SPRING CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
Thursday, May 7, 2026, 7:00 PM

The meeting was held in the Council room at Spring City Hall, 45 South 100 East, Spring City, Utah. This meeting will be held live at the address above and via Zoom electronic meeting service.

In Person Attendance: Christi McGriff, Dave McEwan, Dan Rasmussen, Becky Holbrook Brunner, Tom Brunner, Cade Penney, Kim Crowley, Kat Caldwell, Yvonne Wright, Bruce Spiegel, Dave Oxman, Kristen Mortensen, Brad Petereson, Jane Hawks, Liz Rudman, Suzanne Broadbent, Ken Law, Bille Jo Cox, Randy Strate, Sally Scott, Phillip Wood, Lowell Brown, Charles Shepherd, Suzanne Dean, Virgal Ann, Andrew Skousen, Alison Aderson, Steve Peterson, Jim Cheney; County Commissioner, Preston Arnoldson, Chad Huff; Chief of Police, Trevor Hooser; Public Works, Cory Madsen; Public Works, Ruth Ann McCain; Recorder.

Zoom Attendance: JBBakrt, Stan Soper, Tim Syme, Craig Clark, Craig, Michael, Michael Nelson, Tony Rudman, Shawn Lindow, Mike Tullis, Cynthia, A Skousen, Anne Osborn.

Pledge of Allegiance: Paul Penrod

Expression of Choice: Jane Hawkes

Roll Call: Michael Broadbent, James Baker, Chris Anderson, Paul Penrod, Laurel Work, Stan Soper

Mayor and Council Member Department Reports

Council Member Michael Broadbent explained that Kent located a city in Utah that previously used the same power meters as Spring City but has since discontinued them. That city is willing to give their remaining meters to Spring City at no cost, which is timely since many of the city's current meters, which date back to 2007, are beginning to fail. He also noted that EDAM, the new system through which UAMPS will begin balancing the city's power demand on an hourly basis, is scheduled to go live this month. He clarified that the recent early-morning power outage was caused by Rocky Mountain Power, not the city's system. He concluded by mentioning that there is positive news regarding road projects, which will be addressed during the budget discussion.

Council Member James Baker reported that he traveled to Salt Lake City earlier in the day to participate in the CDBG workshop for the playground project, noting that the city has officially been approved and is now moving into the second phase of the process. Several items were required to be read into the minutes. First, the city's 2026 CDBG Grantee Handbook, normally distributed at the workshop, will be mailed to the city within a week due to a printing delay. Second, the state emphasized the importance of not sharing login credentials for the WebGrants system under any circumstances. Third, although the handbook lists May 31 as the deadline for the second application, the actual final submission date is May 28, since the 31st falls on a Sunday. The state strongly recommended that Spring City set its internal deadline at least one week earlier to avoid system backlogs, as late submissions will not be excused.

Council Member Chris Anserson asked about the purpose of the second application. Cade Penney from R6 explained that it functions as a final submission to the regional council, requiring only minimal additional documentation.

Council Member Baker noted that public comments regarding playground equipment, ADA accessibility, and the National Historic District guidelines are being incorporated into the planning process. Because the playground is located within the historic district, it was recommended that the city use earth-tone colors, such as browns and greens, to align with district requirements.

Council Member Baker reported that the Friends of Historic Spring City are preparing for their annual Memorial Weekend Home Tour and are requesting to close a portion of Center Street between Main Street and the city center on May 23rd, consistent with last year's arrangements. The organization continues to seek community volunteers to serve as docents for the event. As liaison, the Council Member Baker stated that he will attend the upcoming Friends board meeting on the 9th and will relay any updates relevant to the city.

In addition, Council Member Baker shared that the Main Street Alliance has coordinated with the Fort Bridger Association to bring a mini rendezvous experience to Spring City during Heritage Day weekend. The event will run Friday through Sunday and will be set up in the small park behind the DUP building. The exhibit will include two tents and possibly two teepees, with interpreters sharing the history of the mountain men and their role in assisting early pioneers guiding them through valleys, identifying water sources, and facilitating interactions with Native peoples. Depending on community response, the Association may consider bringing a larger contingent in future years. Council Member Baker noted that this addition is intended to complement the home tours, enrich the visitor experience, and help draw additional tourism to Spring City.

Council Member Baker reported that the Main Street Alliance has received a donation designated for concrete repair work along Main Street. One suggested use of the funds is repairing the concrete in front of Strate's Garage. He stated that he has not yet inspected the area, but recommended discussing whether the repairs could be completed before Heritage Day Weekend.

Mr. Penney explained that at the previous month's meeting, Spring City had committed to contributing $22,000 toward the CDBG playground project if required. He reported that updated information from the program shows additional funds have since been allocated, meaning Spring City will now be fully funded and will not need to provide the previously anticipated match.

Council Member Chris Anderson reported that construction at the fire station is progressing well. The furnace has now been installed, allowing the building to be heated so interior finishing work can move forward. Over the next couple of weeks, crews will be installing flooring, painting, and completing additional interior tasks. The project is nearing the point where the facility will be ready for use. Council Member Anderson expressed appreciation for the steady progress.

Council Member Laurel Workman stated that the senior citizens program continues to run well under Jane's leadership, noting that attendance has been strong. However, the program has recently lost its caterer, and anyone who is a caterer or knows of one was encouraged to contact Jane. The current caterer will continue through June, and because the program does not meet in July, a new caterer will be needed beginning in August.

Council Member Workman also announced that the Miss Spring City royalty pageant had taken place, and although the three members of the new royalty, Zoe Evans, Soraya Zubeldia, and Josie Harmer, were unable to attend this meeting, they will be present next month to introduce themselves.

Additionally, preparations for the upcoming car show on June 20th, held over Father's Day weekend, are progressing well. The event is expected to be a fun, family-oriented activity, and the public was encouraged to help spread the word and plan to attend.

Council Member Stan Soper stated that he had nothing to report.

Mayor Paul Penrod commented on the recent Spring City pageant, noting that it was an exceptionally well-run and professional event, with the participants and organizers doing an excellent job. He also recognized the outgoing Miss Spring City, Haleigh Butterfield, who completed her service project on the day of the pageant. Haleigh, a skilled welder, created a handcrafted metal bench that will likely be placed at the cemetery to provide seating for visitors.

Public Comments

Preston Arnoldson reported that he recently replaced a set of stairs on Main Street and explained that the concrete will show color variations for a few days while it cures. He shared that he has lived in Spring City for nearly a year and has observed a significant amount of concrete in need of repair throughout the community and the county. He specifically noted the damaged concrete in front of Strate's Garage, describing it as a heavily trafficked area especially during holidays like Memorial Day.

Mr. Arnoldson stated that he would like to work with the city to replace approximately 80 linear feet of damaged sidewalk in that area, offering to complete the work to a high standard so it would not require future rework. He requested permission to dispose of the old concrete at the city's property east of town to reduce costs and asked that any required permits be processed quickly so the project could be completed and cured before Memorial Day. He estimated the total cost for removal, replacement, grading, and finishing at approximately $8,500, noting that the cost could be reduced if the city assisted with transporting the broken concrete or waived recycling fees. He also mentioned that he has performed trade work for the city previously and would be willing to discuss additional arrangements or in-kind exchanges if that would support his bid.

Phillip Wood expressed disappointment that neither elected nor appointed officials had signed the petition requesting that Spring City residents be allowed to vote on the issue of half-acre lot sizes. He stated that long-time residents and property owners deserve a meaningful voice in

determining how their land may be used and emphasized that the issue has divided the community for years. He urged city leaders to listen to the people they serve.
He then questioned the consistency of the city's approach to land-use enforcement, asking why preserving the historic Mormon grid is treated as a core principle when, in his view, a previous exception was made allowing Mr. Broadbent to place a home in the middle of that grid contrary to ordinances in place at the time. He also questioned why spot zoning was considered acceptable for the mayor's coffee shop but not for his own property, stating that he does not understand why the standards appear to differ.

Mr. Wood also addressed what he described as misinformation circulating in the community. He clarified that he personally built the duplexes that now generate monthly revenue for the city and will continue to do so for years. He stated that the project did not cost the city money beyond expenses the city chose to assume and noted that he personally paid for some improvements, including burying power lines to avoid overhead utilities. Based on these experiences, he reiterated his strong support for property rights and for allowing smaller lot sizes.

Kristen Mortensen reported attending the Six-County Growth Summit and noted that land-use ordinances should be grounded in the principles of health, safety, and welfare. She referenced a conversation had the previous evening about "welfare" and it was felt that it is the prosperity of the entire community. Ms. Mortensen presented a pictorial diagram showing the historical pattern of lot sizes in Spring City, explaining that from the earliest days residents frequently split and traded portions of lots. The historic core contains many lots under half an acre, with smaller parcels interspersed throughout most of the city except the northeast quadrant, which consists entirely of one-acre lots. She emphasized that residents have diverse needs: widows who cannot maintain a full acre, multigenerational families wishing to live near one another, and farmers facing economic pressures. For these individuals, a strict one-acre minimum can feel burdensome. She urged the council to allow more flexibility in lot adjustments and to empower Planning & Zoning to engage in meaningful planning work. Ms. Mortensen encouraged the city to develop clearer ADU guidelines, create design concepts that help new construction fit the historic community, and extend the historic grid into the buffer zone to avoid unregulated septic and well development that could threaten the aquifer.

Andrew Skousen expressed concern about a recent council discussion regarding whether to take steps that might subvert the referendum effort currently circulating among residents. He explained that Planning & Zoning has been working on potential solutions to the lot-size issue, including exploring criteria that could allow property owners with extenuating circumstances to request subdivision options without creating a blanket policy. Mr. Skousen stated that his primary concern was the appearance that the council might attempt to counteract or pre-empt the referendum, which he felt could be perceived negatively by the public and deepen divisions in the community. Mr. Skousen encouraged the council to collaborate with Planning & Zoning on possible alternatives and to work toward solutions that reduce tension rather than create the impression of "government versus the people."

Becky Holbrook Brunner stated that she attended the recent work meeting where public comment was not permitted. She recalled a discussion in which Council Member Chris Anderson presented an option that involved making changes to the ordinance, reverting it to an earlier version, and then revisiting revisions later. Randy noted that such an action would stop the referendum effort. Ms. Brunner expressed deep disappointment at that possibility, emphasizing that the community is currently divided and that residents deserve the opportunity to have their voices heard. She urged the council to allow the referendum process to proceed and to recognize that many citizens are willing to work collaboratively on solutions, including those suggested by Planning & Zoning. Ms. Brunner encouraged the council to consider the needs of all residents, not only those aligned with historic preservation, and warned that the council my create a rising up that we don't want to see.

Dave McEwan expressed concern that some comments during the meeting implied that most residents favor reducing the minimum lot size to half-acre. In his view, the majority of citizens do not want changes to the current standard. Mr. McEwan noted that the most recent election reflected this sentiment and urged the City Council to take that into consideration. The speaker stated that the 1.06-acre minimum is one of the reasons many people choose to live in Spring City. However, he also acknowledged that certain individual circumstances such as health issues or family needs may justify case-by-case exceptions.

Commissioner Jim Cheney Proposed Non-Motorized Trail Construction in Spring City Canyon

Commissioner Jim Cheney explained that the issue before them originated at the recent Commission meeting, where the county's Economic Development/Outdoor Recreation director, Kevin Christensen, presented proposed trail improvements in Ephraim Canyon and Spring City Canyon. The Forest Service has approved enhancements to several existing trails, including the trail leading to the Spring City waterfall, which would be improved as a non-motorized route for hikers, horses, and bicycles. The Commission was asked to allocate outdoor recreation funds toward the project, but the commissioners declined to approve funding without first seeking public input. Commissioner Cheney emphasized the importance of understanding whether Spring City, Ephraim, and county residents actually want these improvements before committing county resources.

To gather feedback, the county created a flyer and an online survey. The survey is open to all county residents. Commissioner Cheney noted that while recreation is often promoted as an economic benefit, many visitors purchase supplies elsewhere, leave trash behind, and rely on local emergency services without contributing significantly to the local economy. He stressed that the Commissioners are not opposed to the project but want to ensure it reflects local priorities. The commission will follow the majority opinion expressed through the survey.

Mayor Penrod acknowledged there might be some hesitancy at the county level because the trails are on federal land. Commissioner Cheney stated that funding would come from a combination of Forest Service sources, grants, and the county's outdoor recreation fund, but reiterated the importance of hearing from Spring City residents.

Council Member Chris Anderson reported that he had spoken with Kevin Christensen about the proposed trail enhancements and had received the materials he provided, including a video showing the area. He noted that while some of the images in the flyer, such as the hiker were AI-generated, the waterfall depicted is real and is an impressive natural feature. Council Member

Anderson stated that the improvements would increase access to the waterfall and surrounding trail. He also mentioned receiving a call from Laura Kendall, who is involved with the bike-path efforts, and expressed her enthusiasm for the project.
The flyer can be viewed in the handouts.

Fiscal Year 2026-2027 Tentative Budget

Mayor Paul Penrod introduced Dave Oxman who helped with our 2026-2027 Tentative Budget. Mr. Oxman presented the Fiscal Year 2027 tentative budget message, noting that the proposed budget is balanced and maintains current service levels while supporting long-term infrastructure needs. The general fund is balanced at approximately $1.19 million in both revenues and expenditures, reflecting a conservative and disciplined approach. He emphasized that the city continues to rely on a diversified revenue structure property tax, sales tax, service charges, and intergovernmental revenues which helps stabilize operations and avoids dependence on any single source.

Mr. Oxman explained that Enterprise funds for electric, water, and sewer remain generally stable. The electric fund is projected to maintain a positive net position while operating near break-even levels and fully funding depreciation to support future infrastructure replacement. The water fund remains operationally sound, with capital improvements supported by external funding. The sewer fund shows modest operational pressure and will continue to be monitored for long-term sustainability.

Mr. Oxman stated that in preparing this budget one-time grant revenues were intentionally excluded from operating projections to ensure an accurate picture of ongoing financial performance. Administrative costs are allocated across enterprise funds to reflect the shared cost of citywide services such as financial management, utility billing, compliance, and general administration, improving transparency and ensuring full cost recognition.

The tentative budget allocates approximately $67,000 in general fund surplus revenue toward contracted road work, with the understanding that these funds may be reallocated until they are spent. Capital expenditures will continue to vary year to year based on project timing and available funding. The current budget reflects continued investment while maintaining overall financial stability.

Mr. Oxman explained that a key component of this year's budget reflects direction from the Mayor and City Council regarding employee compensation. After review, administrative wages, particularly the recorder position, were found to be well below market and have been adjusted accordingly. The budget also allows for potential wage adjustments in the power and water departments at the mayor's discretion, based on performance, operational needs, and available resources.

Mr. Oxman concluded that the tentative budget supports current operations while preserving long-term financial stability and responsible infrastructure investment. (The full message can be found in the handouts.)

Council Member James Baker questioned the budget allowed for Wildland Firefighting noting that the 2027 budget is lower than the 2026 budget and it is expected to be a dry year. Mr. Oxman explained that the budget shows a conservative approach without too much speculation. Mayor Penrod stated that Wildfires generate revenue for the city when vehicles are sent out on fires.

Council Member Chris Anderson noted that the city currently receives just over $13,000 per year in revenue from leasing its Verizon Wireless tower. He explained that the city has received multiple offers to sell the tower outright for an amount equal to six or seven years of lease revenue. However, he cautioned that selling the tower would permanently eliminate the ongoing annual income the city currently receives. He added that, while renegotiating terms in the future might be possible, any sale would end the revenue stream entirely, and he wanted the council to be aware of that trade-off.

Council Member Chris Anderson made a motion to approve the tentative budget as presented. **The motion was seconded by Council Member Michael Broadbent. Discussion:** There was no further discussion

Vote:

Michael Broadbent	Yes
James Baker	Yes
Chris Anderson	Yes
Laurel Workman	Yes
Stan Soper	Yes

City Council Performance Bond for the Paving of the Roads Per Strate-UP Subdivision Drawings – Randy Strate

Randy Strate addressed the council to request clarification regarding whether a performance bond would be required for his subdivision project. He explained that, to his knowledge, Spring City has never required a bond for previous subdivisions, including Phil's project, and that this would be the first instance of such a requirement. He acknowledged that the purpose of a bond is to protect the city in the event a developer fails to complete required improvements, but emphasized that he is a long-term resident with an 180-acre farm and fully intends to complete the project.

Mr. Strate noted that the zoning administrator suggested a bond might be necessary specifically for the paving of the subdivision roads, citing concerns stemming from the decades-old Packer Subdivision, where the developer reportedly did not complete the paving as some residents expected. He clarified that the original agreement in that case appears to have been informal or not fully documented, but the resulting unfinished roads have since become a burden for the city.

Mr. Strate then read from the city ordinance, Section 11-5-2, which states that a performance guarantee may be required at the discretion of the City Council, and may take the form of either an escrow account or a performance bond. He provided two paving bids for the council's reference: Christensen Ready Mix at $2.00 per square foot and Bennett Paving at $1.93 per square foot, totaling approximately $46,000–$48,000. Under the ordinance, a bond would need to cover 110% of the project cost, or roughly $58,000. He explained that the bond itself would not cost that amount; instead, bonding companies typically charge around 3%, meaning the bond would cost him approximately $1,500–$2,000 and would need to remain in place for two years until the subdivision is fully completed and closed.

Council Member James Baker responded by noting that the topic of performance guarantees had also been discussed at the R6 meeting held the previous day. He agreed with Kristen's suggestion that the city should review its ordinances to ensure they reflect current needs and expectations rather than relying on standards established years ago. Council Member Baker explained that, according to the information presented at the R6 meeting, there are generally two acceptable approaches for ensuring completion of required improvements in a subdivision: either a performance bond or the developer providing the full cash amount up front.

Council Member Baker emphasized that this situation highlights the need for both the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council to pause and evaluate where discrepancies may exist within the city's ordinances. He stated that the city should establish a clear, consistent policy that applies not only to the current project but to all future development in Spring City. He expressed confidence that Mr. Strate has no intention of abandoning his project but cautioned that making exceptions now could create vulnerabilities if a future developer from outside the community were to leave the city responsible for unfinished work.

Mr. Strate responded by explaining that the bond question is one of the final outstanding items required before he can seek final subdivision approval. He stated that he is currently waiting on three things: the development agreement, now with the city attorney for review, updated cost estimates for the subdivision infrastructure, and clarification from the council regarding whether a bond will be required. He noted that once these items are complete, he expects to be ready within a couple of weeks to present the project to the Planning and Zoning Commission for final approval.

Council Member Chris Anserson asked whether the development agreement itself could specify that the developer is responsible for the full cost of the required improvements, noting that Mr. Strate clearly has sufficient assets in town to ensure completion. He questioned whether the agreement could simply state that the developer is financially responsible for the work, thereby providing the city with assurance without necessarily requiring a formal bond.

Mr. Strate explained that his original development agreement had designated the subdivision road as a private road, and he would have been fully accountable for its maintenance and improvements. However, the zoning administrator informed him that the city ordinance requires all streets and utility easements within a subdivision to be dedicated to the city, so he revised the agreement accordingly. In doing so, he removed the language stating that he would be responsible for the road as a private improvement. He noted that he had already agreed to complete the paving under the original plan and asked whether that responsibility could be written back into the development agreement in lieu of requiring a bond, if the council felt that approach would satisfy the ordinance and provide the city with adequate assurance.

Council Member Stan Soper asked if the development agreement is with Mr. Strate personally, or with an entity that is doing the subdivision? Mr. Strate replied that it is RLS Farms, LLC and the developer is Strate Farm LLC which he owns. Council Member Soper shared his perspective based on prior experience working with performance bonds in other cities such as Orem and Midway. He explained that bonds or cash deposits serve multiple purposes: they ensure that developers complete all required improvements and give the city leverage to verify that every element, such as curbs or other infrastructure, have been properly installed before final sign-off. He noted that in some cases, cities hold deposits until all work is completed to their satisfaction. He also pointed out that bonds protect the city in situations where a development is carried out by a special-purpose entity that could dissolve or go bankrupt, potentially leaving the city responsible for unfinished improvements. He added that this concern does not appear to apply in the current situation.

The Council discussed the need for a consistent approach within the ordinance, one that uses clear, objective criteria and applies fairly to both local developers and those from out of town. They also talked about what some of those criteria might look like in the future. However, it was noted that Mr. Strate has already applied and paid the application fee, meaning the current ordinance is what applies to this development.

Council Member Chris Anderson made a motion to not require a performance bond and clarify in the development agreement that it is the developer's responsibility to pave the road. This will be recorded with the County and verified that the property is owned free and clear. **The motion was seconded by Council Member** Stan Soper. **Discussion:** Council Member Baker expressed concern, noting that a banking institution would never give special treatment simply because a family had banked with them for 100 years. He emphasized the importance of applying consistent standards. There was additional discussion about how any future ordinance changes would not apply retroactively to this development, which contributed to some hesitation about approving the current motion. Mayor Penrod reminded the council that the development agreement is legally binding, and Mr. Strate added that the agreement can be recorded with the County, which provides formal legal backing.

Council Member Soper then asked whether the city could require a performance deposit as an alternative to a bond, something like a $5,000 or $10,000 completion deposit. He questioned whether this option already exists under current ordinance or whether it would require a new ordinance to implement. He expressed concern about having to revisit the same debate repeatedly and about putting applicants in the uncomfortable position of feeling that their integrity is being questioned. He suggested that the city should standardize its approach, potentially by offering two clear options: either a bond or a deposit equal to a set percentage of the project cost. This, he said, would create a predictable and fair process for all future developments.

Mr. Strate responded by clarifying that the current ordinance only provides two options: an escrow account, into which he would have to deposit 110% of the project cost, or a performance bond. He noted that there is a third possibility, the council may choose not to require either one, since the ordinance gives the council full discretion in determining whether a guarantee is needed at all.

Council Member Soper noted that, while the council may trust Mr. Strate's integrity and recognize that he owns substantial property in town, they do not have visibility into important financial details, such as whether the farm is mortgaged or whether additional loans might be required to complete the development. These unknowns, he said, are part of why cities typically rely on objective safeguards like bonds or deposits rather than personal familiarity.

Mr. Strate replied that the property is 100% paid off.

Council Member Soper acknowledged this and stated that if the property is indeed fully paid off, and that fact can be verified, the council might reasonably determine that a bond is not necessary in this particular circumstance.

Vote:

Michael Broadbent	Yes
James Baker	Yes
Chris Anderson	Yes
Laurel Workman	Yes
Stan Soper	Yes

Randy Strate Facts Regarding Income Versus Expenses to the City Related to Growth

Randy Strate addressed the council to express concerns about recent public messaging related to the referendum, specifically a flyer mailed by Friends of Historic Spring City around May 30th and banners posted on Main Street. He stated that both materials contained assertions he believed was misleading. The flyer claimed that 100 new homes would generate only $40,000 in revenue while costing $442,000 annually, and the banners suggested that signing the referendum petition would cost residents money, water, and services. Mr. Strate argued that these claims were inaccurate and provided detailed financial scenarios to illustrate his concerns. (You can find Mr. Strate's handout to the Council in the meeting handouts).

Using a model of 100 new homes on half-acre lots, Mr. Strate estimated that the city would receive approximately $977,000 in impact fees, which would help pay down the city's infrastructure loans. He projected at least $126,000 per year in water and sewer utility revenue based on base rates, along with $19,000 in annual property-tax revenue to the city and $178,600 to the county. He also estimated an additional $60,000 in annual sales-tax allocation, based on population-based state distributions.

In a second scenario using 1.06-acre lots, impact fees and utility revenues remained the same, but property-tax revenue increased due to higher land and home values. Mr. Strate estimated $32,000 in annual property-tax revenue to the city and $270,000 to the county, with sales-tax revenue unchanged at $60,000.

A third scenario examined the 130 acres of Greenbelt agricultural land within city limits, which currently generates only $45 per year in city property-tax revenue and $425 for the county. If converted into approximately 80 one-acre lots, the speaker estimated that annual city property-tax revenue would rise to about $25,000, county revenue to $216,000, impact fees to roughly $781,000, and annual water/sewer revenue to over $100,000, with an additional $48,000 in sales-tax allocation.

Mr. Strate then used his own five-acre subdivision as an example. He currently pays $12.80 in annual property taxes, with $1.29 going to the city. After development, the city would receive $63,000 in impact fees, $8,820 per year in utility revenue, and approximately $1,470 in annual property-tax revenue, while the county's share would increase from $11 to about $12,501. Mr. Strate stated that these examples demonstrate significant revenue potential and contradict the flyer's and banners' claims.

Turning to water supply, Mr. Strate reviewed Spring City's 2024 usage of approximately 42–44 million gallons and compared it to the city's 184-million-gallon annual source capacity from five springs and three wells. He noted that the city typically operates solely on spring water and rarely uses the wells, which collectively produce more than the springs. He listed individual source capacities and explained that actual usage is far below the state's estimated 400 gallons per household per day, largely due to widespread access to secondary irrigation water and smaller household sizes.

Mr. Strate also addressed comments from Sunrise Engineering, made at the work meeting, suggesting the city was near its source-capacity limit. He clarified that the state's peak-demand requirement of 800 gallons per household per day would require about 154 million gallons, still below the city's current capacity. Mr. Strate emphasized that Sunrise's concern was based on 20-year growth projections, not current conditions. Based on this information, Mr. Strate stated that claims suggesting residents would "lose their water" if they signed the referendum were unfounded.

Council Member Michael Broadbent asked for clarification on the output of the wells and springs. Mr. Strate stated that according to the numbers Cory gave him the three wells have the capacity of 240 gallons a minute while the springs are at 156 gallons a minute.

Council Member James Baker acknowledged the value of the detailed data but noted that growth also brings increased liability and service demands, and a broader perspective is what is needed. He wondered if our police and fire service would be able to handle the growth.

Mr. Strate concluded by briefly addressing sewer capacity, noting that according to Sunrise Engineering, Spring City has sufficient sewer capacity to accommodate the 100 additional hypothetical homes used in the earlier scenarios. He emphasized that current residents would not lose services, contrary to what the banners in town suggest. He encouraged the council, Planning & Zoning, and the community to understand.

Council Member Chris Anderson remarked that the presentation seemed to suggest growth would bring in substantial revenue and benefit residents, yet a review of other Utah towns with higher growth and density shows those communities actually pay higher taxes than Spring City. He stated that this indicates a disconnect between the idea that growth improves finances and the reality in other cities. Council Member Broadbent agreed, noting that if growth truly solved financial problems, the rapidly expanding cities along the Wasatch Front would not be experiencing the same budget challenges.

Mr. Strate clarified that he was not suggesting Spring City would be free of financial challenges simply because new homes generate additional revenue. Instead, he emphasized the importance of basing public statements on actual data and analysis. Mr. Strate stated that the numbers he presented offer a clearer picture of the situation and added that he would be open to hearing the data or rationale behind the assertions made in the flyer and banners.

Sponsor in Conjunction with Horseshoe Irrigation Company an Evening Meeting in the City Ballroom to Present Drought Condition/Water Available Changes We are Facing – Randy Strate

Randy Strate, President of the Horseshoe Irrigation Company, addressed the council, noting his extensive experience with water systems, water history, and the distinctions between secondary and culinary water. He emphasized that public education is critical, especially in a year like this year and the severe drought conditions. Mr. Strate suggested the council consider hosting a public education night with the Irrigation Company focused on the seriousness of the drought and on responsible water use. He explained that preparing an educational presentation requires significant time, but stated that he believes there could be value in holding one if the council felt it would benefit the community.

Cade Penney suggested that the Fire Department could participate in any proposed public education night, noting that the ongoing drought also increases fire danger.

Mayor Paul Penrod stated that a date should be set. There was a discussion about the importance of a meeting and the public's understanding.

Council Member James Baker made a motion to set a date for the public meeting on Wednesday June 17th at 7:00 PM. **The motion was seconded by Council Member Michael Broadbent. Discussion:** Mr. Strate confirmed that he will prepare a presentation from the Irrigation Companies position. Mayor Penrod stated that Cory will present culinary water information.

Vote:

Michael Broadbent	Yes
James Baker	Yes
Chris Anderson	Yes
Laurel Workman	Yes

Stan Soper	Yes

Bids for a New Shed at the City Yard

Mayor Paul Penrod stated that there are bids for a proposed new shed at the cemetery. He explained that the shed would serve two purposes: providing secure storage for the mini-excavator and other cemetery equipment, and offering a long-needed protected space for the Miss Spring City float, which needs a permanent home. Mayor Penrod noted that significant improvements have been made to the float in recent years, making proper storage increasingly important.

The three bids received were from: TC Contracting (Tim Clark): $30,456, General Ops Construction: $61,633, and Rick Christian: $48,300.

Council Member James Baker expressed hesitation about spending a significant amount of money to store the float. He commented that many residents keep their own flatbed trailers outdoors and questioned how the public might react if the city chose to house a float, described as a flatbed trailer with plywood and decorations, in a new structure costing between $30,000 and $60,000.

Council Member Michael Broadbent clarified that the main shed is intended primarily to store the mini-excavator and other cemetery equipment, not the float. He explained that the float would be stored only in a small lean-to addition, estimated at $5,400, which he felt was reasonable. Council Member Broadbent also noted that the mini-excavator is a recent purchase and emphasized the importance of protecting it from sun and weather exposure.

Council Member Chris Anderson made a motion accept the Tim Clark bid on the shed construction. **The motion was seconded by Council Member Laurel Workman. Discussion:** Council Member Stan Soper asked who determines the appearance, materials, and overall design standards for the proposed shed. He questioned whether the city makes any effort to ensure such structures are visually consistent with a particular approach or standard. Cory Madsen explained that the new shed would match the existing shed at the cemetery, using metal siding. He added that the siding would be green, allowing the structure to blend in with the cedar trees.

Vote:

Michael Broadbent	Yes
James Baker	Yes
Chris Anderson	Yes
Laurel Workman	Yes
Stan Soper	Yes

Resolution 2026-05 Reinstating Kay Van Buren as a Planning Commissioner and Readjusting Andrew Skousen's Termination Date from the Planning Commission

Council Member Michael Broadbent stated that, in his opinion, Kay Van Buren was inappropriately removed from the Planning and Zoning Commission. He explained that the resolution being presented was intended to correct that situation. Council Member Broadbent then read the resolution aloud so everyone could understand what was being proposed. (The Resolution is included in the handouts.)

Council Member Michael Broadbent made a motion to approve Resolution 2026-05. **The motion was seconded by Council Member Chris Anderson. Discussion:** Mayor Paul Penrod stated he was glad the issue had been reviewed and noted that he was the one who made the decision. After further discussion and consideration, he consulted the city's land-use attorney, Brent Bateman, who advised that the removal should be reversed. Mayor Penrod added that the city does not currently have clear code on how such situations should be handled and that this process will need to be updated.

Vote:

Michael Broadbent	Yes
James Baker	Yes
Chris Anderson	Yes
Laurel Workman	Yes
Stan Soper	Yes

Planning and Zoning Report

Council Member Michael Broadbent stated that Jones & DeMille returned with refinements and clarifications to the Master Transportation Plan, including responses to public comments. They addressed criticism regarding the plan's assumption of 2% annual growth, noting that some residents felt the estimate was too low. Jones & DeMille stated that data from the past five years supports the 2% figure, and they intend to retain that assumption.

They also discussed the possibility of installing a four-way stop at 400 South and 500 East, noting that it is an option the city could pursue if desired.

A resident had suggested that the plan should address sidewalk issues, particularly sidewalks used by children walking to school. Jones & DeMille responded that sidewalk analysis was not included in their contracted scope of work, so it would not be addressed in this plan.

They recommended that the city revisit and update the Master Transportation Plan in approximately five years, as conditions and needs will change with growth.

Jones & DeMille also outlined preferred truck routes within the plan. It was suggested that the city may want to conduct a more detailed impact study in the future to evaluate how truck traffic affects the streets along those routes. This level of analysis is outside the scope of the current plan but could be considered later.

Council Member Michael Broadbent stated that other Planning & Zoning items included: discussing Mike Nielsen's, who recently resigned, criticisms of Planning & Zoning's use of Zoom meetings. The commission plans to continue the discussion at their next meeting. The commission approved the Lindow subdivision, contingent on further discussion with Kent Kumar regarding electrical issues. They also discussed the bonding requirements for the Strate-Up subdivision, which related to the earlier council discussion.

Ordinance 2026-06 An Ordinance to Repeal Ordinances 2026-03 and 2025-05 and Amend Titles 10 and 11

Council Member Chris Anderson acknowledged public concern about the issue and offered context for his position. He emphasized that the council is a collaborative body and that they have no authority to act independently. He noted that all council members elected in the most recent election had publicly supported 1.06-acre zoning, and those candidates won, making it difficult for them to conclude that residents now prefer a different standard.

Council Member Anderson explained concerns about the referendum process, stating that once referendum signatures are certified, zoning in a large portion of the city would automatically shift to half-acre lots. He argued that this change would occur before Planning and Zoning could make recommendations, and that if the commission later recommended keeping certain areas at one acre, it would be too late to go back.

Council Member Anderson stated that the intent is to maintain the zoning that has been in place for approximately 20 years, including during the terms of former officials Cynthia DeGrey and Neil Sorensen, while allowing Planning and Zoning time to develop recommendations. He referenced ideas from Council Member Stan Soper about possible overlays or approaches to accommodate different interests.

Council Member Anderson argued that waiting for Planning and Zoning to provide input may be too late. He suggested that the council repeal the recently adopted ordinance, which would eliminate the need for the referendum and prevent immediate zoning changes. He expressed support for ultimately allowing a public vote, but only after the city has had time to evaluate options.

Council Member Anderson contrasted Spring City with Mount Pleasant, stating he does not want Spring City to follow a development pattern like Mount Pleasant. He concluded by recommending that Planning and Zoning hold a public hearing to gather input before deciding how to proceed.

Council Member James Baker noted that after attending Planning and Zoning and City Council meetings for several years, he rarely heard Planning and Zoning recommendations tied back to citizen input, the general plan, or survey data. Instead, recommendations are usually presented as the person's individual conclusions. He questioned what has changed in the past two years since the general plan was recently adopted that would justify such a significant zoning change now, when similar changes were not pursued four or eight years ago.

Council Member Baker expressed support for the approach suggested by Council Member Anderson: to pause, gather comprehensive input, conduct surveys, hold public comment opportunities, and ultimately allow a vote so the issue can be settled clearly.

Council Member Baker stated that some individuals who contribute significantly to the city live in the buffer zone and cannot vote in city elections, yet their perspectives should still be considered. He acknowledged that voting is limited to city residents but argued that property owners who cannot vote still have legitimate interests and should be included in a holistic review of public input.

Council Member Laurel Workman stated that it just makes sense to return to the zoning conditions that existed before the whole town got blown up and then move forward from there. She noted that the city can still make changes as needed but emphasized that the issue needs to be put to rest.

Council Member Michael Broadbent stated that he views the proposal as a way to buy time and allow more conversation within the community. He noted that Stan had offered good ideas in the recent work meeting and suggested there may be a path where different interests can come together, with some give-and-take. He emphasized that public policy takes time, and this approach would help accomplish that.

Council Member Stan Soper stated that while the question of 1.06 acres versus half acre is clearly important to the community, focusing on that single issue can make it seem like it is the only, or the most important, factor. He encouraged everyone to think more creatively and approach the problem with more nuance, so people do not feel polarized. Instead of forcing a simple yes-or-no choice between 1.06 acres and half acre. He expressed hope in a well thought out plan that would continue to support growth in a moderate and thoughtful way and includes some opportunities for half-acre lots when certain criteria are met.

Water Infrastructure Contingency Plans Follow-up

Council Member Laurel Workman stated that some decisions need to be made with the money left from the water project. A little more time is needed because it has been too wet to look for springs.

Resolution 2026-06 Amending Per Diem Rates Set Forth in the Spring City Personnel Policy

Mayor Paul Penrod explained that the city needs to amend its per diem rates for employees, noting that it had been brought to his attention that the current amounts are very low. He expressed concern that employees attending training were given minimal allowances, previously set at $6 for breakfast, $10 for lunch, and $12 for dinner. The proposed amendment would increase the rates to $12 for breakfast, $18 for lunch, and at least $25 for dinner. Mayor Penrod stated that this resolution will update the per diem rates.

Council Member Michael Broadbent made a motion pass Resolution 2026-06 amending the reimbursable per diem rates for our employees. **The motion was seconded by Council Member James Baker. Discussion:** There was no further discussion

Vote:

Michael Broadbent	Yes
James Baker	Yes
Chris Anderson	Yes
Laurel Workman	Yes
Stan Soper	Yes

Plan a Work Meeting for Fraud Risk Training

It was decided to set a work meeting for Fraud Risk Training on May 28, 2026, at 6:30 PM.

Financial Reports for April 2026

Council Member Chris Anderson made a motion to approve the financial reports for the period through April. **The motion was seconded by Council Member Michael Broadbent. Discussion:** There was no further discussion

Vote:

Michael Broadbent	Yes
James Baker	Yes
Chris Anderson	Yes
Laurel Workman	Yes
Stan Soper	Yes

Payment of Bills

Council Member Laurel Workman made a motion to pay the bills. **The motion was seconded by Council Member Michael Broadbent. Discussion:** There was no further discussion

Vote:

Michael Broadbent	Yes
James Baker	Yes
Chris Anderson	Yes
Laurel Workman	Yes
Stan Soper	Yes

Minutes for April 2, 2026, City Council Meeting

Council Member Laurel Workman made a motion to approve the minutes. **The motion was seconded by Council Member Stan Soper Discussion:** There was no further discussion

Vote:

Michael Broadbent	Yes
James Baker	Yes
Chris Anderson	Yes
Laurel Workman	Yes
Stan Soper	Yes

Council Member Michael Broadbent made a motion to adjourn.

Adjournment: 9:18 PM

APPROVED