of talking to someone about emergency preparedness. The art loops had already been presented in October. Jake asked about Emily's presentation. Carla led a discussion on how the development process works and noted that some community members do not fully understand the system, which can lead to confusion and unproductive feedback.

A motion was proposed recommending that the City Council engage the community more intentionally, using the board as a resource to provide insight and education. Members stressed that the Community Board's responsibility is to facilitate productive input rather than allow the loudest voices to dominate discussions. They reviewed its advisory role in development feedback, with the responsibility to help the community understand what is realistic in development suggestions. The goal is to help the public understand what is possible by explaining cost limits and what can realistically be done. Board members said they want to give helpful and clear feedback to developers, like Clyde Companies, so conversations stay organized and don't turn into chaos.

The board's approach will focus on education and coordination, holding public meetings only when necessary and using the newsletter and social media to provide context and guidance to the community.

The board clarified that agenda item number two—community board reports—is where time is carved out for board members to report back on action items. Appreciation was expressed for staff updates at the last meeting, including updates on Buc-ee's, WinCo, and the North Gateway project. Buc-ee's is aiming for an opening on July 3, 2028, and WinCo is not pushing as hard; it is a bigger building, but not a bigger site.

The board asked for another presentation on emergency preparedness. Patrick reported that Joanne Larson is the city's emergency preparedness coordinator, and CERT training is going strong, with graduate recognition at City Council meetings every few months. Joanne can present again.

2. Community Board Member Reports

Deborah brought up that certain topics could also fall under staff reports—things that are on someone's mind, something they've noticed, or thing to consider for the city. Mariah gave the example of voter engagement in Springville. Patrick shared that tomorrow there would be three segments on KUTV (7:45, 8:15, and 8:45 a.m.) about the Clyde developments. He clarified that the city cannot make official statements about projects like Buc-ee's or Clyde developments until permits are pulled and projects are moving forward. The city can confirm property purchases, demolition permits, and construction permits, such as work happening on 1400 North, but cannot speculate about economic impact or future plans. Instead, Clyde Companies' spokesperson will participate in two of the segments, speaking directly about their plans. They posted signage with a barcode inviting citizens to share ideas with over 100 responses and expect more responses to review. The idea of gathering public input came directly from Jeremy Hafen, CEO of Clyde Companies. While many public suggestions include things like a roller-skating rink or bowling alley, the cost to build and operate such amenities would likely make them unaffordable. They also purchased a significant amount of property in the 1400 North area—approximately 60-70 acres—including not just one corner but property across the street near Joe Banditos. Demolition has taken place on some of those properties as part of the broader redevelopment. Todd reported that the realities of construction costs, market forces, zoning impacts, and the difficulty of delivering affordable housing under current conditions will determine the scope of the project.

It was noted that it is advantageous to have a company like Clyde Companies that owns the property outright and can spend time determining what to put back into the community. Their goal is not to maximize a typical 22-23% return. They still need a return to cover costs and continue operating, but it can be significantly lower. There was strong appreciation expressed for Clyde's investment in Springville, described as "unheard of," similar in spirit to Central Bank's reinvestment and Wilford's Springville Rising efforts to revitalize properties.

The board discussed its role in facilitating meaningful public input for the Main Street project while ensuring feedback is realistic and actionable. The focus would be on coordinated, valuable input that benefits both the developer, Clyde Companies, and the community, rather than allowing the loudest voices to dominate. This process is also an opportunity for public education, helping residents understand development realities, zoning constraints, and what types of uses are possible on the site.

Kelly moved to advise the City Council to engage the community through the Community Board on the Main Street project (Clyde Companies *The Corner at 4th & Main* project) to engage the community in a more productive manner. Riah seconded the motion, and the vote was 4 to 2.

3. Featured Presentation / Learning Segment
    a) Art Loops/Public Art as Economic Drivers   postponed

4. General Plan Discussion

They discussed the General Plan draft process and the draft shared by the consultant. The board has already provided comments in the past, and it appears that some recommendations were not implemented. The draft feels too generic and not detailed enough. The board agreed that for the plan to be accepted, the recommendations need to be clearly explained and strongly supported, not just lightly edited. Josh said it is important to use professional judgment instead of simply making routine changes. The next draft is expected in early March. The review process will happen in steps, starting with a spreadsheet of responses before the full document is shared. The board may also divide the plan between members to review it more carefully.

Concerns were raised about the connection between observations, data, and recommendations. The board noted that the draft lacked clear logical links between findings from existing conditions, interviews, and public engagement and the suggested actions. The board also noted that analytical lenses such as transportation, housing, and economic development were not consistently applied across recommendations, making it harder to evaluate their impact on overall guiding principles. The discussion revolved around concerns with the current General Plan deliverable and how the board and staff should respond. There are trade-offs in planning, such as balancing traffic with walkability and creating a strong sense of place. Board members were concerned that earlier drafts did not clearly connect the data, guiding principles, and final recommendations.

They said it is important to look at how things work and how they feel, not just check boxes to comply with the state mandate. The preferred approach is the “new way,” looking at form, function, and local context rather than producing a standard generic deliverable. Josh has made a significant effort in guiding the consultants and ensuring the final product meets professional and community standards. The goal is a locally grounded, justified, and actionable plan rather than a generic template. The board is ready to escalate if quality is compromised but is currently giving the consultants a chance to respond thoroughly. There is no fixed state deadline, though the current plan is to have a final adopted General Plan by June.

ACTION ITEMS AND STRATEGIC DISCUSSION

The board talked about its members and their terms. The board is supposed to have between seven and thirteen members, but there are currently nineteen representatives listed, including both students and adults. Some members are close to reaching the four-year limit, and the mayor prefers that people serve no more than two terms. Jake and Mindy will work with the mayor to determine who will be reappointed and how to fill any open positions.

The board discussed making sure “the work that we're doing is acknowledged” and that the valuable deep-dive discussions are actually going somewhere instead of just “sitting in minutes on the computer.” They discussed possibly having a representative attend City Council meeting on a rotating schedule to report and receive information back, so the committee is not “easy to ignore” and the work being done has a greater impact.

The board opined that the committee still feels “inaugural,” while still figuring out the right way to operate. This includes defining the mission, mechanics, reporting structure, agenda setting, reporting back to council, and rules, which have evolved. Kelly noted that members are willing to have assignments and action items decided by the end of meetings so they can work on them during the month.

The board also discussed how it works with the City Council. Members asked for updates on how the City Council responded to past advice. They explained that two council members must agree to place an item on a work session agenda, and the next possible meeting would be in the first week of March. Jake, Patrick, and Kim will help coordinate this. The goal is to receive feedback from the City Council, not to require them to take action, and then share a short report with the board about what occurs.

Wrapping up the General Plan discussion, the board noted that the General Plan and zoning code are behind schedule, with a draft expected in March. To manage the workload, splitting sections among members and reviewing them asynchronously was proposed. Staff will pre-screen the draft against acceptance criteria to ensure the committee reviews a version that is meaningful and actionable. Comprehensive preparation with existing documents and public engagement summaries is essential for informed feedback. They realize that board members are in charge of the board and that members can ask for what they need with a stronger sense of ownership and direction.

ASSIGNMENTS AND NEXT STEPS

- Focus for the next agenda: general board discussion of General Plan review, which may take two meetings.
- Cody will guide the process remotely.
- Board members may prepare individual section notes in advance for discussion.
- Board members asked for updates on advisory requests to the City Council and learned that two city council members must submit an agenda item for a work session.

ADJOURNMENT BY CONSENSUS 8:52 p.m.

This document constitutes the official minutes for the Springville City Community Board Meeting held on Thursday, February 12, 2026.

I, Jennifer Grigg, do hereby certify that I am the duly appointed, qualified, and acting as a recorder for Springville City, of Utah County, State of Utah. I do hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate, and complete record of this meeting held on Thursday, February 12, 2026.

DATE APPROVED: ____________________ ____________________________

Jennifer Grigg
Deputy Recorder