SPRING CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
Wednesday, April 22, 2026, 6:30 PM

The meeting was held in the Council room at Spring City Hall, 45 South 100 East, Spring City, Utah.

In Person Attendance: Dan Rasmussen, David McEwan, Cami Christensen, Kristen Mortensen, Jesse Ralphs, Jason Brimhall, Ruth Bergener, Becky Brunner, Tom Brunner, Charles Shepherd, Burce Spiegel, Lowell Brown, Scott Grindstaff, Scott Newman, Neil Sorensen, Su Tullis, Cami Christensen, Cory Madsen, Trevor Hooser, Chad Huff, Ruth Ann McCain; Recorder.

Zoom Attendance: Chris Anderson, Craig Clark, Dana Chapman, iPhone, Tony Rudman, Craig Paulsen, KS, Your iPhone, Michael Nelson, Mbeck@gmail.com, Liz Rudman, JBBarker, Tim Syme, Mike Nelson, Leslie Clark

Roll Call: Michael Broadbent, James Baker, Laurel Workman, Stan Soper, Paul Penrod, Chris Anderson – attending via Zoom.

Water Project Discussion with Sunrise Engineering

Mayor Paul Penrod welcomed Jesse Ralphs and Jason Brimhall from Sunrise Engineering. Jason Brimhall explained that a water line was installed on 700 East for the chlorine building. JCI has been the contractor on the project. The project is now complete, with only a few punch-list items remaining.

Jesse Ralphs then gave a recap of the overall water project to help the new council members understand its scope. Mr. Brimhall reported that approximately $450,000 of project funding remains available for contingency options. He outlined several possible uses for the remaining funds:

- Replacement of 24 nonfunctional fire hydrants, at an estimated cost of $12,000–$14,000 each.
- Construction of a 12” high-pressure zone line, for which easements have already been secured. This line would support future development east of town. Estimated cost: $212,000.
- Adding gravel to 800 East to improve road conditions. Estimated cost: $9,000.
- Installation of a chlorine residual analyzer in the lower tank chlorine building. This device would measure chlorine levels downstream from the tanks. Estimated cost: $25,000–$30,000.
- Spring development; no viable springs have been identified at this time.
- Well development, based on the city’s well-siting study. The recommended location is near 400 N and 200 W.

Mr. Ralphs noted that Spring City currently has a water source deficit according to state standards, and this deficit will likely be the limiting factor for future growth. Both Mr. Ralphs and Mr. Brimhall answered all questions from the council.

Cory Madsen was asked which project he believed should be prioritized. He stated that the chlorine residual analyzer would be his first choice, followed by spring development, and then the replacement of three fire hydrants.

The council discussed developing springs and other potential projects. Mr. Ralphs emphasized that no decisions were required at this meeting, but the council will need to determine which projects should move forward.

Mr. Brimhall provided a brief overview of the sewer project. He explained that the project allows all properties north of the ditch to connect to the sewer system. A 12-inch interceptor line now runs from the lagoons to 950 North and connects to all streets up to 700 East. With this expansion, all homes in the city are now within 300 feet of the sewer system. The project is substantially complete. Inntelex, the contractor, is currently working through its punch-list items and anticipates full completion in May.

Mr. Brimhall reported that the project budget was approximately $5 million. The current contingency balance is $686,000, with a quantity adjustment change order of $263,000, bringing the potential contingency total to $949,000. Potential upcoming change orders include:

• Grading on 200 North to 600 North — estimated cost $13,500
• Chip seal on 700 East from 500 North to 600 North — cost estimate pending

Mr. Ralphs stated that Sunrise Engineering is in the process of bidding out the headworks building. Mr. Brimhall explained that advertising will occur in the coming weeks, bids are projected to be opened at the end of May, and construction is expected to begin in the summer or fall. At this time, it appears there will be enough funding to cover the project. If not, the city will need to talk to Rural Development for additional funding.

Mr. Brimhall and Mr. Ralphs answered all questions presented by the council.

Planning and Zoning Commission Composition, Discussion

Council Member Chris Anderson explained that this item has come up because of concerns in last month's meeting regarding statements made by and about Kay Van Buren and his position on the Planning & Zoning Commission. Mr. Van Buren claims that the council improperly removed him from the commission. Council Member Anderson clarified that the council did not remove Mr. Van Buren; rather, they were advised that he had vacated his seat, creating a vacancy that the council then filled.

To confirm the accuracy of that advice, the mayor and Council Member Anderson consulted with legal counsel Brent Bateman. During that discussion, no provision was found in the municipal code requiring Planning & Zoning members to be full-time residents. It was mentioned that a draft ordinance was introduced at the last meeting to add such a residency requirement for future clarity. Mr. Bateman advised that even if such a requirement existed, Mr. Van Buren's absences over six months would not constitute loss of residency as long as he maintains a household in Spring City. Council Member Anderson stated that an option for the council would be to reinstate Mr. Van Buren to the Planning & Zoning Commission, since the city currently has a vacancy.

Council Member Anderson explained that he talked to Mr. Bateman about commission members attending their meeting via Zoom, and Mr. Bateman confirmed that it is permissible for Planning & Zoning Commission members to participate remotely when necessary, similar to how the City Council allows remote participation.

Council members discussed whether reinstatement would reset Mr. Van Buren's term length. It was noted that he had approximately two to two and a half years remaining on his original term. The general sense was that reinstating him with his original remaining term would be reasonable.

Playground Equipment Bids and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Discussion

Mayor Paul Penrod reported that Spring City placed third in the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding cycle and was awarded $226,946 for park improvements. The city has already received bids for the project but would like to obtain additional proposals. He expressed interest in retaining and refurbishing the existing playground equipment rather than replacing it entirely, noting that this approach would save money. The desired additions include swings and sunshades.

Mayor Penrod also noted that early estimates suggested the city might be short approximately $22,000. However, after speaking with Cade Penney, it appears likely that the project will be fully funded through CDBG without requiring the city to cover that shortfall. In addition, the community has already raised $9,000 for the project, reducing the potential city contribution to roughly $10,000 to $11,000 if needed. Mr. Penney expressed confidence that even this amount may not be required.

Council Member James Baker raised several concerns related to the park design and long-term planning. He expressed concern that the color scheme in the current equipment and the bids did not align with the surrounding national historic district. He suggested using earth-tone colors such as browns and greens to better complement the restored historic buildings. He also emphasized the importance of ensuring that any new equipment blends cohesively with the existing structures if the city chooses to refurbish rather than replace.

Additionally, Council Member Baker encouraged the council to consider Spring City's current population, projected future growth, and the fact that the park is used heavily by both the public and a school. Because this dual use increases wear and tear, he stressed the need to select equipment that is durable and capable of supporting a growing community.

The council acknowledged the need for additional proposals, design considerations, and final cost evaluations before moving forward.

Possible Repeal of Ordinance 2026-03 and Possible Revision or Repeal of Ordinance 2025-05

Council Member Chris Anderson acknowledged that the topic was sensitive but said he wanted to speak plainly from his own perspective. He explained that some residents have been told that signing the referendum petition carries no consequence beyond placing the issue on the ballot, but stated that this is not entirely accurate. If the referendum succeeds, the zoning ordinance would change immediately—specifically the lot-size requirements—and those changes would remain in effect until the next election. His concern is that even if the referendum ultimately failed, the timing might make it impossible to revert the ordinance back to its prior form in time to avoid unintended impacts. Council Member Anderson stated that the city is consulting with legal counsel about possible options. One option would be for the council to repeal the most recent ordinance now, effectively giving petitioners the outcome they are seeking six months early. The council could then introduce a new ordinance, either reinstating the previous version or drafting an entirely new one that better reflects what the community wants. Council Member Anderson emphasized that this is simply another path the council may want to consider as it decides how to move forward.

Council Member Michael Broadbent asked whether the original referendum application had stated that the vote be held in 2027. Ruth Ann McCain explained that state law requires the referendum to go to the next municipal election, which is in 2027. However, after the application was posted, both the county and the state informed the city that the referendum could instead be placed on this year's general election ballot. She noted that the date has been amended accordingly, and if all requirements are met in time, the referendum would appear on the ballot this November.

Council Member Anderson explained that tonight's discussion is to talk about what the council would want in a new ordinance if the other one were repealed.

Council Member Laurel Workman noted that the square footage of a guesthouse/accessory dwelling unit needs to be a little bigger if stairs are to be considered.

Council Member James Baker stated his concerns that Planning and Zoning are the ones who should be getting community input and bringing land-use ordinances to the council. He felt that this would alleviate concerns from the community about shrinking the National Historic District, council members owning property, and conflict of interest. Both Council Members Anderson and Workman noted that this would be a land-use ordinance and therefore would need to have a public hearing conducted by Planning and Zoning, along with a recommendation from Planning and Zoning to the council. There was a lengthy discussion among the council, which included looking at more choices in buildable lot sizes, repeal of the ordinances, a vote/referendum, the General Plan, and preserving open space and heritage in the community.

City Public Meetings Rules of Order, Training

Ruth Ann McCain, the Spring City Recorder, presented some general rules in Robert's Rules of Order to the Council.

Adjournment: 8:42 PM

APPROVED

SPRING CITY, UTAH RECORDERS OFFICE CORPORATE SEAL