

SPRING CITY COUNCIL WORK MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, July 30, 2026, 6:30 p.m.

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

In Person Attendance: Cami Christensen, Kristen Mortensen, Jesse Ralphs, Craig Paulsen, Andrew Skousen, Sally Scott, Ashley Webb, Bruce Spiegel, Cory Madsen, Trevor Hooser, Ruth Ann McCain; Recorder.

Zoom Attendance: Terry Bredthauer,

Roll Call: Michael Broabent, James Baker, Chris Anderson, Paul Penrod, Laurel Workman, Stan Soper, Cami Christensen, Kristen Mortensen, Craig Paulsen

Deer Ordinance

Mayor Paul Penrod explained that the proposed deer ordinance prohibiting the feeding of deer is the first step required by the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) before the City can move forward with options to reduce the deer population within the city. He said DWR receives a number of calls regarding injured animals in the area and has indicated they could work with the City on a possible depredation hunt in the fall once the necessary steps are completed.

Council Member Chris Anderson supported moving forward with the ordinance, noting that the City had considered a similar ordinance several years ago when feeding deer was an issue. He suggested contacting Manti to find out how effective their ordinance and subsequent efforts have been, saying he would like to know how many deer have they got rid of and whether the program has made a noticeable difference.

Council Member Laurel Workman asked whether adopting the ordinance would result in DWR doing anything differently than what is currently being done. Mayor Penrod explained that DWR requires the City to have a no-feeding ordinance in place before they can begin their process to reduce the herd. He said DWR has several steps the City must complete, with the no-feeding ordinance being the first.

Council Member Stan Soper questioned whether there are currently people actively feeding deer in town and whether the City would be addressing a problem that may not presently exist. Council Member Anderson responded that the larger problem is the number of deer in town and the damage they are causing. He explained that DWR requires the feeding ordinance because they do not want people attracting deer into town while efforts are being made to reduce the herd.

Mayor Penrod noted that people have openly fed deer in the past and there may still be feeding occurring that the City is unaware of. Council Member James Baker shared that when he purchased his property, there were large salt blocks on the property that appeared to have been placed there for the deer, which he removed.

Council Member Workman asked whether DWR had previously thinned the herd in Spring City. Mayor Penrod said he was not aware of DWR having done so and reiterated that the City must first complete the required steps. Council Member Anderson again suggested finding out what results Manti has experienced, noting that if only a few deer are removed each year, he would like to know whether the program has made enough of a difference to be worthwhile.

Well Study

Mayor Paul Penrod invited Jesse Ralphs to discuss options for using the remaining funding from the City's water project. Mr. Ralphs explained that, with the current restrictions on new connections and concerns about water system capacity, there has been renewed interest in pursuing a new well. Although the remaining project funds would not be enough to construct a complete production well, the City could complete several preliminary steps and move the project toward being shovel ready.

Council Member Chris Anderson asked where a new well would likely be located. Mr. Ralphs explained that a well-siting study had previously been completed and identified near 300 North and 200 West. The study considered the geology and aquifer, existing well logs, proximity to power and the City's existing water system, and the availability of property. The goal would be to find a site capable of producing approximately 300 to 400 gallons per minute. Mr. Ralphs emphasized that the study cannot guarantee water at that rate but identifies the area with the highest probability of success.

Council discussed the property identified in the study and which landowners might need to be contacted. Mr. Ralphs said the first step would be to approach property owners in the recommended area and determine whether they would be willing to allow the City to investigate the site.

Council Member Stan Soper asked whether the City has sufficient water rights to drill another well. Mr. Ralphs said the City does have the water rights but would need to file a change application to add the new well as another point of diversion. He noted that the City's water rights associated with its wells are actually larger than those associated with its springs.

Council Member Soper then asked whether the City's existing wells are not producing enough water. Mr. Ralphs explained that there are two considerations: the amount of water physically available to the City today and the amount of source capacity the State requires the City to maintain. While the City's tanks currently have water, the State requires capacity beyond average daily use to account for emergencies, fire flow, and other demands. Based on current spring flows and State calculations, the City can be more than 100 gallons per minute short of the required source capacity under certain conditions.

Mr. Ralphs explained that the City may eventually be able to conduct a system-specific sizing study using information from the new master meters. If actual water use is lower than the State's standard assumptions, the State may reduce the City's required capacity somewhat. However, he cautioned that this would likely only reduce the deficit and would not eliminate the City's need for additional source capacity.

The Council discussed how the proposed Ashley Webb water extension fits into the City's overall water system needs. Mr. Ralphs explained that approximately \$200,000 of City funding would be needed to complete the Canyon Road portion of the line. Mr. Webb would then continue the line to his property and connect it back into the City's system.

Council Member Anderson asked specifically how the Webb project would benefit the City. Mr. Ralphs explained that the City currently has one 12-inch transmission line carrying water from the upper tank into the system. The existing line is providing adequate pressure and flow, but there is no redundancy. The proposed project would create a second feed into the City's system, increasing transmission capacity and allowing more water to move through the system without as much loss in pressure and flow.

Mayor Penrod asked whether the additional line would affect fire flow. Mr. Ralphs explained that it would improve available fire flow, particularly in the lower portions of the system, because water stored in the tanks could reach the distribution system through two feed lines instead of one.

Mr. Ralphs emphasized that the Webb project would be an improvement to the City's system, particularly for redundancy, fire flow, and future growth. However, the City's distribution capacity is currently adequate, the new tank has provided sufficient storage, and the City is meeting its minimum fire-flow requirements. The City's present deficiency is its water source. As Mr. Ralphs explained, the additional transmission line is not really a benefit until you've got enough water to put into your system.

With approximately \$450,000 remaining in contingency funding from the current water project, the Council discussed how best to use those funds. Mr. Ralphs said portions of both projects could potentially be completed, but emphasized that right now, the critical piece is the well.

Mr. Ralphs then walked the Council through the steps required to develop a new well. Before drilling a test well, the proposed site would need environmental clearance. This process, referred to as NEPA, would include an archaeological survey, consultation with applicable agencies, and a determination of whether there are significant environmental impacts. The estimated engineering cost for this portion is approximately \$17,000.

Once environmental clearance is received, bid specifications and contract documents could be prepared so the City could solicit bids from well drillers. The City could then drill a test well to determine whether the site is capable of producing the amount of water needed.

Mr. Ralphs explained that there are different levels of engineering involvement the City could choose during test drilling. The City could have the well driller complete the work and report the results, or the City's engineers and hydrogeologist could be involved in coordinating the drilling and evaluating the material brought up from the well. The hydrogeologist could use that information to help determine the appropriate screen and gravel pack for a future production well.

The test well could also be pump-tested. A temporary pump would be placed in the test well to determine how much water the site can actually produce. If the test results are satisfactory and the City decides to proceed, the next phase would include separate designs for the production well, well house, and transmission line.

As part of the production well design, a Preliminary Evaluation Report (PER) would be submitted to the Division of Drinking Water. The report would evaluate possible contamination sources surrounding the site and help establish that the well could ultimately be approved as a culinary water source.

Council Member Laurel Workman asked whether the preliminary work would still be useful if the City did not construct the production well for several years. Mr. Ralphs said that once most of the work is completed, it would remain useful. If the project were delayed for a very long period, such as 15 years, some information and approvals would likely need to be refreshed. A delay of two to five years, however, should not create significant problems, although a State plan-review approval could have an expiration date.

Council Member Soper asked how water from the new well would enter the City's existing system. Mr. Ralphs explained that a transmission line would run along 200 West and connect with the existing line currently used by the City's West Well. The new well would become an additional source feeding into the existing system and tanks.

Mr. Ralphs also explained that the design would include a small well house containing the equipment and controls. This would be different from the City's existing West Well, where equipment is located in an underground vault. Current Division of Drinking Water requirements and operating considerations favor placing the equipment in an actual well house.

Council Member Workman asked how much property the City would need for the well site. Mr. Ralphs said approximately one to one-and-a-half acres would be desirable. Drinking water regulations require the City to control the area immediately surrounding the well to protect it from potential contamination. Approximately one acre provides the necessary protection radius, while additional property provides room for fencing, a well house, drilling equipment, and future maintenance.

Rather than purchasing property immediately, Mr. Ralphs suggested that the City first enter into a simple agreement with a property owner allowing a test well to be drilled, with the understanding that if the well tests successfully, the owner would be willing to sell the necessary property. If the landowner is not interested, the City could look for another property within the same general area identified by the well-siting study.

Council Member Workman asked whether purchasing the property could be paid for with the remaining project funds. Mr. Ralphs said the Division of Drinking Water will generally reimburse eligible property acquisition costs and had done so for the City's tank site. He said he would confirm the details with the project manager before the City proceeded.

The Council also discussed the costs involved. Mr. Ralphs explained that the engineering fees in the proposed amendment do not include the actual cost of drilling the test well. Based on recent projects, he suggested budgeting approximately \$100,000 to \$150,000 for test-well drilling, although bids can vary considerably. He estimated that drilling a complete production well could cost approximately \$500,000.

Mr. Ralphs noted that a test well is not required. The City could choose to proceed directly to designing and drilling a production well, but doing so carries greater risk. He described the test well as a risk mitigation measure because it confirms that water is available, determines how much the site can produce, and provides information needed to design the permanent well before the City commits to the much larger expense.

Mayor Penrod asked whether the City could consider purchasing an existing private well or property in an area where water is already known to be available. Mr. Ralphs said that option could be investigated; however, most agricultural or private wells are not constructed to culinary water standards. An existing well could help establish that water is present in an area, but the City would likely still need to drill a new well constructed to culinary standards.

Council Member Workman asked whether water from a new well could instead be pumped into one of the irrigation ponds for use on lawns and gardens. Mr. Ralphs explained that this could potentially be done; however, the City's current source-capacity calculations already assume that approximately 70 to 90 percent of City residents are using irrigation water rather than culinary water for outdoor use. Because that secondary water use is already factored into the calculations, pumping water from a City well into the irrigation system would not resolve the City's existing culinary source-capacity deficit or provide the additional source capacity needed for future growth.

Council Member Soper asked what consequences the City could face if it did not address the source-capacity deficit. Mr. Ralphs explained that the State conducts a sanitary survey approximately every three years, which includes an assessment of source and system capacity. If the City is found to have insufficient source capacity, it could be restricted from adding new connections and therefore limited in its ability to grow.

If the deficiency is significant, the City could be required to enter into a Corrective Action Plan and show the State how it intends to correct the problem. Mr. Ralphs explained that the City would then be expected to take action on that plan. Continued failure to resolve the deficiency could eventually result in fines and increasing State enforcement.

Council Member Soper asked whether a community could simply stop allowing new connections rather than correct the deficiency. After discussing examples from other communities, he commented that simply stopping future connections and growth did not appear to be a realistic long-term solution for Spring City.

Council Member James Baker asked whether drilling another well could lower groundwater levels and affect nearby private wells or ponds. Mr. Ralphs acknowledged that groundwater sources are interconnected and that impacts are possible. He explained that the required water-

right change application would be reviewed by the Division of Water Rights and opened for public protest. If significant concerns were raised, the Division could require further review before making a decision.

Mr. Ralphs added that the hydrogeologic study considers nearby wells when recommending a location, both for source protection and to reduce potential impacts on neighboring water sources. He compared groundwater development to "a bunch of straws in the same cup," explaining that locating wells farther apart can help reduce the effect one well may have on another.

Mayor Penrod asked whether other City-owned property might also be considered for a well site and mentioned having a local dowser look at potential locations. Mr. Ralphs explained that, as the City's professional engineering provider, his firm could not base an engineered well recommendation on dowsing or place an engineer's stamp on that method. However, if the City wanted to have a dowser look at possible sites independently as another point of reference, he did not see a problem with doing so.

Ashley Webb's Water Extension

Ashley Webb presented an additional option for his proposed development involving water-conservation systems in the new homes. He explained that similar systems are already being used in other states and can capture, treat, and reuse water that would otherwise be discharged. Mr. Webb said he recently purchased such a system for another project and believes the technology could significantly reduce the amount of water used by each home.

Mr. Webb said that if the Council were interested in exploring this option, he would be willing to require the systems as part of the covenants and restrictions for the lots in his development rather than asking the City to mandate them. He estimated the additional cost at approximately \$15,000 per home, depending on the number of bathrooms. He felt this could give the City an opportunity to see how the systems perform without placing the responsibility or liability for the requirement on the City.

Mr. Webb explained that developing the property through the County would be the simpler option for him. However, because the property is in the City's buffer area and near the edge of town, he felt there could be a long-term benefit to incorporating the development into the City's overall design rather than creating lots that may remain permanently outside the City.

The discussion then turned to annexation and the neighboring Mickel's property. Mr. Webb said he had spoken with Dan Mickel and understood that the Mickel's were supportive of the project and annexation as long as they were not required to pay for the improvements and could receive a water connection.

Mayor Paul Penrod said his recent conversation with Mr. Mickel had been different. Mayor Penrod said Mr. Mickel had specifically stated, "we are not annexing." He understood that the Mickel's would welcome a water line and connection if the City or Mr. Webb paid for it, but they did not intend to annex their property.

Mr. Webb said he had specifically discussed annexation with Mr. Mickel and had understood that it would be acceptable. He acknowledged that the conflicting information would need to be clarified. Mayor Penrod agreed that another conversation with Mr. Mickel would be necessary.

Mr. Webb said that if annexation and the City water connection did not work out, he could develop the property through the County, most likely as five-acre lots. He said this would be considerably easier for him, but he had been willing to explore the City option because he lives in the community and believes incorporating the property into the City's long-term plan could produce a better result.

Mr. Webb then asked whether the City's current water concern was primarily a pumping issue or whether there was actually insufficient water capacity, and how much difference approximately seven additional homes would make.

Jesse Ralphs explained that the City currently has a source-capacity deficit of approximately 130 gallons per minute. From a system-capacity standpoint the City should not presently be adding new connections, whether that is one house, seven houses, or a much larger development. He explained that the goal should not simply be to reach the minimum required capacity but to develop enough additional source capacity to provide some surplus for future growth.

Mr. Webb acknowledged that the City's current situation involves more than the financial cost of extending the water system; there is also a question of whether sufficient source capacity is available to serve additional connections. Given those circumstances, he said developing the property through the County would probably make more sense at this time.

Mr. Webb mentioned a well he owns on the west side of town and briefly discussed his experiences drilling wells in the area. He noted that well production can vary considerably even between nearby properties. His own well required drilling approximately 640 feet to reach about 100 gallons per minute, while another nearby well drilled to approximately 600 feet produced only about two gallons per minute. Other wells in the area have also had varying results.

Council Member Laurel Workman commented that the City had hoped to locate a spring as an additional water source, which would have been ideal, but no suitable spring had been found.

Mr. Webb concluded that he would most likely proceed with the property as a County development but wanted to bring the alternatives before the Council and discuss them before making that decision. Mayor Penrod thanked him for the information, and the discussion concluded.

Workflow Response to Citizen Communication for City Council

Mayor Paul Penrod introduced Council Member Stan Soper's suggestion regarding how the City responds to citizen communications. Council Member Soper questioned whether a Council Member should serve as a communication liaison to help make sure citizens' concerns are acknowledged and Council Members know when issues are being addressed.

City Recorder Ruth Ann McCain explained that she generally responds when communications come directly to her, while historically the Mayor has taken the lead on citizen concerns or worked with her to determine who should respond. She noted that Council Members may not always see the communication that occurs afterward.

Council discussed the challenge of staying informed while being careful not to create Council deliberations through group emails or other communication outside of a public meeting. Council Member James Baker said it is important for Council Members to be aware when significant issues arise, but acknowledged there is a "very fine line that we not cross" by beginning a back-and-forth discussion.

Council Member Soper suggested that the Mayor continue to generally take the lead, with Council Members checking with him when they are unsure whether something has been received or addressed. Ms. McCain noted that in a recent situation, neither she nor Mayor Penrod had received the original communication. Council agreed that if a Council Member receives something the Mayor may not have received, it should be forwarded to him.

Council Member Michael Broadbent added that the responsibility should not fall entirely on the Mayor. When a concern involves a Council Member's assigned area, such as water or sewer, that Council Member should take the initiative to follow up with the Mayor. Council Member Chris Anderson also noted that the City has a complaint form available when a concern should go through the formal complaint process.

Mayor Penrod explained that when a matter has been referred to City Attorney Wes Mangum, there may be times when the Mayor and Council should not respond. In those situations, they need to follow the City Attorney's direction.

The Council generally agreed that Mayor Penrod will continue to take the lead on citizen communications, with Council Members contacting the Mayor or Recorder individually when they need additional information, forwarding communications the Mayor may not have received, and following up when an issue relates to their assigned area. When the City Attorney is involved, the Council will follow his direction regarding further communication. Mayor Penrod encouraged Council Members, "When you have concerns, please give me a call."

Resolution 2026-08 A Resolution Establishing a Public Planning and Land Use Review Process & Resolution 2026-12 A Supplemental Resolution Establishing a Process for Developing a Comprehensive General Plan

Mayor Paul Penrod introduced Resolution 2026-08 regarding a public planning and land use review process. Council Member Stan Soper explained that he and Michael had each prepared possible resolutions to begin the General Plan review. Council Member Broadbent suggested that rather than establishing a separate committee, the process should begin with the Planning and Zoning Commission, which has already started looking into professional assistance. Council Member Soper agreed that his main concerns were making sure the review moves forward, includes broad public participation and diverse voices, and he is open to using a professional to help guide the process.

City Recorder Ruth Ann McCain noted that there may be a public notice requirement when considering amendments to the General Plan and suggested confirming the requirements with Cade Penney. Council questioned whether a formal resolution is actually necessary since Planning and Zoning has already begun the process. Council Member Laurel Workman noted that it sounds like we just need a notice rather than a resolution. Council Member Soper suggested confirming both whether a Council resolution would be helpful or customary and what public notice is required.

Planning Commission member Andrew Skousen questioned what specific deficiencies in the existing General Plan the City is trying to address, noting that one-acre lots are already referenced several times. Council Member Broadbent said the larger reason for the review is the division that has occurred in the community and the hope that a public planning process could create more consensus. Planning Commission Chairperson Cami Christensen added that the intent is not necessarily to rewrite the entire plan, but to hold the meetings necessary to receive public input and make sure concerns that people feel were previously left out are considered.

Council Member Soper said the current plan also contains goals that have not developed as originally envisioned and lacks clarity in areas that affect the City's historic character. Discussion followed about the difference between the General Plan and City ordinances. Council Member Broadbent explained that the General Plan is intended to be an advisory, long-range living document, while specific requirements such as building height and setbacks belong in ordinances that support the plan. When Council Member Workman asked whether the City needs more work on the General Plan or simply stronger ordinances, Council Member Broadbent responded, "I think we need both."

Council agreed that an important part of the review will be providing meaningful opportunities for residents to participate and feel their perspectives have been heard. Ms. Christensen felt bringing in an outside professional could also provide a helpful third-party perspective in a community that has become divided. Council Member Soper said the goal is not necessarily to produce a document that satisfies everyone, but to be able to say, we hired a professional, we listened to everyone, and this is the best compromise we could come up with.

Council Member Broadbent concluded that they should first ask Cade Penney whether a resolution is necessary. If one is needed or would be helpful, Council Members Broadbent and Soper can work together on a revised resolution.

Resolution 2026-13 A Resolution Requesting Review of the City's Signage and Lighting Regulations

Mayor Paul Penrod introduced Resolution 2026-13 regarding a review of the City's sign and lighting regulations. Council Member James Baker explained that with new small businesses opening along Main Street, he felt it would be wise to review the City's regulations before Spring City begins seeing some of the larger, flashing, or changing signs found in surrounding communities. He suggested having a small advisory group review the existing ordinance and recommend whether signage and lighting requirements need to be updated.

Council Member Baker discussed including Alicia King a local business owner, Anne Osborne a member of the Main Street Alliance, Jhan Miller from the Historic Subcommittee, and a Planning and Zoning representation in the review. Council Member Laurel Workman expressed concern about bright or flashing signs and their impact on nearby residents. Council Member Chris Anderson agreed that there are definitely some deficiencies in our ordinances and supported gathering input from different interests in the community, including the Friends of Historic Spring City.

Council also discussed how sign regulations relate to dark-sky concerns. Council Member Stan Soper noted that excessive lighting can affect the fireflies found on the west side of town and suggested that protecting darker nighttime conditions could have environmental and community value.

The Council questioned whether a formal resolution was necessary to begin the review. City Recorder Ruth Ann McCain clarified that any changes to the City's existing sign code would ultimately need to be adopted by ordinance. Council generally agreed that Council Member Baker could move forward with an informal ad hoc committee to review the current regulations and bring recommendations back to the Council. Council Member Michael Broadbent supported moving forward, and Mayor Penrod agreed that the proposed group was a good place to start.

Resolution 2026-14 A Resolution of the City Council of Spring City, Utah, Establishing a Temporary Moratorium on New Culinary Water Connections

Mayor Paul Penrod introduced Resolution 2026-14 regarding a temporary moratorium on new culinary water connections.

Council Member Laurel Workman explained that based on information received from Rob Terry, a moratorium would need to be connected to work on an ordinance and a plan to address the conditions creating the need for the moratorium. She said the City's intent is simply to temporarily stop new connections for approximately six months while the current water situation is addressed, and she had been trying to determine whether an emergency restriction order would be a better option.

Council Member Stan Soper questioned whether the City could develop an ordinance establishing a process for restricting connections during emergency conditions. Council Member Michael Broadbent added that his understanding was that a moratorium would also need to be tied to a specific plan for alleviating the water-capacity problem. Council noted that the City's consideration of a new well and other water-system improvements may be part of such a plan.

City Recorder Ruth Ann McCain noted that Rob Terry had recommended contacting the Local Advisor, Cade Penney for guidance. Mayor Penrod asked Council Member Workman to follow up with Mr. Penney to determine the appropriate process. Mayor Penrod added that the City is currently monitoring its water daily, and Public Works Director Cory Madsen confirmed that there are no current requests for additional water connections.

Council Member Stan Soper motioned to adjourn, and Council Member Laurel Workman seconded the motion. **Adjournment: 8:03**

