



## **Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**

July 22, 2026

47 S Main St. Tooele, UT 84074

Council Chambers Room 308

7:00 p.m.

Draft

### **1. Pledge of Allegiance**

Pledge of allegiance led by Commissioner Alder.

### **2. Roll Call**

Chairman Toni Scott called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM, showing in attendance Commissioner Curtis Beckstrom, Commissioner Kevin Christensen, Commissioner Michael Dow, Commissioner Richard Mitchell, Commissioner Andy Stetz, Commissioner Dean Alder and Chairman Toni Scott.

### **3. Minutes**

#### **A. Minutes from the May 6, 2026 Meeting**

MOTION AND VOTE

Attachments

1. MAY 6, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – DRAFT.PDF

Commissioner Beckstrom made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from May 6, 2026. 2nd by Commissioner Dow. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

#### **B. Minutes from the June 3, 2026 Meeting**

MOTION AND VOTE

Attachments

1. JUNE 3, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES – DRAFT.PDF

Commissioner Christensen made a motion to approve meeting minutes from June 3, 2026. 2nd by Commissioner Mitchell. Commissioner Beckstrom abstained as he was not in attendance for the June 3, 2026, meeting. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

### **4. Subdivisions**

#### **A. SUB AMD 2025-155 Nelson Molina is requesting approval for a plat amendment to Captains Island Subdivision #2, Mili Pioquinto**

MOTION AND VOTE

Mili Pioquinto, Planning Staff, summarized that Nelson Molina is requesting a plat amendment approval to consolidate two (lots #27, and #93) parcels into one parcel within Captains Island Subdivision located in Stansbury Park. The applicant owns both parcels. Staff and the applicant have identified a minor concern regarding the utility easement vacation. While some utility providers have approved the vacation in full, others have either not granted approval or have only approved limited encroachments. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, it must be demonstrated that the proposed building placement complies

with all required setbacks and does not encroach on any remaining utility easements. No public comment was received prior to today's meeting on this item. Planning Staff recommends that the Tooele County Planning Commission makes a motion to approve the subdivision plat amendment, subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant to work with Comcast on obtaining utility vacation letter.
  - a. If a vacation letter is not granted, a note shall be placed on the plat before recording.
2. Applicant to work with Ensign Engineering to add the Planning Commission signature block onto the plat.

Commissioner Dow made a motion to approve subdivision amendment 2025-155 with the stipulation that the property owner add the Planning Commission signature block on the plat as well as work with the utility companies to obtain utility vacation letters. 2nd by Commissioner Alder. Roll call vote. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

**B. SUB AMD 2025-168 Joseph and Lindsey Wilson are requesting a plat amendment for Golf Course Island Subdivision #3, Mili Pioquinto**  
MOTION AND VOTE

Mili Pioquinto, Planning Staff, summarized Joseph and Lindsey Wilson are requesting a plat amendment approval for lot #27 within Golf Course Island Subdivision #3 located in Stansbury Park. The request is to consolidate the three parcels into one parcel. The subject properties consist of approximately 0.482 acres total, located in Stansbury Park. Staff and the applicant have identified a minor concern regarding the utility easement vacation. While some utility providers have approved the vacation in full, others have either not granted approval or have only approved limited encroachments. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, it must be demonstrated that the proposed building placement complies with all required setbacks and does not encroach on any remaining utility easements. No public comment was received prior to today's meeting. Planning Staff recommends that the Tooele County Planning Commission makes a motion to approve the subdivision plat amendment, subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant to work with Comcast on obtaining utility vacation letter.
  - a. If a vacation letter is not granted, a note shall be placed on the plat before recording.
2. Applicant to work with Ensign Engineering to add the Planning Commission signature block onto the plat.

Chairman Scott made a motion to approve the subdivision plat amendment subject to the following conditions. 1. The landowner works with Comcast on obtaining the vacation letter for utilities and 2. The applicant works with Ensign Engineering to add the Planning Commission signature to that plat. 2nd by Commissioner Christensen. Roll call vote. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

**5. Conditional Use Permits**

**A. PUBLIC HEARING- CUP 2026-097 ETSRS LLC is requesting Conditional Use Approval for Land Farming Modified in the MG-EX zone, Mili Pioquinto**  
PUBLIC HEARING, MOTION, AND VOTE

Mili Pioquinto, Planning Staff, summarized that ETSRS, LLC is requesting a conditional use permit approval for a landfarming-modified facility in the MG-EX zone. The site will provide industrial and commercial organizations with the capability to responsibly dispose of non-hazardous contaminated soils and liquids. The subject property is located to the south of the Republic Services Wasatch Regional Landfill, on the east side of Rowley Rd. No public comment was received prior to today's meeting.

**Aaron Norton**, Vice President of ETSRS, explained that the operation will be similar to the company's existing facility in Salt Lake County, which is scheduled to close at the end of the year. Due to the growing demand for this type of service in Utah, ETSRS is proposing to expand its operations from its current 40-acre site to a new 100-acre site. Mr. Norton explained that the facility takes petroleum-contaminated soils,

such as those from gas stations, and combines them with biosolids and bacterial amendments. Through a treatment process, the bacteria break down the petroleum contaminants, resulting in clean, high-quality topsoil. He stated that the topsoil is tested to ensure it meets all requirements. Mr. Norton noted that the Salt Lake County Landfill uses the product as daily and final cover material. ETSRS currently operates under a DEQ permit at its existing facility and will obtain a new permit for the proposed location as well.

Chairman Scott asked how contaminated materials are disposed of. Mr. Norton responded that there is no disposal process, as the bacteria biologically treat the petroleum contaminated soils. The resulting byproduct is clean topsoil that is tested to ensure it meets all requirements. He added that the treatment process at the proposed facility will be the same as at the existing Salt Lake County facility.

Chairman Scott opened the public hearing.

No public comment.

Chairman Scott closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Mitchell made a motion to approve the CUP requested by ETSRS LLC for the proposed ETSRS Facility for landfarming-modified, application number 2026-097, based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed by the Planning Staff: Following and completing conditions identified at preliminary, final, and site plan application approvals. 2nd by Commissioner Dow. Roll call vote. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

## **6. Rezones**

### **A. REZ 2026-051 Gardner Francis with Westland Development Services is requesting a rezone from MU-40 to MG-EX (tabled from 5/6/2026), Mili Pioquinto**

#### **MOTION AND VOTE**

Mili Pioquinto, Planning Staff, summarized that this rezone was tabled at the May 6 meeting to allow the applicant additional time to provide clarification regarding the requested rezone. Since that time, the applicant has submitted the requested studies and addressed all modifications requested by staff. The property is located south of the Tooele Army Depot and is currently zoned MU-40. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property to MG-EX to allow a gravel excavation operation. Staff noted that the public hearing and public comment period were held during the May 6 Planning Commission meeting. As no additional public hearing was required, staff is requesting that the Commission consider the item and make a motion.

**Gardner Francis**, the applicant, summarized that an environmental assessment and traffic impact study had been completed. Mr. Francis reported that the traffic study anticipates 18 truck round trips per day and concluded that the proposed operation would increase traffic on SR-36 by approximately 0.5%. Because SR-36 is classified as a Category II highway, no roadway improvements or traffic mitigation measures were recommended. The environmental assessment stated that the property has remained undeveloped grassland and that the third-party environmental review identified no recognized environmental concerns, significant data gaps, or conditions warranting further investigation. He added that nearby properties, including the Tooele County Waste Facility and the Tooele Army Depot, did not present concerns affecting the subject property. He also stated that he had been referred to the Health Department and Roads Department, neither of which raised concerns. Mr. Francis outlined the proposed reclamation plan, explaining that the excavation would be completed in phases. Approximately 30 acres would remain active throughout the operation to accommodate crushing and processing activities, while the remaining areas would be reclaimed concurrently as mining progresses. He stated that reclamation would follow applicable standards and that a detailed reclamation plan would be submitted as part of the Conditional Use Permit application.

Chairman Scott asked whether the proposed haul route could utilize the Mormon Trail rather than SR-36 to reduce truck traffic through Main Street. The applicant, Gardner Francis, responded that SR-36 is

anticipated to be the primary haul route, although alternative routes have not been finalized. He explained that discussions with the County Roads Department determined that if haul trucks negatively impact county roads, the applicant would be responsible for addressing those impacts through an appropriate agreement.

Commissioners and staff further discussed concerns regarding increased truck traffic through Tooele City and Grantsville, as well as the potential use of existing designated truck routes, with Chairman Scott addressing Deputy County Attorney Nathan Harris for feedback.

Deputy County Attorney Nathan Harris stated that his recommendation was not to impose any additional impacts on the applicant, but instead to require that the applicant follow any designated truck routes as applicable under the Tooele County Code, as the County has specified truck routes. He explained that there are exceptions to the truck route requirements, such as when a truck must leave a designated route to access a business location. He further stated, as Ms. Custer had explained, that the County cannot dictate what is or is not allowed on state-controlled roadways. Because portions of SR-36 are designated truck routes by UDOT and Tooele City, the County cannot control whether trucks use SR-36. Mr. Harris acknowledged the concerns regarding truck traffic but recommended against imposing conditions that could be detrimental to the applicant's business interests.

Commissioner Dow made a motion to make a favorable recommendation for Rezone 2026-051 to the County Council. 2nd by Commissioner Alder. Roll call vote. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Toni Scott called for a five-minute break at 7:44PM. The meeting resumed at 8:11PM.

## **7. Land Use Ordinances**

### **A. PUBLIC HEARING- TCLUO 2026-102 Staff is requesting an ordinance to adopt a Regionally Significant Development Zone (RSDZ) Overlay, Mili Pioquinto**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING, MOTION, AND VOTE**

Rachelle Custer, Community Development Director, summarized that staff are requesting an ordinance to adopt a Regionally Significant Development Zone (RSDZ) Overlay. The overlay was established through HB507 during the legislative session. She noted that it does not create a new land use zoning district, but rather an overlay that allows for regionally significant development projects. Ms. Custer stated that projects eligible under the overlay could include large load customer facilities, mixed-use developments, high-density income-targeted housing, large commercial and office developments, and data centers. She explained that the overlay allows the County to establish conditions related to water availability, utility capacity, traffic infrastructure, buffering, and compatibility. Ms. Custer emphasized that the overlay does not change the underlying zoning district but is applied over the existing zoning designation. She added that the overlay also allows qualifying projects to access certain state infrastructure financing opportunities. Ms. Custer explained that the process begins with the Planning Commission making a recommendation to the County Council. The County Council would then adopt the Overlay Development Zone, which must also be approved by the State. Once approved, if qualifying projects or properties are identified, the overlay may be applied to the existing zoning district for those properties, allowing them to accommodate larger-scale developments and utilize available state financing tools.

Commissioner Mitchell asked whether the ordinance allows Tooele County to establish a Regional Significant Development Zone and whether it establishes the process for creating that zone. Ms. Custer confirmed that it does and explained that Chapter 34 addresses one type of regional development. She clarified that not all data centers would receive an RSDZ designation, as each project is considered independently and reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether use of the financing tool is appropriate and whether the project provides a significant regional benefit. She noted there is no single set of qualifying criteria. Commissioner Mitchell asked what public involvement is allowed in establishing an RSDZ. Ms. Custer stated that the County would retain all land use authority, conditional use permits would

still be required where applicable, and an RSDZ would follow the County's standard land use process. Commissioner Christensen asked if the ordinance is following what the State of Utah is proposing. Ms. Custer confirmed that it is and explained that adoption of the ordinance establishes the process. If an applicant later applies to use an RSDZ, the County would then begin its review process. Chairman Scott noted that there is currently no applicant or application associated with the ordinance. Ms. Custer explained that the ordinance creates an overlay zoning tool that may be applied over qualifying housing, commercial, industrial, or other projects providing a regional benefit, not just data centers. She clarified that adoption of the ordinance does not give the State authority to locate projects without County approval. Any proposed RSDZ would require a recommendation from the Planning Commission, approval by the Tooele County Council, State approval, and any required conditional use permit. Commissioner Mitchell asked if the purpose of the item was to recommend adoption of the ordinance. Ms. Custer stated that staff are requesting a recommendation to the County Council. Commissioner Mitchell also asked about blank sections in the staff report. Deputy County Attorney Nathan Harris explained that they are still working through the House Bill and finalizing details, including whether to prioritize specific industries or locations. He stated the remaining sections would be completed before the ordinance is presented to the County Council. Ms. Custer explained that the process includes a recommendation from the Planning Commission, approval by the County Council, and approval by the State, after which staff would draft the chapter and begin the adoption process. Commissioner Dow asked whether State approval would qualify a project for funding and who would receive the funding. Ms. Custer explained that any funding or incentives would be provided to the project holder. She also noted that HB 307 specifies which uses must remain conditional uses.

Chairman Scott opened the public hearing.

**Anita Dalrymple** expressed concern that the proposed RSDZ could reduce the County's local land use authority and override the General Plan. She stated that she was concerned the language in Chapter 34 could give entities such as MIDA and the Utah Inland Port Authority greater authority over projects, including data centers, resulting in a loss of local control. She also stated that, in her opinion, the potential tax incentives did not outweigh the importance of maintaining local decision-making authority.

**Jeanette Hansen**, a Tooele resident, asked why staff indicated the proposed ordinance was not specifically about data centers when the next agenda item addressed regulations for data center facilities. After receiving clarification that the current public hearing was for the overlay zone and that data centers would be discussed under the next agenda item, she indicated she would reserve her comments until that time.

**Rose Moore**, a Stansbury Park resident, expressed concern that the proposed overlay language is vague and could allow data centers or other unintended projects. She suggested adding exclusionary language to better align the ordinance with the County's goals and to maintain local control before future projects are approved. She also stated that she found the agenda confusing and felt unprepared to comment. She encouraged the County to strengthen the ordinance if the goal is to prevent data center development.

**Mike Lloyd** asked the Commission to look at the proposed overlay to establish limits on impacts such as water usage, power consumption, traffic, and other development standards. He encouraged the County to establish those parameters now to help limit future impacts from projects, including data centers, housing, and distribution centers. He stated that he would like Tooele County to preserve its rural character as the community continues to grow.

**Jeremiah Klingonsmith**, a Tooele resident, questioned what additional authority or benefits the proposed framework would provide beyond the County's existing land use authority. He expressed concern that the framework could facilitate large-scale developments, including data centers, and questioned whether it would increase or reduce the County's authority over future development decisions.

**Natalie Merriam** stated that her family has lived in Utah for several generations and that she wants Tooele County to remain a place for future generations. She offered three recommendations regarding data centers: no tax incentives for data centers, no increased power costs for residents, and no water rights for data centers. She stated that developers should be responsible for the costs associated with their projects rather than passing those costs on to the community. She added that if such measures discourage data

center development, it would be easier to prevent those projects than address potential impacts after they are built.

**Patrick Alldredge** lives near the Inland Port area and relies on a private well. He expressed concern about the potential water demand of future data center development and questioned including data centers within the same framework as other qualifying projects, such as affordable housing. He referenced information regarding a proposed data center and estimated water use, stating that he believed the potential demand could significantly impact local water resources. He also questioned whether Tooele County has the infrastructure and climate necessary to support data center development.

**Michael Benson**, a resident, expressed concern that the proposed overlay language is too broad and could be subject to unintended interpretation or misuse. Drawing on his professional experience interpreting laws, he encouraged the Commission to address any questions or concerns with the ordinance now rather than relying on future assurances. He stated that clarifying the language during the adoption process could help avoid future issues or the need for additional legislation.

Chairman Scott closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Mitchell stated that the public had provided thoughtful comments that should be respected and considered. He asked whether Tooele County would have greater or less authority over its land by adopting the ordinance. Ms. Custer responded that the County's authority would remain unchanged. Commissioner Mitchell asked about the status of the document, noting that the Commission was being asked to vote on it as a final document even though it would later go before the Tooele County Council, the State, and return in a revised form. Ms. Custer explained that the document before the Commission asks the Planning Commission to make either a favorable or unfavorable recommendation to the County Council to create a Regional Significant Development Zone. If the Council chooses to proceed, the proposal would then be submitted to the State for approval. Following State approval, staff would draft the chapter containing the specific development standards, including setbacks and other requirements, which would then return to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation.

Commissioner Dow referenced a comment made during the public hearing that questioned why data centers and low-income or high-density housing were being grouped together. He stated that his understanding is that they are not being grouped together for zoning purposes, but only as potential uses that may qualify for a RSDZ zone, which is separate from the County's zoning regulations and is primarily related to the ability to access state financing tools. Ms. Custer confirmed that was correct. She explained that similar to an industrial zoning district that contains a table of multiple permitted uses, an RSDZ may include a variety of qualifying uses, such as low-income housing, data centers, or other eligible projects. She clarified that those uses are grouped together only because they may qualify for an RSDZ, not because they are treated as the same type of development.

Commissioner Stetz made a motion to table the County Land Use Ordinance request by staff for the adoption of the Regionally Significant Development Zone Overlay (RSDZ) application number 2026-102 until staff fills in the blank on the uses. 2nd by Commissioner Dow. Roll call vote. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

**B. PUBLIC HEARING- TCLUO 2026-100 Staff is requesting Tooele County Land Use Ordinance Chapter 34 to create a chapter for Data Center Facilities , Mili Pioquinto**  
PUBLIC HEARING, MOTION, AND VOTE

Rachelle Custer, Community Development Director, summarized that Tooele County does not have a data center ordinance. Data centers are being proposed across Utah, including in and around Tooele County. Without a specific ordinance, each application gets reviewed on a case-by-case basis under general zoning – creating uncertainty for residents, applicants, and staff. The proposed ordinance sets strict guidelines, clear location and design standards. Requires full disclosure of impacts (water, power, economic & fiscal impacts as well as roads and services), protecting neighborhoods and quality of life.

Every data center facility will require conditional use permits regardless of the size. It also addresses the plan for the end of the facility's life. The proposal at this time is to allow data centers to only be allowed in our heavy manufacturing zoning districts because those are buffered from any residential use. They are in areas where we anticipate higher traffic use, higher power use, higher water use, for our heavy industrial developments. Planning staff requests that the Planning Commission review the ordinance thoroughly and make a favorable or unfavorable recommendation to the County Council. Ms. Custer read some of the public comments that were received prior to the public hearing and distributed to the Planning Commissioners prior to the meeting.

Commissioners had a discussion regarding the need for guidelines for data centers.

Chairman Scott opened the public meeting.

**Joshua Reuter**, a member of the public, asked if the Planning Commission would accept a petition with signatures. The Commission advised that the petition should be submitted to the Community Development Department. Joshua reiterated comments made by Commissioner Dow, stating that now is the appropriate time to adopt ordinances addressing potential impacts before future projects are proposed. He recommended a temporary 12-month moratorium to allow additional public discussion regarding water rights, power infrastructure, and other potential impacts and would provide time to ensure appropriate regulations are in place before future development occurs.

**Janette Hansen**, a Tooele City resident of 27 years, stated that she has witnessed declining water levels in the Great Salt Lake and worsening drought conditions during that time. She expressed concern that data centers would require significant water resources, generate wastewater, and contribute to heat impacts that could affect wildlife, residents, and the environment. Ms. Hansen also stated that, in her opinion, data center developers target rural communities by promising economic development and jobs, but that the long-term employment benefits are limited. She further expressed concern that environmental impacts, including water quality, noise, and declining property values for nearby residents, have not matched the promises made by data center developers. She encouraged the Commission to oppose data center development.

**Michael Benson** reiterated his earlier comments and encouraged the Commission to ensure the ordinance language is clear and consistent. He expressed concern about noise standards, stating that the ordinance should clearly define the applicable noise measurements and adequately address the potential impacts of large-scale data centers. Mr. Benson also expressed concern about the handling and disposal of chemicals associated with data center operations and encouraged the Commission to ensure those impacts are addressed to protect local water resources and the Great Salt Lake. He recommended that any utility infrastructure upgrades, including substations, transmission lines, and generation facilities required for data centers, be paid entirely by the developer rather than local ratepayers. Mr. Benson further recommended prohibiting onsite natural gas turbines or diesel generators as primary power sources to help protect air quality. He also expressed concern about light pollution and its potential impacts on surrounding residents. He concluded by encouraging the Commission to address any concerns in the ordinance now, stating that clear requirements are necessary to avoid future issues with large-scale developments.

**Jeremiah Klingonsmith** questioned the need to create an ordinance for a type of development that does not currently exist in the County, stating that doing so suggests such development may be anticipated in the future. He also suggested that data centers be treated more like a public utility than a traditional commercial development so that the County and its residents receive a direct benefit. As an example, he recommended requiring a data center developer to offset its power usage in a manner that would help reduce utility costs for County residents.

**Anita Dalrymple** stated that she had submitted scientific research and supporting references regarding the potential impacts of data centers for the Commission's consideration. She requested that the Commission hold an additional public meeting to allow for specific recommendations on the proposed ordinance language, stating that she believed portions of the draft were vague and could create unintended

consequences or increase the risk of future litigation. She encouraged the Commission to further refine the ordinance before making a recommendation.

**Toree Sherrod** presented several case studies that she found documented the environmental and community impacts of data center developments in other states. She cited examples involving concerns related to air quality, water consumption, wastewater, emissions, e-waste, and public health, as well as community opposition and legal challenges.

**Patrick Alldredge** expressed concern that the County should prioritize the public's water needs over future corporate development. He shared his personal experience of declining well conditions. He also expressed concern about wastewater discharges and potential impacts on the Great Salt Lake and its ecosystem. Mr. Alldredge encouraged the Commission to gather additional information before making decisions regarding future data center development and asked that water resources remain a priority.

**Tracey Grgich** stated that she was confused about what the County can and cannot do regarding the proposed overlay and questioned whether MIDA or the Utah Inland Port Authority could override the County's decisions, referencing what she understood had occurred in Box Elder County. She questioned the purpose of the process if state entities could ultimately proceed based on national security. Ms. Grgich also expressed concern about potential noise from a data center. She further expressed concern about water resources and stated that she felt residents' concerns were not being heard. She said she was concerned that MIDA could ultimately move forward with a project based on national security regardless of local opposition.

**Charles Akerlow**, one of the owners and developers of the Interstate Business Park at Interstate 80 and the Burmester Road interchange, stated that the business park encompasses approximately 600 acres. Mr. Akerlow stated that his company has been working with a data center developer for the past three years and has gained a better understanding of the power and water requirements associated with data centers. He explained that water use is regulated by the Utah State Engineer and stated that his company purchased and registered sufficient water rights for the property, with water usage monitored to ensure compliance. He expressed confidence in the state's water management system and concluded by stating that data centers are a critical component of the nation's infrastructure.

**Christopher Aydelotte** stated that he moved to Tooele County because of its small-town character and expressed opposition to the proposed data center. He encouraged the Planning Commission to conduct thorough due diligence before making a decision. Mr. Aydelotte expressed concerns about potential increases in taxes, utility costs, water use, noise, and electricity demand. He also opposed providing tax incentives or tax credits to a data center developer, stating that he did not want taxpayers to bear the financial burden. He questioned the long-term economic benefits of a data center, expressing concern that employment opportunities would decline after construction and that a developer could leave after receiving tax incentives. He urged the Planning Commission to carefully consider the long-term impacts of the proposal before making a recommendation.

**Stacie Jelte**, a Tooele resident originally from Box Elder County, encouraged the Planning Commission to consult with officials from Eagle Mountain City and industry professionals regarding the impacts of large industrial and data center developments. She stated that, based on information she had heard, the construction and startup of data centers may require significant water use for flushing and treating water lines before operations begin. Ms. Jelte expressed support for obtaining additional input from subject-matter experts before making a decision. She also requested that the proposed regulations include clear accountability and enforcement measures if a developer fails to comply with stated commitments or exceeds established limits, expressing concern that financial penalties alone may not be an adequate deterrent.

**Lisa Lingwell**, a Grantsville resident, stated that she agreed with the concerns expressed by previous speakers. She said she was concerned after hearing that a data center project had been in development for several years and referenced information she had heard that a previously approved data center project was in the process of drilling wells. Ms. Lingwell urged the Planning Commission to consider the concerns of local residents and carefully evaluate the potential environmental impacts of future data center development, stating that protection of the environment was her primary concern.

**Jessica Pashan**, a Grantsville resident, expressed opposition to the proposed data center overlay, stating that she was concerned about potential impacts on air quality, water resources, drinking water, energy

availability, and the Great Salt Lake. She questioned whether developers would be held accountable for complying with water use and other commitments and referenced examples from other states that she believed demonstrated negative impacts associated with data centers. Ms. Pashan also expressed concern about the use of taxpayer incentives for data center development, questioned the long-term economic benefits after construction is complete, and raised concerns about the limited number of permanent jobs that would be created. She further questioned whether the proposal would provide sufficient benefits to Tooele County and requested greater accountability, transparency, and information regarding permanent employment opportunities and the overall community benefits of data center development.

**Cameron Ordakowski**, a real estate consultant working with developers in Tooele Valley, clarified that, to his understanding, a previously discussed data center project was still in the research and discussion phase and had not yet been approved or constructed. He stated that he was neutral on data centers and explained that the developer he represents has declined data center proposals in favor of commercial and industrial development that would provide more long-term employment opportunities. Mr. Ordakowski suggested that, if data centers are permitted, they should be located in remote areas of the county to reduce potential impacts on nearby residents. He also expressed concern that, as the military increasingly relies on artificial intelligence, data centers could eventually be developed on federal or military-owned land, where local governments would have limited authority. He questioned whether the County would receive tax revenue from data centers located on federal or military property.

**Christa Aydelotte** asked whether the County could choose not to allow data centers and stated that she opposed their development. She expressed concerns about potential impacts on water resources, electricity demand, and the environment. Ms. Aydelotte said she moved to Tooele County about 30 years ago because of its rural character and natural beauty and, while she recognizes that growth is inevitable, she does not want development to change the community's identity. She encouraged the Planning Commission to consider alternative types of development that would better preserve the County's rural character and quality of life.

**Amy Lawson** stated that she had spent time researching the topic in an effort to better understand the proposal and provide informed comments. She thanked the Planning Commission for proactively addressing the issue and expressed support for taking steps to avoid problems experienced in other communities. Ms. Lawson questioned why the County could not simply choose not to allow the proposed overlay or future data center development. She also stated that she was unaware the Regional Significant Development Overlay would be discussed at the meeting and expressed concern that the agenda and available information did not clearly indicate the overlay would be considered. Additionally, she expressed confusion regarding the County Commission meeting process and requested greater clarity about future discussions.

**Mike Lloyd** stated that he shared the concerns expressed by other residents regarding the proposed data center development. He expressed concern about the County's limited water resources. He asked if the County cannot prohibit data centers, can they consider limiting their size.

**April Booth**, a Tooele resident, questioned whether the County could choose not to allow data centers if they are determined to be incompatible with Tooele County's long-term land use goals, water resources, electrical infrastructure, and rural character. She stated that she moved to Tooele County more than 30 years ago because of its small-town atmosphere and expressed concern about preserving that character as the County grows. Ms. Booth asked the Planning Commission to consider whether data centers should be defined as a use that is not permitted in any zoning district or as a conditional use.

**Zel**, a Tooele County resident and school teacher, expressed opposition to data center development. She stated that, given the County's desert environment and limited water resources, data centers should not be considered an appropriate use. She also expressed concerns about the broader impacts of artificial intelligence.

**Jared Shields**, a Stansbury Park resident, stated that he supported the County taking a proactive approach to developing ordinances but encouraged the Planning Commission to take the time necessary to ensure the language is thorough and enforceable. He suggested that recommendations should be written as mandates to eliminate ambiguity. Mr. Shields also stated that enforcement measures should be

meaningful, expressing the opinion that large companies may view financial penalties as a cost of doing business unless the consequences significantly affect their operations.

**Clint Warner**, a Stansbury Park resident, stated that he had concerns about the economics of data centers and questioned their long-term financial viability. He expressed concern that rapid advances in technology could require costly hardware replacement and stated that communities could ultimately bear the financial consequences if projects are not sustainable. Mr. Warner supported adopting ordinances to regulate data centers and emphasized that any such development should provide a clear economic benefit to Tooele County.

Chairman Scott closed the public meeting.

Ms. Custer clarified the distinction between MIDA and Utah Inland Port Authority. She explained that MIDA has legislative and land use authority within its project areas, including authority over private property when a project area is established with county approval. In contrast, the Utah Inland Port Authority does not have land use authority. She stated that projects within an Inland Port project area remain under the County's land use authority, with the Inland Port serving primarily as a financing and taxing tool. Chairman Scott emphasized that the Planning Commission's responsibility is to plan for future land use and zoning. She noted that other Utah counties had been approached with data center proposals before adopting regulations specific to those uses and stated that Chapter 34 provides the County with a starting point for regulating data centers. While acknowledging public concerns that the ordinance could be strengthened, she expressed that having regulations in place is preferable to having none. Commissioner Dow stated that the commission should make an informed decision rather than act hastily. He requested that staff prepare additional research identifying how strict or lenient the ordinance could legally be under state law. He also asked staff to review public comments and provide recommendations on issues such as water use, closed loop versus air-cooled systems, setbacks, and noise standards. Ms. Custer responded that many of those provisions are already included in the draft ordinance, but stated staff would be happy to conduct additional research if the Commission identified specific topics through a motion. She encouraged commissioners to provide detailed direction as well as the public comments received.

Additional discussion occurred between the Planning Commission, Staff, and the County Attorney regarding the draft Chapter 34 ordinance. Discussion included legal authority, ordinance definitions, technical standards, public comments, bonding requirements, the review process, and potential revisions prior to bringing the ordinance back for further consideration.

Commissioner Mitchell made a motion to table Chapter 34 to a work session in August until they can complete the draft form and bring it back on the agenda in September. 2nd by Commissioner Alder. Roll call vote. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

## **8. Planning Commission Comments**

## **9. Adjournment**

Chairman Scott adjourned the meeting at 9:50PM.