

**OGDEN VALLEY CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL PROPOSED TAX INCREASE
HEARING**

August 11, 2026, 6:00 p.m.

Huntsville Town Hall, Council Chambers, 7474 East 200 South, Huntsville, Utah

Name	Title	Status
Janet Wampler	Mayor	Present
Tia Shaw	Council Member	Present
Kay Hoogland	Council Member	Present
Don Hickman	Council Member	Present
Peggy Dooling-Baker	Council Member	Present
Chad Booth	Council Member	Absent
Sharon Robbins	Recorder	Present
Kathy Zindel	IT Director	Present
Sherrie Broadbent	Finance Director (KM CPA)	Present via Zoom

1. Call to Order

Mayor Janet Wampler called the hearing to order at 6:01 p.m. and welcomed attendees to the official Fiscal Year 2027 Truth-in-Taxation Public Hearing. The Mayor explained that the City had conducted months of public budget discussions, public notices, communications, and an interim public hearing in June. She emphasized that this hearing was the official Truth-in-Taxation hearing required by state law.

- a. Roll Call – Chad Booth is absent
- b. Pledge of Allegiance led by Mayor Wampler
- c. Moment of Silence for approximately one minute

2. Proposed Tax Increase Overview

The Mayor stated that no action would be taken during the hearing. The purpose of the hearing was to receive public comment regarding the proposed tax increase. Any budget and tax decisions would be considered at the City Council meeting scheduled for August 18, 2026.

Finance Director Sherrie Broadbent presented an overview of the proposed Truth-in-Taxation budget. She explained that:

- The proposed tax increase would generate approximately \$2,475,138 in additional property tax revenue annually.
- The tax on an average residential property valued at \$1,222,000 would increase by \$535.66 annually, from \$104.85 to \$640.51.
- The tax on a business of equivalent value would increase by \$973.94 annually, from \$190.63 to \$1,164.57.

Ms. Broadbent reviewed impacts of a budget without the proposed tax increase, including:

- Reduced road funding.
- Consideration of a Transportation Utility Fee (TUF) to fund transportation needs.
- Continued municipal energy tax.
- Reduced staffing and slower response times.
- Delayed stormwater studies.
- Limited grant matching funds.

She further explained that property tax rates vary among communities due to differences in sales tax revenues, property values, tax base, service levels, infrastructure requirements, and debt obligations. She noted that tax rates should not be compared without considering these factors. Citizens were directed to the City's online Budget Book and Finance Department webpage for additional budget information, FAQs, staffing proposals, and tax relief resources.

3. Public Hearing

Mayor Wampler opened the public hearing and outlined procedures for both in-person and online participation. Citizens were asked to state their name and place of residence for the record.

Public Comments

Don Smyrl

- Referenced a conversation with Arden Cook from the Lieutenant Governor's Office regarding incorporation.
- Stated that the original feasibility study indicated incorporation would result in at least a 5% budget surplus and no need for additional property taxes.
- Questioned how the City moved from projected surpluses to a proposed tax increase exceeding 500%.
- Suggested the City formally request relief or a waiver from the Lieutenant Governor's Office.
- Proposed that any tax increase be temporary and removed or reduced once property tax authorization issues are resolved.

Vince Bennett

- Expressed concerns about what he viewed as double taxation.

- Questioned what happened to taxes previously paid to Weber County for services such as snow removal.
- Stated that rising property taxes are creating financial hardship.
- Asked why operating under city government appears more expensive than remaining under county administration.
- Indicated he would prefer returning to the previous county governance structure.
- Raised concerns about impacts on retired residents living on fixed incomes.

Ray Ross

- Stated he and his wife are retired and living on fixed incomes.
- Recalled hearing that taxes would not need to be increased following incorporation.
- Asked whether future increases in tourism and ski-related revenues could eventually improve the City's financial position.
- Questioned how those future revenues might affect property tax needs.

Jeff Burton

- Thanked City officials for their efforts but described the incorporation process as being built on a "faulty foundation."
- Argued that the feasibility study was inaccurate because the City is now proposing a significant tax increase.
- Asserted that residents would have continued receiving county services without the tax increase if incorporation had not occurred.
- Requested that the City petition state officials to create a process for rapid disincorporation.

Anita Golden

- Read a prepared statement.
- Stated that voters were told revenue generated locally would remain in the community and that incorporation would not require property tax increases.
- Expressed concern that the proposed 512% tax increase differs substantially from what many residents believed when they voted.
- Requested transparency regarding the consultant and financial analysis that determined the City was sustainable.
- Asked officials to investigate the feasibility and legal process for dissolving the City and returning governance to Weber County.
- Emphasized accountability and transparency before adopting significant tax increases.

Penn Hollist

- Stated he anticipated that creating another level of government would increase costs.
- Characterized the proposed 500% tax increase as excessive.

- Questioned what residents would receive in return for such a substantial increase.
- Noted that many services were already being provided under county government.

Michael Wire

- Asked whether residents could return to county-provided services.
- Stated he opposed incorporation but understood the desire for local control.
- Questioned the benefits of incorporation given the size of the proposed tax increase.
- Requested answers to questions be posted publicly.

Megan Bowen (Online)

- Asked whether the proposed increase is a temporary funding measure related to the City's inability to collect property taxes during the current year.
- Wanted clarification regarding whether the increase would remain permanently or be reduced once the City receives taxing authority.
- Suggested consideration of a temporary assessment rather than a permanent rate increase.

Dane Hixson (Online)

- Indicated that if the 500% increase is necessary merely to reach baseline operations, the City should consider revisiting incorporation.
- Suggested a future vote on returning to county governance.
- Asked whether alternative funding options had been explored.
- Suggested taxes or fees on non-resident property owners as a possible way to reduce impacts on full-time residents.

Greg Friedman (Online)

- Discussed long-term financial sustainability.
- Suggested future operating costs may continue increasing due to staffing and governance needs.
- Noted that volunteer elected officials may not be sustainable indefinitely.
- Expressed concern about ongoing budget shortfalls and the lack of sunset provisions on temporary funding mechanisms.

Chris Ackerson

- Analyzed the budget from a business perspective.
- Questioned proposed increases in administrative expenditures and staffing costs.
- Suggested the City focus more resources on public works and road maintenance rather than administration.
- Later requested additional transparency, including detailed cost breakdowns, road funding estimates, and information regarding Transportation Utility Fees.
- Asked how HOA residents would be affected by future transportation fees.

Douglas Martin

- Expressed optimism about the future of Ogden Valley City.
- Described the current circumstances as an exceptional situation.
- Indicated he believes the proposed increase may be a temporary measure.
- Encouraged accounting for eventual compensation and staffing costs as the City matures.

Blanche Youngberg

- Stated she had experience observing other incorporations.
- Suggested exploring toll roads or visitor-user fees at valley entry points as an alternative revenue source.
- Believed visitors would continue coming to the area despite a modest fee due to local attractions.

Laura Warburton

- Asked whether Ogden Valley had previously been subsidized by broader Weber County revenues.
- Questioned whether such financial support could continue if the City disincorporated.
- Stated she opposed incorporation and warned that future costs may continue increasing.
- Acknowledged the work of elected officials while expressing concern about long-term financial consequences.

Joe Donovan

- Asked whether Weber County had provided information regarding what tax increases residents might have experienced if incorporation had not occurred.
- Suggested residents may be assuming taxes would have remained unchanged under county governance and requested clarification.

Richard Baker

- Explained that many residents supported incorporation because they wanted local control over growth, zoning, and development decisions.
- Stated that dissatisfaction with county rezoning decisions contributed to support for cityhood.
- Emphasized the desire for a government that is more responsive to local concerns.

Douglas Martin

- Requested clarification regarding whether the Valley had historically subsidized Weber County or whether Weber County had subsidized the Valley.
- Asked that the issue be addressed in future City communications or FAQs.

Anita Golden

- Referenced budget figures posted on the City website.
- Stated that a significant portion of the proposed increase appeared to be associated with administrative costs and staffing.
- Highlighted proposed salary and staffing expenditures as contributors to the tax increase.

Michael Gillespie

- Described the situation as a "bait and switch."
- Requested that the City petition the Lieutenant Governor's Office for a new feasibility study.
- Suggested a new vote on incorporation following updated financial analysis.
- Believed residents might vote differently if current financial realities had been known previously.

Jeff Burton

- Stated that residents had been told the Valley was subsidizing Weber County.
- Asserted that budget figures suggested Weber County had instead been subsidizing the Valley.
- Encouraged officials to reconsider incorporation and focus on residents' financial concerns.

Terry Klein

- Shared personal property tax history beginning in 1997.
- Noted substantial property tax increases over recent years.
- Stated he did not support incorporation and was satisfied with prior county governance.
- Expressed concern that incorporation will create additional financial burdens.

Mayor Wampler reiterated that the public hearing was for receiving testimony only and that responses to questions would be addressed through future communications, website updates, public meetings, or budget materials. She reminded attendees that budget discussion and potential action were scheduled for the August 18, 2026 City Council meeting.

Resident comments received through email are listed in Exhibit A below.

4. Adjournment

Council Member Hickman moved to adjourn the Special City Council Proposed Tax Increase Hearing. Council Member Hoogland seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. The meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

The August 11, 2026 Special City Council Proposed Increase hearing minutes were approved by the Ogden Valley City Council on the 31st day of September, 2026.

Signature: *Sharon Robbins*

Printed Name: Sharon Robbins

Exhibit A – Additional Resident Comments

From Garrett Rees

Date Fri 7/3/2026 1:20 PM

Strong Opposition to the Proposed 519% Property Tax Increase

Mayor Wampler and Council Members,

I'm writing as an Ogden Valley resident to register my strong opposition to the proposed property tax increase, a jump of over 500% on the rate residents currently pay.

I voted against incorporation. Part of the reason I did was skepticism that a brand-new layer of government could deliver on its financial projections without eventually reaching into residents' pockets. I was told, along with everyone else, that the feasibility study showed incorporation would not require a tax increase. That was a central selling point used to get this city approved. Sixteen months later, we're being asked to accept a fivefold tax hike to cover a shortfall that study was specifically supposed to prevent.

Before any Truth in Taxation hearing moves forward, I want the following addressed publicly, not just referenced in passing:

- Who produced and certified the feasibility study, and what accountability exists for a projection this far off from reality?
- What specific alternatives have been fully evaluated before jumping to a 500%+ rate increase? Spending cuts, phased-in increases, fee structures, deferred capital projects, and why each was deemed insufficient.
- A clear, itemized breakdown of the \$2.2M shortfall, not just top-line totals, so residents can evaluate whether this is the minimum necessary increase or a convenient round number.

A tax increase of this magnitude, arriving this early in the city's existence, is going to be a serious burden for retirees and residents on fixed incomes in this valley. People who were assured this wouldn't happen. I expect the city to treat this as the trust problem it is, not just a budget problem.

I intend to attend the Truth in Taxation hearing once it's scheduled and I'd appreciate direct notice when a date is set. I'd also ask that this email be entered into the public record for consideration on this matter.

From Angela Dean

Date Wed 8/12/2026 11:24 AM

Tax increase comments

Hello Mayor and Council,

If you are still collecting public comments regarding the proposed tax increase, I have some thoughts to share.

Of those in attendance at last night's hearing, a few mentioned reverting back to county control, believing that the municipal tax would then revert to the amount they paid prior to incorporation. I believe this is a false hope for the following reasons.

My understanding is that both the LRB report and the Utah Foundation report, which was funded by the opposition to incorporation, showed a budget surplus. Apparently, the county did not have proper accounting practices in place to understand the actual cost of services provided to Ogden Valley prior to incorporation. Rather than being the result of a bait-and-switch or intentional deception, it seems to have been an accounting error that the county was not aware of, which led to inaccurate data being provided to the consultants.

I would venture to guess that the county is now aware of this mistake. If we were to revert to the county, it can reasonably be assumed that they would correct the error and adjust the municipal tax line item to account for this new understanding. Thus, even if we were to revert to county control, we should expect the municipal tax line item to increase. By how much would ultimately be up to the three county commissioners, not our local representatives.

I think an explanation to the community along these lines may go a long way toward addressing the fears, frustrations, and distrust surrounding this issue.

As has been stated, property taxes have risen drastically in the recent past, with the county increasing them by thousands of dollars for some residents. I would hope that those who are frustrated by tax increases are as vocal with the county about those sizable tax hikes as they are now about the few hundred dollars being requested by the city. The perspective on this seems to be lost, or perhaps simply misunderstood.

There were good points made about the increased cost of just about everything due to typical inflation, as well as the added expense of administration, potential future building costs, and other costs associated with adding this level of government. It is quite possible that, in the end, we will in fact pay more in taxes for local representation and the ability to have a say in the vision and shape of our city. For some of us, that added cost is worth it.

With that, I believe the sensible course of action is onward as a city.

Thanks for all you do,

Angela Dean

From: Courtney Camacho, Cord Cook

Date Mon 8/17/2026 7:00 AM

I oppose proposed tax rate increases – Parcel # 07-273-0006

Dear Council Members,

I'm reaching out as a resident living in Weber County to put my voice on record against the property tax rate hikes being brought up for our area (Parcel # 07-273-0006).

Look, we all know running a local city takes real money, and nobody expects services to be free. But a tax hike this steep puts a massive burden on regular working people, families, and folks living on fixed incomes who are already watching every single dollar just to keep up with basic bills.

I'm asking the council to step back, look hard at the budget, and find ways to cut costs or stretch out any needed increases over time instead of slamming taxpayers with a sharp jump all at once.

Please add this to the official public record for the upcoming budget discussions.

Thanks for your time,
Courtney Camacho, Cord Cook