

**TREMONTON CITY CORPORATION
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SEPTEMBER 15, 2026**

Members Present:

Kristie Bowcutt
Brent Jex
Beau Lewis
Sharri Oyler
Blair Westergard
Bret Rohde, Mayor
Linsey Nessen, City Manager
Cynthia Nelson, City Recorder

CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP

Mayor Rohde called the September 15, 2026 City Council Workshop to order at 5:00 p.m. The meeting was held in the City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Those in attendance were Mayor Rohde, Councilmembers Bowcutt, Jex, Lewis, Oyler, and Westergard, City Manager Nessen, and City Recorder Nelson. Also in attendance were City Planner Jeremy Lance, Zoning Administrator ChrisDean Epling, Police Chief Dustin Cordova, Fire Chief Jeff Jarrow, and City Engineer Chris Breinholt.

1. Call to Order and Declaration of Conflict of Interest
2. Council Reports and Updates

Councilmember Bowcutt said Public Works really needs another employee. Secondary water usually gets shut off mid-October and they are sticking to that plan. Thank you to Planner Lance and Administrator Epling for a job well done. I love your notes in the packet.

Councilmember Oyler said the Food Pantry had their food drive on Saturday, raising 19,600 pounds, which is up 4,000 from last year. They are still doing the Western Ag food drive. As people donate, that company matches up to \$3,000. The Senior Center had to stop their pickup meals due to new evaluation and enforcement. The pickup option was only supposed to happen during COVID, but we had been doing pickups for years before that and continued it afterward. That stopped the first of this month. They want to encourage people to come in for the social aspect. I asked about the holidays, because we do have a lot of pickups then. She is going to look into that and see if they can still do it on those days. This is a good benefit for the elderly community. Their emergency preparedness event is Wednesday, September 23, from 2-5 p.m. The way they closed in that bowery at the library looks terrible and they cannot use it. They had put in the budget to get a separate shed for storage, but it turned into closing in that stage area. Mayor Rohde said they are siding it this week. Once it is sealed, they will be able to use it. Councilmember Oyler said there is some Dolly Parton money the library can get in order

to get books. They will look into that. The library has lots of fun activities planned and are doing great.

3. Presentations:

a. **Title:** Discussion of RES 26-55 Budget Amendment for FY 26/27

Manager Nessen said Finance Director Heiner is on vacation, but there are some pressing matters, so I am presenting today. Director Mackley had somebody ready to hire August 31, and does not want to wait another two weeks for this budget amendment. Director Heiner's staff report was very thorough. We already have money budgeted to fix the AV in here. We are using webcams and our TV does not work half the time. We budgeted \$30,000 out of non-departmental. It was increased because the bids came in at \$45,000. Our sound cabinet will be replaced. Mayor Rohde said they are putting in new microphones and working on the camera systems. The other thing I hope we are doing is making it so when a video is running, half the screen is video while the other half is the agenda so people on YouTube can see the full picture. The big part is the sound system. They are getting new speakers and microphones that are high-end and have noise cancelling options.

Manager Nessen said we moved it out of the General Fund and into capital projects and then up \$20,000. Next, we are hoping to fund six part-time employees at the fire department. That would be another person per shift so each shift would have five employees. We cannot get to transfers as quickly as we sometimes need to. Having another employee would help. We need more, but this is a start. This will add one employee per shift, because they are part-time. One will work 24 hours, and the other will work the other 24 hours to cover one 48-hour shift. It is one position, but two people are filling it as part-time employees. Our revenues are going up a bit with Gold Cross so it was increased, hoping we will take more transports. This also includes trying a sprinter van for transports rather than a full-on ambulance. There is a transfer of \$100,000 from the fire department to capital vehicles. Director Heiner is projecting putting money from the fire department into capital vehicles for the next 10 years. This is the beginning of the fleet plan showing every vehicle we own. This plan is an estimate so it will change. This 10-year plan does not take into account selling anything so there could be surplus money. Each enterprise fund pays admin fees—paying for our time. It just was not budgeted for this year. This is a correction. The streets will be paying their portion of admin fees. There is the fire station remodel, and the Senior Center needs new carpet. It is starting to bunch up and trip people. We also need to update our cameras so they cannot be hacked. This is a quote to replace all of our cameras at City Hall, the police station, fire station, and our parks. These are the capital projects. We do have a grant coming from the State for an ambulance, \$57,000 plus the transfer from them for \$100,000 to buy that new Sprinter van. We have four police vehicles budgeted. We are also surplus three of them tonight. They need a new Meals on Wheels car and two for building inspection. We accidentally budgeted for a backhoe twice so there is money sitting there to pay for our new water department employee and a new vehicle. Director Heiner is working on the enterprise fund and just needs to figure out where projects sit. We have discussed ways to

clean up the funds and how they are paid for administrative work. That would clean up a lot of things and make payroll considerably easier.

b. **Title:** Discussion of RES 26-56 Clover Fields Development Agreement

c. **Title:** Discussion of ORD 26-18 Clover Fields Overlay

Items b. and c. were discussed together.

Planner Lance said this is the Clover Fields Phase 3 and 4 overlay. The development agreement is paired with this request. The peculiar thing about this request is they want to invoke the SFRTTO zone. That is an overlay that was used for Envision Estates. This is a different property owner in a different part of the City, who wants to invoke that same overlay. This SFRTTO zone was brought in as a tool for the City to standardize the way overlays are generated and adopted. The PUD overlay tool came after that and was used for about two years. That code was recently repealed. We are in a weird limbo where this antiquated system still remains in our code. The request is to invoke that method of bringing overlays forward for this project. In talks with our attorney and staff, we were not sure if this was the best way to bring overlays forward. This applicant has been in platting and review process for over a year. We figured the best way to work with this request was to allow the legislative process to take its course. Basically, he copied and pasted the SFRTTO language, put Clover Fields in and is invoking the code in that manner. The question tonight is does the Council want to see overlays come forward in this manner? This would create 25 homes across two parcels near Maverick. There is a higher density there, but not this high. Administrator Epling said in exchange for the added density, there are two things required of the developer. One is streetscape improvements, meaning there will be a tree at every house and the building materials need to be a little bit higher. Two, they will also be required to pay a fee in lieu for parks (\$7,380 per dwelling unit). Our parks impact fee is about \$2,500 so it is a significant amount more that they will pay to compensate the City for the added density for our park system. Here is a concept of what they have proposed for those two lots. There are four different property owners who have to agree to two different conditions within the development agreement. It has been a collaborative effort to get all those pieces put together. Councilmember Lewis then explained four changes to the ordinance that would address clerical errors.

d. **Title:** Discussion of RES 26-57 Heritage Country Development Agreement

e. **Title:** Discussion of ORD 26-19 Heritage Country PUD Overlay

Items d. and e. were discussed together.

Planning Intern Abigail Mattinson said this is the Heritage Country PUD overlay. Brody Calder is the owner of L.B. Land Holdings LLC. It is located at the intersection of 6400 West and 1000 North. The date of application was May 18, 2026. It is currently zoned as residential R1-8 (southeast parcel) and R1-10 (northwest parcel). Planning Intern Mattinson said the General Plan designation is single-family residential or low density. The acreage is 73.67 acres combined. The request is for adoption of the Heritage Country

PUD overlay. The Planning Commission heard this item at their meeting on July 28, 2026. Comments were made during the public hearing with concerns regarding preserving the rural character. Comments included testimony from the NPI district about infrastructure and impact fees and property owners. The Planning Commission discussed the proposed PUD overlay, including the project housing mix, park trails, open space, infrastructure, and the role of the development agreement in governing the project's application. Planning Commission discussed the impact fees for existing residents within the annexed area, including the potential use of West Corinne water shares to offset sewer impact fees, with staff clarifying that would be determined by the Council as part of the development agreement. Planner Lance said the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the PUD overlay by a 3-2 vote. Commission Members Ellsworth and Greener voted no. The Planning Commission gave staff a list of things to look at in the development agreement. They are proposing 496 units across 11 phases with a park. Administrator Epling said Utah State code requires that only the legislative body may amend zoning districts or regulate other land provisions such as density. Anytime density is an issue, it needs to be brought before the Council. Tying infrastructure improvements to density requests should not be handled with the administrative body, but with the legislative body. Listening to Council reports and different things, the way the project was presented, we felt there was some tying of density to infrastructure promises or requests. Our code allows bonus density based on amenities, not infrastructure improvements. If the Council's decision for added density is based off of infrastructure promises, that needs to be presented and figured out. Is the bonus density coming through the amenities? That is the way the PUD code is set up.

Administrator Epling said we are planning on bringing the PC Zone to the Council. It will allow the Council to negotiate infrastructure for density, but not the administration. There are a couple of different avenues for moving forward. We can try to create something that will be in the City's benefits through the current application, or we can go forward at a later date with the PC Zone application. When we were working out the details of the development agreement, I read that all the infrastructure improvements would be reimbursed to the developer, which is a bad practice. The Council needs to understand what is happening. It is worded that the impact fee reimbursements will be given. We changed the wording so the developer would pay for all the infrastructure. If we required an upsizing, then the City would pay for it in cash at the time. The benefit for the developer would be that all infrastructure improvements would be reimbursed, not just the upgrades. The Council has to decide if you want to have 500 homes added in that area. All impact fees will pay for that and not our current sewer treatment plant. If we had a sewer treatment plant that was up to date and ready to receive all that, that would be something the Council could consider. You just need to understand the ramifications of how are we paying for this infrastructure. A pioneering agreement is what our attorney and Public Works would like us to do instead. A pioneering agreement is where the developer agrees to build out all infrastructure and pay for it with the promise of future improves and development coming in. Those developers would pay him back for their share of what they use of that infrastructure. There can be a cap and the City would have to track it. When we get future growth, we would require the next parcel to help pay this developer back for their contributions. It is a risk for the developers because they may

never be reimbursed. There is a way to help reduce that risk that our attorney suggested, giving them a time frame, the Council decides, and if they do not get paid back within that amount of time, then we will pay a percentage back. The Council would decide how that is handled. The developer mentioned a funding option through a bill to get funding for low-income housing from the State. We are looking into that. The question at hand would be, does the density have to be tied with the infrastructure? If the infrastructure is being paid back, then the density should be a separate question for the Council. The PUD will allow for bonus density based on the amenities provided within the project.

Councilmember Bowcutt said when this was presented to the Council a long time ago, it was agreed upon that it would be quarter acre lots and the developer would put in a park. Now we are changing the density. I think we should stick to the zone. I drove all over out there and people bought into a lifestyle. In Planning Commission, it was stated we do not have enough homes, but as of today Tremonton has 20 townhomes and 57 single-family homes for sale. There are 3,118 high-density doors that have already been approved. For low density or larger lots, our current doors are 1,198 with 209 approved. High density and affordability keep being brought up. According to the gentleman at our workshop in St. George, he works with Governor Cox on his committee, he was asked to define affordable and said there are more than 19 definitions. Pick one. I think it is an overused statement. We are way over what the State is requiring of us. I do not agree with the density. Those people bought a lifestyle. There are two homes that may have septic issues but are dealing with the health department. He says there is usually a fix. Residents of Freedom Farms have been told to just sell their water shares and they will hook them up. That process has been very deceptive. I sat on that road yesterday for 45 minutes and counted the semis and cement trucks that barreled down that road. It is not the right place for that type of density. Also, if you start moving those drain tiles there will be problems. There are still so many things we need to take into consideration. There is also the pump station. Who is going to pay for it? I do not feel like Tremonton should be paying for infrastructure. It does not pencil, and impact fees need to stay intact.

Councilmember Westergard said can you make the R1-8 work or not? Mr. Calder said we are still working through this. There are a lot of questions. The planning department has been great to work with. We originally dealt with City Manager Shawn Warnke and then Bill Cobabe. Three years later here we are. We planned on paying for all the infrastructure for our development. Freedom Farms was annexed in, so we were to help there. The lift station for all of that section with any upgrade beyond that for additional growth. We thought the City was going to be taking that. Originally, we did not want to come into the City. We were going to put storage units here, but the Manager said we want you guys. So, we were annexed in. We knew we could not put all this infrastructure in unless we picked up another piece. We will have to put out a lot of cash to try to get all of it spread out and that is why we picked up that second piece, to make it pencil. We were pitched the PUD. We presented the annexation with an RM-8 zone. That was a higher density with eight units an acre. We were told no so we went to R1-8. I do not know where the quarter acres came from. We did talk about townhomes and having those along the railroad tracks and cement plant. Let me just take you through what we are planning to do with the PUD and why it makes sense. We have a big park in the southern

parcel that would be given over to the City with three lacrosse fields. It has a pavilion and playground. We would make all the improvements there. There is a second park in the center of the northern parcel with two pavilions and two playgrounds. There is a walking trail tying into Freedom Farms. We have proposed 496 units for 6.7 units per acre. The houses would sit on lots ranging from 4,000 to 8,000 square feet. We do have to figure up sewer no matter the density. Stormwater detention is another big one. Water will hit those fill drains and we will ship it all the way to the Malad. If we do not go through with the PUD that is not happening. Neither are the parks. Administrator Epling said I know the drainage is an issue and has been from the beginning. No matter what is developed there, it has to have the ability to drain. Our engineer is very adamant that we are not detaining water. It will have to drain into the Malad. Mr. Calder said everything would drain all the way to the park at first as a retention pond until we get to a certain phase. Then we would grab that and go underneath the canal toward the church and to the Malad. That would happen in Phase 7 when the park gets put in. We also have the sewer relief from Freedom Farms. They annexed in because some people wanted the relief of the sewer and other perks that would come with this development. They will have the option to sell their West Corinne water share. We put the townhomes on those two sides where citizens requested. With our bonus density right now, we could go up to 544 homes. We have removed and shrunk some to help with concerns from staff and citizens. We could be at 7.35 units per acre but are down to 6.7. We have a major issue with our income versus housing costs. The average household in Box Elder County only makes \$84,000 a year. You cannot purchase a home on a quarter-acre lot with that. These townhomes will cost between \$230,000 to \$330,000. The single-family houses will be \$350,000 to \$475,000. If we go to the R1-8 over the whole thing, those are bigger with bigger houses so it would not qualify for state funding.

Councilmember Jex said I have a problem with one thing being presented and then a work-around to get something else. The main reason why we got rid of the PUD was because of how it was implemented. My understanding is that when this was presented, there was a row of townhomes to block the view of the cement plant and everything else was going to be single-family homes. It sounds like this is a pretty messy development. There are a lot of changing trajectories. It is not coming through how it was presented, and I have concerns about that. If you want to build something a certain way, just come and ask and we will give a thumbs up or a thumbs down. I am less concerned about the money we can get for low-density housing from the State if it does not fit the area. Mr. Calder said the reality is we are here to try to create a solution and we need density to do that. We can go up to 360 units as our max for the R1-8. We could go back to the R1-8 and the R1-10 and then we are not going to help with anything. We are trying to make it a win-win. With extra density we can get into these price points, because the bigger lots actually make me more money, but we are trying to hit these price points for what sells. Councilmember Jex said when I talk about what works for the City, I look at it as what works for the citizens, too. I think we need to go back to the drawing board and start from scratch to do it the right way, in the open without any side agreements. This body needs to be at the table for everything. Mr. Calder said there are probably a handful of citizens that really do not want it.

Councilmember Bowcutt said I love the department reports and will touch on them a bit. Our Fire Chief has some concerns in relation to fire access. In the case of an emergency, will the roads be wide enough for the ladder truck? Will there be enough parking areas for citizens to park rather than being on the streets? Our Fire Chief said, I have found that with large number of homes and small access roads between them, it can create problems for the fire department in the event of an emergency. Mr. Calder said if you have problems you need to fix the code. We wrote that to the code. Councilmember Bowcutt said correct, but I am bringing this out so everybody can hear it. Our City Engineer said with the density in this area there will be significant infrastructure improvements required beyond the boundary of the development to service this part of the City. I am not saying that the infrastructure cannot be built to support it, but in this area south of the freeway, this is not the best location for higher density housing overall. Public Works has expressed concerns regarding utility infrastructure necessary to serve the proposed development. At this time, there is insufficient information regarding the availability and capacity of water, sewer, storm drain, potential up-sizing, and sewer lift station requirements. They are working on an evaluation. Until the evaluation is complete, Public Works cannot represent that utility services are available to the property. I appreciate our planning department going to the department heads for this information. I have talked to so many residents and they are not feeling what you are saying. After some discussion on what would be in the development agreement, Administrator Epling said the PUD does not allow for up-sizing infrastructure. That is one of the flaws of the PUD and why I believe the PC Zone will be better. The recommendation from staff would be to either table the current PUD or if you denied it, bring it back with the PC Zone. Either way it would still need to have a development agreement attached to it.

f. **Title:** Discussion of RES 26-58 Amending Section XVIII: Leaves of Absence

Chief Cordova said we are proposing we mimic the fire department's policy. We are not really following the one we have in place because we are consistently asking for exceptions due to staffing. It is hard for people to burn those hours. It also encourages people to burn their hours toward the end of the year, which causes issues. During a previous discussion, the Council seemed supportive. It lets our officers bank some time. We are currently understaffed and about 75% of our department will be forced to take time by January, which would put us in a bad place. I reached out to other agencies so you have a side-by-side comparison to our most competitive and comparable agencies. We are well behind them with the total carryover hours. According to the Government Accounting Standards Board, this would show as a liability, but we are not required to have all the funding in there at the time. This is more a reporting requirement. We do not need extra funds to cover this. For example, the average salary in our department, with someone fully maxed out, if they separated employment and we had to pay that off, it would only take two months for us to break even. When we hire right now, it takes about six months to replace them, so I am not super concerned about that. If everyone collectively quits that would be a bigger amount, but you would not replace everyone immediately so you would get whole again due to not be paying any salaries and other fees. If that ever did happen, we would have a much bigger problem than finances. The total hours we would like to be able to bank would be 336, just like the fire department.

Councilmember Bowcutt said is this going to cause problems in other departments? I want to be fair all the way across. Manager Nessen said there has been talks of creating a benefit committee that would be comprised of employees who would hear these types of issues and bring them to the Council with suggestions. One of the suggestions I have heard is, why do we not do it for everybody. We have a policy that we are following, but it is a workaround for the policy if an employee has extenuating circumstances and cannot use their leave by January 1. They can ask the Mayor or City Manager for permission to carry more over than the allowed amount. Chief Cordova said either way, in January we are going to be making exceptions and not following the policy we have, or we can improve the policy where it is standard operation. I am for all City employees having this, that is just outside my lane. For the sake of our staffing issues and what we are contending with, I prefer the solution. The Council agreed to look into this at their next meeting with more information, but that they should also look into doing this same policy across all departments in the future.

g. **Title:** Discussion of disposal of surplus police vehicles

Sergeant Gailey said I want approval to sell a couple of our vehicles that are under the carport. We are looking at selling two pickups through GovDeals. It is an auction website we have used in the past. There are not any fees to the City. The buyer pays all of the fees. If you are good with that, I would like to move forward with listing those.

h. **Title:** Discussion of Planning Commission Expectations

Mayor Rohde said I have worked with Administrator Epling on this and would like to have this document presented to every Planning Commissioner as they are appointed. It goes through the expectations, the dignity scale and what we expect every Commissioner to do. That way everyone gets the same information when we are talking to them after an interview and as they are appointed. Councilmember Bowcutt said I like how they have to sign their name to it and acknowledge they have read it. It does open up a dialogue. The Council agreed.

i. **Title:** Discussion of RES 26-59 Financial Consultant

Manager Nessen said we put out an RFP for a financial services consultant to help us with our audited financial statements every year and then any questions Finance Director Heiner has throughout the year. Davis and Bott put in for the cap of \$32,000 a year. That cap just depends on how many hours they spend. They did say this year will cost us more because they have to learn the City and go through previous documents. If we were to go with them again next year, that price would likely go down because it will not take as long to get through. The \$32,000 would be for the financial statement preparation to help us through the audit.

4. *CLOSED MEETING: No Closed Meeting held at this time.*

a. *Strategy session to discuss the purchase of real property when public discussion of*

- the transaction would disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration or prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms; and/or*
- b. Strategy session to discuss the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual; and/or*
 - c. Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; and/or*
 - d. Discussions regarding security personnel, devices or systems*

The meeting adjourned at 6:47 p.m. by consensus of the Council.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Mayor Rohde called the September 15, 2026 City Council Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was held in the Tremonton City Council Meeting Room at 102 South Tremont Street, Tremonton, Utah. Those in attendance were Mayor Rohde, Councilmembers Bowcutt, Jex, Lewis, Oyler, and Westergard, City Manager Nessen, and City Recorder Nelson. Also in attendance were City Planner Jeremy Lance, Zoning Administrator ChrisDean Epling, Police Chief Dustin Cordova, Fire Chief Jeff Jarrow, and City Engineer Chris Breinholt.

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call
- 3. Invocation by: Administrator Epling
Pledge led by: Resident Jed Abbott
- 4. Approval of Agenda:

Motion by Councilmember Lewis to approve the agenda of September 15, 2026 with one exception, moving 11. b. to Strategic Business. Motion seconded by Councilmember Bowcutt. Vote: Councilmember Bowcutt - yes, Councilmember Jex - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Oyler - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- 5. Declaration of Conflict of Interest: None.
- 6. Presentations:
 - a. Presentation of Tremonton Wellbeing Survey – Dr. Courtney Flint, USU professor

Ms. Flint said it has been a pleasure to partner with Tremonton on this survey for many years. There is interest and passion in hearing the community's voices. It has been a much more active partnership than many other communities, and for that I applaud you. I am here to talk about the findings from the well-being survey we did this year. We provide city and town leaders, such as yourselves, with information on the perspectives of residents and we do this to inform planning and local decision-making, to help you keep your finger on the pulse of your community. It is one point of information and a piece of the puzzle. We also do research on community well-being over time and support

other Statewide regional policy and planning initiatives. We partner with cities and towns all across the State. Our reports are publicly available. For a community of this size, your response numbers are really good, with 465, which is a powerful response. Any adult 18 and over can participate. She then reviewed those demographics. Here are the findings. 65% of respondents said their personal well-being is a four or five on a five-point scale. Household income is pretty correlated with some of the well-being values. Tremonton's household income is up (about \$75,000 a year). Community well-being is always a little lower than personal well-being. People often think themselves as doing better than the community as a whole. Those values have declined over the last few years and so we do note that decline.

Ms. Flint said you guys have been participating since 2022, so we have those three points in time. We also look at 12 different categories of well-being. Well-being is what makes up a good life, but the bundles of things that make up a good life can vary from person to person and from community to community. For Tremonton, the most important domains were mental health, safety and security, family life, and living standards. The highest rated domains were family life, safety and security, and mental health. Things that are important, but rated a little lower than the average were leisure time and local environmental quality. When we look across time with these, especially since 2024, a lot of these domains have ticked up. The well-being scores declined while these things tipped up. In many places, these are declining, and you have an uptick. Community connection, how connected do you feel to Tremonton as a community is something we have asked over time. This is very low. We are at the bottom of this list of 57 communities for community connection. People who have higher levels of overall well-being have a higher sense of community connection and mental health is correlated as well.

Ms. Flint said there is a lot more data, we just highlight a few things. For religion you have an active community, but it is good when a city can provide resources for more. We include a question about how do you feel about the current rate of population growth, and here you are one of those communities standing out. People think it is too fast. Your population growth rate from 2010 to 2020 is 29%. In terms of the pace of economic development, we get a much more split perspective, some say that is too slow and some say it is too fast. In the open comments, they are talking about the same things, but are coming at it from different angles. There is a very split perspective on economic development. The comments say they would like a few more things in terms of economic development, so it is complicated, and I urge you to look at the open comments we have for Tremonton. A lot of people have voiced their opinion. For surveys we often see only about 10% answering open comment questions, but in Tremonton that is about 80%. We do not share the comments publicly, but we have offered those to the City to review. When asked, what aspects of the local economy would you like to see changed? Folks do comment about wanting more businesses and amenities versus the development of new homes in terms of economic development. More shopping and dining opportunities were notable in the comments and addressing issues of growth and development in general. Cost of living was a new question this year. For those for whom childcare is relevant (42%), that is the biggest difficulty in terms of affordability. 74% of those folks say it is

difficult or very difficult to afford. Housing and healthcare are right up there and on the high side compared to a lot of communities, and food and utilities as well, along with transportation opportunities. There are some issues with cost of living. We have a long list of concerns we have been asking for years and we track this over time. The top this year are water supplies, open and green space, affordable housing opportunities for youth, and water quality. You have a whole other tier that is over 50% of folks indicating a moderate or major concern in a whole host of things related to safety, traffic, employment, recreation, shopping, and food.

Ms. Flint said we asked what people value about Tremonton? The small town comes up loud and clear. They love that small town feel. People take pride in the community, rural living, a safe place, open space, and a quiet neighborhood. What would they like to see improved? These quotes represent the top themes, slow down the growth of houses, Sidewalks and road maintenance needed, parks and rec could use some attention, recreational and educational opportunities, public transit to get to and from Brigham City and a few more businesses to catch up with population growth. Also how important are amenities to your wellbeing. At the top of the list were fishing, nature, and open spaces, but library and playgrounds, indoor recreation spaces, community gathering and events, trail development, swimming and aquatics facility, would also be important to wellbeing. We asked what residents would support or oppose those if it meant a modest increase in property taxes, and you get a little more nuanced answers. You would have to navigate this in terms of support and opposition if it means raising taxes. Patriotic events were also at the top in terms of support. Level of support or opposition to continuing to utilize Midland Square, and you see half support this with over a third being neutral so your opposition is quite small in this group of respondents. Then we asked about their satisfaction with Tremonton services. Fire and police are your top satisfaction there and garbage recycling service and city library are also right up there. Thank you to all who participated in the survey.

7. Citizen Engagement – General Public Comment: None.
8. Recognition of Firefighters and Police Officers that worked on the Harley Drive Fire

Mayor Rohde and the Council recognition of firefighters and police officers who worked on the Harley Drive fire. Chief Jarrow said fighting this fire was very successful because of our staff. Those guys saved homes and stepped out of their realm and helped each other out. It was amazing and was a collaborative effort between both departments. Chief Cordova and I felt it was worthy of commending them publicly.

Mayor Rohde called a Public Hearing to order at 7:28 p.m. to receive input on the budget listed below. There were 32 people in attendance.

9. Public Hearing:
 - a. To receive public input on amending the Budget entitled "The Tremonton City Annual Implementation Budget 2026-2027 General Fund, Capital Fund(s), Enterprise Fund(s), and Special Fund(s)", for the period commencing July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027

There were no public comments. Mayor Rohde closed the Public Hearing at 7:28 p.m.

10. Unfinished Business from Work Session: None.
11. Consent Agenda – Any Councilmember may request an item be removed for separate discussion – Roll Call Vote
 - a. Approval of minutes – September 1, 2026
 - b. *Approval and adoption of June and July Financial Statements and Warrant Registers*
This item was moved to Strategic Business for further discussion
 - c. Approval of Resolution No. 26-58 Amending Section XVIII: Leaves of Absence
 - d. Approval of Resolution No. 26-59 Financial Consultant

Motion by Councilmember Westergard to approve the Consent Agenda without Resolution 26-58, we are going to table that until next week and are going to discuss the financials in the Strategic Business section of the meeting. Motion seconded by Councilmember Oyler. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Bowcutt - yes, Councilmember Jex - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Oyler - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

12. Strategic Business (Ordinances & Policies)
 - a. Discussion and consideration of adopting RES 26-55 Budget Amendment for FY 26/27
- Motion by Councilmember Jex to adopt the resolution.** Motion seconded by Councilmember Bowcutt. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Bowcutt - yes, Councilmember Jex - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Oyler - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

The Council then discussed the June and July Financial Statements and Warrant Register, pulled from the Consent Agenda. Councilmember Bowcutt said there were some that were listed twice. Manager Nessen said that is because this report ran from June 1, through the 30. She ran the other report for two months. This is showing you this month again on this one. This other one could be coming out of two different GL accounts. It is listing it twice because it is the same fee but split in half. Councilmember Bowcutt said do we have nine Adobe Creative Cloud accounts. Manager Nessen said yes, they are for different departments and employees.

Motion by Councilmember Bowcutt to approve the June and July Financial Statements. Motion seconded by Councilmember Lewis. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Bowcutt - yes, Councilmember Jex - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Oyler - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

- b. Discussion and consideration of adopting RES 26-56 Clover Fields Development Agreement and ORD 26-18 Clover Fields Overlay

Administrator Epling said I have noted the clerical errors discussed during the Work Session. Councilmember Bowcutt said when this first came about, there were issues with the roadway. I like the changes that have been made and appreciate the property owners working together. Administrator Epling said it was seen at the NPI two different times and noticed twice with public hearings. Out of the two public hearings there were not many comments. One person was concerned about spot zoning. Overall, it was received as an appropriate place for this density. Here are the two existing homes and the rest will add 4,000 to 5,000 square foot lots (25% of them have to be 5,000). Planner Lance said the ask here tonight is to put an overlay to get more density. Administrator Epling said this would add about 25 total on 3.94 acres. The exchange for extra density is they would add landscape improvements, architectural standards, and fee in lieu for parks.

Motion by Councilmember Lewis to adopt the ordinance with the corrections they discussed. Motion seconded by Councilmember Westergard. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Bowcutt - yes, Councilmember Jex - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Oyler - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

c. Discussion and consideration of adopting RES 26-57 Heritage Country Development Agreement and ORD 26-19 Heritage Country PUD Overlay

Councilmember Bowcutt said thank you for the department reports and the work you have done. The whole document was well put together. Councilmember Lewis said what was the feedback from the NPI? Administrator Epling said they were concerned about density. During a meeting we gave a summary of the project and residents expressed concerns regarding commitments they believe had been made during the annexation process that were not clearly reflected in the proposed development agreement. Discussion centered on responsibility for infrastructure improvements and utility costs with several attendees seeking clarification regarding who would be responsible for funding utility hookups. The developer indicated that the project is intended to focus on providing affordable housing opportunities and stated that the development would contribute to the City's affordable housing inventory. Residents also expressed concerns regarding existing agricultural tile drainage lines located along the southern portion of the project area. Attendees emphasized the importance of appropriately addressing the drainage system to avoid adverse impacts to the drainage of adjacent farmlands.

NPI Chairman Jamie Crowther said I represent the NPI for the south district and live on Iowa String. I appreciate you listening to our concerns. I am asking you to deny the request for the PUD overlay. In the survey I did with the majority of the members that live in and surround that area, the comment that was made that there are only four or five people in opposition is a false statement. The majority of the people who live in or surround that area are in opposition to this development request for the PUD overlay. We are asking that you maintain the current zoning designation, which allows for just single-family homes and does not permit the proposed higher density townhouse development. Our concerns are first, what is being proposed does not align with the current land use plan, which states that higher density housing should remain closer to the City center. In this situation, it is probably a two- or three-mile walk. In this proposed development, your end points are Iowa String, railroad tracks, and an irrigated field or a cement plant. I

feel those are not easily walked to get to the City center, which provides amenities, services, and transportation. This proposal does not align with the vision the City has. The second concern is that several staff members have expressed significant reservations to this development. The fire chief has raised concerns regarding emergency access, noting the high number of homes being served by limited access and the one parcel, both of those accesses come out on 10,000 North. Those are the only access points. He also notes that the development borders train tracks and that if there is a train that could possibly delay emergency services. He cites concerns with the very small lot sizes. Could that mean higher car volume? Can emergency services get in and out? The City's engineer expressed concerns regarding proposed density and the substantial infrastructure needed beyond the boundaries of the development. He also stated that south of the freeway may not be the best location for higher density housing. Those assessments are consistent with the City's Land Use Plan. Likewise, the Public Works director has stated there is insufficient information regarding the availability and capacity of water, sewer and storm drainage. They were not prepared to make comments until additional evaluation were completed. Parks and Recs commented that yes, parks are needed, but giving the disjointed proposal of two different parcels and two different parks, will they have different ponds? How is that going to be maintained? It is not just one big park. Concerns were presented during Planning Commission that I do not feel were addressed or resolved with meaningful discussion. It is troubling to me that despite these concerns, Planning Commission recommended approval. If City staff is raising concerns these questions need to be answered. Why would we want to approve higher density development until these concerns are addressed and answered?

Mayor Rohde said I have been part of this whole process. As mayor, I do not have a vote, but I do have an opinion. I have talked to a lot of the residents in your area. I would recommend that the City Council deny the Heritage Country PUD overlay. The application seeks a density and a housing pattern that departs substantially from the property's adopted low density residential designation from the R1-8 zoning. While denial does not stop the project, it holds the property to the density we adopted and allows the developer to proceed under his existing zoning. The proposal by the developer is 496 residential units—205 detached family lots and 291 townhome multi-family units. For a maximum of 516 units under the PUD density calculation, across two parcels, with 73.67 acres in 11 phases. That would include 13.5 acres of park. Parcel A, zoned R1-8 would have the 202 units while parcel B, zoned R1-10 would have 294 units. More than half of the project (291 of the 496 units) would be townhouses. That is the density increase this application is really asking for. The future land use designation in 2023 of the Integrated Land Use Plan is single-family residential, low density. The developers own public description of his plan was far more modest than this application. At the Town Hall meeting he described it as a single-family development with a row of townhomes with a park. Quote, "we are pitching R1-8, which is 8000 square foot single lots. We were planning on just a townhome row right in front of the cement plant and then we would do a park and put in single-family all the way to Kelly Wood's place." He also acknowledged the density increase to this Council's call. If we wanted to get bonus density, it has to be pre-approved from the Council and that is what he is doing here today. There is no signed development agreement. I know they are working on one, but

there has not been one put together yet, which makes it hard for us to adopt this without that. A PUD overlay is a legislative decision. Here are my findings of why we should deny it. Number one, it is inconsistent with the General Plan. Number two, it is incompatible with the surrounding area. The property sits on the City's rural edge, adjacent to rural residential and agricultural land. Staff finds the proposed concentration townhouses incompatible with adjacent rural residential zoning, and out of step with a gradual transition. At the City's periphery, infrastructure cannot presently be committed. We have had a lot of discussions about staff concerns over access and public safety. The site has limited access to the existing street network along Iowa Street and 1000 North. The Fire Chief raised concerns, even though this is part of the code, it still is a concern in that area. It exceeds what was adopted and what the developer represented as R1-8 and about 200 homes, which is what this Council adopted. I remember sitting here representing the citizens and very adamantly saying, this is all we are going to do, right? An application for 496 units with 290 of those being townhouses goes well beyond both. Our residents and committees accepted the lower density and gave concessions to get it there. I appreciate what the citizens did in giving concessions. Residents worked through this process and accepted R1-8. The developer reduced from RM-8 to R1-8 in response. The City's own survey ranks preserving rural character and open space as the top priority. Listening to our residents is exactly what we need to do. Denial does not stop the project or punish the developer. He may proceed under the zoning already in place, developing a single-family neighborhood at the adopted density. Any development agreement and infrastructure accompanying it would come to this Council for further action. Denial simply declines the density increase and the townhouse concentration that departs from our plan. We now open the discussion up to the residents.

NPI Chairman Zach Whatcott said I live in Freeman Farms and am here to express my concerns about the Heritage Country PUD overlay request. I am asking you to deny it. I am concerned that the development agreement was not available prior to this meeting. The public needs to review that and provide comments as part of this consideration. The PUD overlay has been previously repealed by this Council, but due to the maturity of the plans, they are allowed to proceed forward. It is obvious the intent of the Council is to not allow PUDs going forward. I would consider that as part of your consideration. This is a closing chapter in the PUD overlay era, as we move forward with different zoning within our City. When Planning Commission approved this, there were comments made at the end explaining their reason for the vote and the takeaway was they were passing the hot potato to the Council. This is a rural community area. The R1-8 is a 40% or more increase in density, which is a pretty significant increase. There will be impact on this area because this is going to be a multiyear project. There are 11 phases and the developer mentioned two years per phase. That is 22 years to completion. That is an extremely significant time to have that area tore up as they are working through that development. During that time, there will be drainage concerns. That is an area where historically there has been drainage issues. The plan presented to the Planning Commission was that the retention pond would not be plumbed out to the Malad River until Phase 7. That is 14 years before the drainage would be updated. There are future potential risks for the City with this approval.

Mrs. Crowther said I just wanted to finish my thoughts. I request to deny the PUD overlay. I feel Tremonton needs some housing diversity and a broader range of housing options. In a workshop the City presented what is currently approved or in the works, and it feels like it is the same type of development, smaller and tailoring to higher density projects and the first-time homeowner. This area in the South District could present an opportunity to allow for a different type of development and buyer. Let us preserve large lot sizes, single-family housing residents who desire more space, with an agricultural feel. This could be growing families or long-term residents who want to move into a larger lot. Maybe they are business executives who moved from a different location and want a bigger home. I feel we need to have more of a residential rural setting and this South District is a great location for that because that is what exists there already. Instead of just always having small lots and townhomes, I feel like Tremonton needs to offer a variety of homes. Not every piece of land needs to be developed to its maximum density. This area south of the freeway represents an opportunity to preserve a different type of neighborhood. Maintaining current zoning in this area would help preserve that housing diversity. I respectfully ask that you deny the request for the PUD overlay and keep the existing zoning in place. Preserve the small-town feel as was presented in that well-being survey and seemed to be one of the number one things people wanted.

Ashley Anderson said I am concerned about the traffic in front of my home. At the last meeting they mentioned a roundabout that could be put in front. That would need to be large enough to accommodate semi-trucks because there are many that go in front of my home. I am also concerned about overcrowding in our schools. This is my 21st year of teaching. I teach at McKinley where we already have six portables, and the higher density housing would mean more kids. I love kids, but we need a place to put them first. I am concerned about that and where we are going to teach them. The other concern is the parks. I know the parks have been presented as a perk from a Council perspective. I understand why because that is something our community needs, but as a resident, it is not a perk for me. I worry that it will just make getting where me and my family need to go a bit harder because of inadequate parking. People will likely be parking in front of my home. I am also concerned about the pumping of sewage. I am not an expert, but I hope that does not cause me and my neighbors serious problems. I love where I live and that it is rural with farmland. That is why we built our home there. My hope is that you would not change the zoning and leave it zoned as single-family housing.

Selleca Nagy said I do not live in this neighborhood but am a resident of Tremonton. I would like to talk from a different perspective, from the business side of this development. We love to see single-family homes and it brings in a higher income level which is great for local businesses. I work as a business consultant and typically help businesses decide the demographics of where to put businesses and how those businesses grow in our community and how they become successful. This development does not align with the plan and where we have laid out for our businesses to be, because it is so far outside of that range. Our businesses do not see the gain from that because it is not walkable. We do not have a bus system locally or transportation that helps those people who are going to be at a lower income limit into multi-unit housing to make their way downtown. We are not really getting the business benefit of having that dense housing so

far out. The single-family homes would be great. I think that would be a great thing to add to that community. I think that is the right vision with higher density closer to downtown where we can have those walkable business use of the people in those units.

Derek Anderson said thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I came here with no intention of saying a word. However, there were some observations I made that I wanted to bring up. In the wellness survey that was presented, the one number that stuck out to me was 83% of Tremonton residents say growth is going too fast in the City. In a Planning Commission meeting, the developer made the statement that they could make more money leaving the zoning as it is. I would recommend we allow the developer to make more money and listen to the citizens who say we are growing too fast. Slow it down just a little bit. You still get to build some homes but let us slow it down.

Michelle Martineau said I do not live in this area, but I grew up on that side of town and know a lot about it. I feel like the residents there have already made concessions of having that zoned R1-8 and R1-0. That was a big concession in this area because I agree with many of the others that this area would be best served as larger family homes and larger lots. How many townhomes do we have either in process or already in Tremonton? Are we not well above what the governor wants us to have? Administrator Epling said we have a letter from the State saying we are fully compliant with affordable housing. As far as what numbers we have currently, it depends on if it is platted or entitled. There are a couple different numbers. After reviewing those numbers from the Work Session, Mrs. Martineau said that sounds like well over 50% is townhomes. One of my concerns as a resident that has lived here my entire life is for Tremonton to become the low-housing capital of Utah. I feel we need all kinds of incomes, not just low-income families.

Jim Peterson said the development agreement should be thoroughly analyzed, both from a legal and technical standpoint. One of the jewels that Tremonton has available is a lot of intelligent, capable and qualified people. I am concerned about the field drain concept. Resident Ben Hunsaker has presented that information. The development agreement has to be designed and enforced in a way to protect Tremonton and the community.

Meta Crony said I have many of the concerns that have been voiced, but I also have additional ones. After the Planning Commission meeting, I was going to contact every one of you and invite you to come out and go for a ride in this area, but I ended up in the hospital. In the last few days, I have extended you all an invitation to come out and ride with us because after the Planning Commission meeting, I really feel like you need to see an area to understand what it is like. It is not even the agricultural area, but the structural area. 1000 North is basically a one lane road. If you go clear over to the side, two outfits can pass. This is the access road to the one development by the railroad tracks that would have some 240 units. They can either come out of there and over the railroad tracks onto another narrow Country road or they can come down Iowa String. At the corner there are cement trucks. This summer there has been 10 trucks lined up at the end of the day. They are coming in and out, as well as trucks that are coming in with gravel and sand and contractors. I am really concerned about the liability you are going to have as far as traffic, and you are going to have to do some major changes in the road plans. We talked

to an engineer who said pumping stations are very tricky. He said they have to be so sealed off to avoid any groundwater or anything getting into them, and they have to be below all the rest of the utilities and water sources within the area. The developer has said the drainage will come from these two developments down to the church and then to the Malad River. I do not know if you realize that the Malad River is a mile and a third from the church and the developments are sitting north of that. I am really concerned about the liability you are going to pick up at this point, if this is approved. There are times when the wind is blowing from the north and south and you cannot see the mountains. There is just a wall of white. What happens to the traffic on 1000 North with that visibility and a thousand cars or more a day. Another concern I have is you losing the kind of people you want. As we went around and talked to our neighbors, we heard from multiple people, if this is approved, we will just move on, and these are good families. You are basically putting them in a situation that they will leave.

Kelly Wood said I would also ask you to deny the overlay. For every one of the people you see here asking you that, there are dozens and dozens more who have come to so many meetings and have quit coming because they do not feel like anyone is listening. I know things are changing, but I want you to remember all those people who have filled this room and have had valid concerns. I feel concerned about the promises that have been made this entire time and that all keeps getting moved. The signatures they got for the annexation were given because they were given promises that have never been kept. Those promises included one acre buffering lots for Freeman Farms. We were threatened that if we did not sign, then they would just put a Walmart there. I was actually told by Laura Calder that I am lucky that she is not taking my business from me. I do not think that this is the kind of business we want to do in Tremonton. It has been a really, really hard process for the people out there. Like you said many times tonight, we have all given concessions. We all did not want to be annexed. The signatures you got were very few. You are talking two or three that had sewer problems that wanted to annex while the rest did not. Most of them signed because they were promised their impact fees would be paid. That has since been changed. They were promised one acre lots that would buffer their homes. I think we need to be really careful on what we say yes to because is that even going to be followed through on because it has not been so far.

Daniel Baugh said I live south of the Crowthers on Iowa Street and am with everyone. The reason why that survey got such bad reviews is because people feel like they are not being heard. We do not want this to be approved so please deny it.

Tammy Wood said I do not live in that area either, but I have lived on Rocket Road probably half my life. Before you accept and do anything, I ask that you please fix your sewer plant. The smell has been awful most of my life. My friends that come from Brigham and Ogden always ask me, what is that terrible smell? I say it is the sewer. I know it is not built to accept all this building that is going on in Tremonton. For Tremonton to be known by their sewer is kind of heartbreaking. I ask that you deny this until that sewer is fixed and working properly and there is no smell.

Phil Crowther said I live on Iowa String and would echo a lot of the comments that have been said, but the sewer is one of my major concerns in that area. My grandfather farmed out there and I know that area well. It all drains southwest of Iowa String and there are tile drains. If the sewer plant is admittedly at capacity, where are we going to pump all this stuff? I appreciate what you do and ask that you listen to all the voices you have heard tonight.

Councilmember Lewis said as a City we have an obligation to prepare infrastructure for a development at R1-8 even if this is declined. That has to be funded somehow and we need to have a conversation around that. The intention of PUDs is increased density to cover costs. I am not proposing we do this, but I am trying to understand the economics. As a Council we are often asked to do an impossible task. Do not raise taxes, but I want a better sewer. I am just trying to understand how we are going to get there. Engineer Breinholt said the tricky part is we can only require any developer to construct what they need for their development. He needs water connections, sewer, a lift station and a drainage outfall. We can only require him to build a pump station that is sized for his development and water line that would serve it. That is what impact fees have to be used for—to upsize system improvements. I think that was the original intent. Administrator Epling said if this is not approved, what is the City’s obligation to get the infrastructure to that area? Engineer Breinholt said we do not have an obligation to get it to them beyond what is needed for that development. We cannot require them to upsize it for an area. There are some road requirements they would have to do for their own subdivision. Councilmember Westergard said I know they were going to do stuff for Freeman Farms, but was that supposed to happen by now or is that not going to happen? Mr. Calder said we were willing to help figure out a solution to make it happen. We are still willing to make it happen and are in negotiations.

Administrator Epling said the subject at hand tonight is does the density fit? The infrastructure will be worked out with the developer regardless of the zoning, whether it has a PUD overlay or it stays the base zoning. In my mind, they should be two different decisions because does the density fit is a proper zoning principle for that area. Then the infrastructure is something we handle. Councilmember Westergard said I feel like we as a Council went through a lot and got consensus to do the R1-8 with the townhomes by the cement plan. Based on that, I was told you were going to pay their impact fees, but if that is not happening, that is concerning. Councilmember Bowcutt said I want to thank the residents for staying engaged. It has been a long process and it means a lot.

Motion by Councilmember Bowcutt to deny Ordinance 26-19 Heritage Country PUD overlay and deny Resolution 26-57 Heritage Country Development Agreement. Motion seconded by Councilmember Jex. Roll Call Vote: Councilmember Bowcutt - yes, Councilmember Jex - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Oyler - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

13. Reports and Calendar
 - a. City Leadership Report

Manager Nessen said we had a department head meeting and introduced the Tremonton Connection Plan. We have asked department heads to go back and look through that. Director LeFevre has come up with a worksheet to obtain their input on that plan. We will have goals for you by December 1, and ready to implement in January.

b. Upcoming Calendar Items

Mayor Rohde said September 23, is the Emergency Preparedness event at the Senior Center from 2-5 p.m. On September 24, we will hold a Town Hall meeting. Our Planning department will be here to answer questions and we would like to hear from the citizens. October 2, is a Domestic Violence Awareness Walk at Jeanie Stevens Park at 5 p.m. October 27-28, is our Council training. The Emotional Wellness Committee will meet on October 7, at 6 p.m. We are having our first CAC meeting Thursday at 6 p.m. The new website is running. The Main Street Committee will hold their first activity on September 26 at Midland Square with hot rolls and cruising Main from 6-9 p.m.

14. *CLOSED MEETING: No Closed Meeting held at this time.*

- a. *Strategy session to discuss the purchase of real property when public discussion of the transaction would disclose the appraisal or estimated value of the property under consideration or prevent the public body from completing the transaction on the best possible terms; and/or*
- b. *Strategy session to discuss the character, professional competence or physical or mental health of an individual; and/or*
- c. *Strategy sessions to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation; and/or*
- d. *Discussions regarding security personnel, devices or systems*

15. Adjournment.

Motion by Councilmember Westergard to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Councilmember Jex. Vote: Councilmember Bowcutt - yes, Councilmember Jex - yes, Councilmember Lewis - yes, Councilmember Oyler - yes, Councilmember Westergard - yes. Motion approved.

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

The undersigned duly acting and appointed Recorder for Tremonton City Corporation hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes for the City Council Meeting held on the above referenced date. Minutes were prepared by Jessica Tanner.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2026.

Cynthia Nelson, City Recorder