

## South Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District

### Public Hearing Minutes

December 8th, 2025 at 6:00 pm

The Board of Trustees of the South Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District (SSLVMAD), Salt Lake County, State of Utah, met in a public hearing at the District offices at 7308 Airport Road, West Jordan, Utah and via Zoom with an anchor location established at the District offices at 7308 Airport Road, West Jordan, Utah.

The following board members were in attendance either in-person or online: Tarrah Anderson (Herriman), Ellen Birrell (Cottonwood Heights), Jeff Bossard (Brighton), Tish Buroker (Riverton), Silvia Catten (Millcreek), Don Christensen (West Valley), Brad Gilson (Draper), Paul Glover (Midvale), Kelvin Green (West Jordan), Kathie Johnson (South Jordan), Kristie Overson (Taylorsville), Linda Price (White City), Florence Reynolds (Sandy), Ilene Risk (Salt Lake County), Laverne Snow (Murray), and Greg Wilding (Bluffdale).

The following board members were absent: Ty Brewer (Holladay).

Also attending were Dan McBride (District Manager), Scott Sommer (Assistant Manager), Kassie Draper (Board Clerk), Eric Gardner (Assistant Board Clerk), Devin Belnap, Judd Mitchell, residents Gene Drake, Steve Morely, Mark Tonroe, Joseph Miller, Carl, Paul Currie, Scott, Johnson Agiriga, Saranya Hari, Wayne Coturri, Fay Kinglet, Pierre Qian, Brandon Grable, Silvia Morris, Sergio, Scott and Lisa, Jeff Roskelley, Cathy Mullaly, Austin Brown, Melanie, Chandler Shipley, Jeff Gates, Leslie Gates, and a 5 others who did not identify themselves by name.

1. **Welcome.** Chair Catten welcomed everyone and noted that this public hearing is for the SSLVMAD tax increase and budget hearings; no other issues will be addressed.
2. **2025 Amended Budget Public Hearing**
  - a. **Presentation of the 2025 amended budget**

McBride presented amendments to the 2025 budget noting an ending budget of \$1,878,000.00 representing a decrease of \$72,500.00 from the expected budget. Conservative spending was motivated, as always, by efforts to be careful with taxpayer money, and also because funds are short. McBride explained that some savings were possible this year because of reduced opportunities for staff to attend conferences and because insecticide inventory remaining from the previous year reduced the amount of insecticide required to be purchased this year. He also noted some expenses that were higher than usual, especially expenses related to preparations for proposing a tax rate increase.

- b. **Public comment**

1. Catten explained that all attendees (virtual and in-person) who wish to make comment regarding the 2025 amended budget must state their name and address followed by their comments, virtual participants should have their camera on when commenting, and comments will be limited to 3 minutes per individual.
2. Open the hearing for public comment on the 2025 amended budget

Johnson moved to open the hearing for public comment on the 2025 amended budget. Green seconded the motion and the motion carried with all in favor.

Resident Steve Morely from Sandy commented that inflation was listed as a reason for requesting a tax rate increase and, noting increased property values, questioned whether revenue from property taxes increased with property value and if such an increase should offset increased costs due to inflation.

Resident Mark Tonroe from West Jordan commented on concerns about raising property tax rates especially for residents living on a budget. He noted expenses associated with District facilities yet reported observing mosquitoes and questioned the services provided by the District.

Carl asked if the decision to raise the tax rate was already made in private or if the decision was to be made during the public hearing.

Scott suggested that keeping any tax rate increases small and more in line with percent increases in income expected for people who are retired or otherwise living on a fixed income, may be preferable to huge increases.

Johnson Agiriga from Riverton commented that property tax increases do place an additional burden on those on fixed income and questioned whether the District has exhausted other ways to cut costs such as increasing efficiency.

Saranya Hari from Riverton commented that while costs have increased, residents may not have received increased pay or compensation and expressed opposition to a tax increase from that perspective.

3. Close public comment

Hearing no more comments, Green moved to close public comment for the 2025 amended budget. Wilding seconded the motion and the motion carried with all in favor.

c. Discussion

Green noted that the District came in \$72,500 under budget hence the amendment.

Snow thanked participants and invited participation in other board meetings.

Buroker clarified that the current discussion and action was for amending the 2025 budget, not for a tax increase.

d. Action

Green moved to adopt Resolution #25-04 a resolution of the governing board of South Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District adopting the 2025 calendar year amended budget. Wilding seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following vote:

Yes: Anderson, Birrell, Bossard, Buroker, Christensen, Gilson, Glover, Green, Johnson, Overson, Reynolds, Risk, Snow, Wilding

No: None

Abstain: Catten, Price

Absent: Brewer

3. Tax Rate Increase Public Hearing

a. Presentation of dollar amount of additional tax revenue

McBride explained that the District is seeking an additional \$320,000 to bring tax revenue for the District to \$1,420,000.

b. Presentation of purpose and reasoning for additional tax revenue

McBride explained that the District is seeking additional tax revenue to facilitate operational enhancements including potential use of drone-based surveillance and treatment, modernizing vehicles and equipment, and expanding laboratory capabilities.

McBride pointed out that the District has not requested a tax rate adjustment since 2012 and is currently operating at a similar rate as in 2002. Since that time, the population of the District has increased by over 200,000 individuals and 72,000 homes. McBride explained that the tax rate decreases as property values increase such that revenue for the District remains constant. He noted an inflation rate of 34% since 2017, yet the District has had no change in revenue during that time. The proposed tax rate increase intends to catch up with inflation.

McBride emphasized the District's efforts to mitigate risk from mosquito-borne diseases and elaborated on the reasoning behind requesting additional tax revenue. He described how a healthy reserve fund has allowed the District to continue operations but explained that additional funds are required to sustain the current level of service. He noted that programs such as black fly control and public relations have already been cut back. Among operational enhancement opportunities, McBride mentioned available technology such as drones for mosquito habitat surveillance and treatment and improved data systems that the District would like to adopt to increase efficiency and effectiveness and improve the level of service provided to the public. He emphasized the District's efforts to control mosquitoes in an ecologically responsible way. McBride further emphasized that increasing the budget for capital projects could provide for better maintenance of existing facilities and thereby delay the much greater expense of facility replacement. Finally, McBride noted risks from mosquito-borne diseases and explained that increased laboratory capacity can help ensure the District is prepared to respond to that threat.

McBride acknowledged that a 29.09% increase seems high but explained that for an average home valued at \$600,000, the tax increase would amount to around \$0.77 per year and for an average business property valued at \$600,000, the tax increase would amount to \$1.40 per year. He also acknowledged that the proposed increase from the District is only part of the tax burden felt by residents but noted that the District tries hard not to raise taxes often.

Catten commented that anticipated uses of additional funds represent improvements in efficiency and service level and may be less expensive in the long run than alternatives. She noted that the District is among the most fiscally efficient government entities she has encountered in 10 years of public service. Catten acknowledged that any increase in expenses can make a difference especially for people on a fixed income. Additionally, Catten noted that spending a little more for better products and technology can increase the level of service provided to residents and that laboratory capacity may be less expensive than alternatives. She expressed confidence that the proposed tax increase should sustain the District into the future and suggested that the fact that the District has been running at a similar tax rate as in 2002 demonstrates that the District runs a lean operation.

**c. Public comment**

1. Catten explained that all attendees (virtual and in-person) who wish to make comment regarding the proposed tax rate increase must state their name and address followed by their comments, virtual participants should have their camera on when commenting, and comments will be limited to 3 minutes per individual.

2. Open the hearing for public comment for the proposed tax rate increase.

Snow moved to open the hearing for public comment for the proposed tax rate increase. Green seconded the motion and the motion carried with all in favor.

Steve Morely noted that property values have increased and asked why the District wouldn't automatically see an increase in revenue if the same tax rate is applied to higher property values. McBride explained that the tax commission adjusts tax rates such that District revenue stays the same despite fluctuations in property values. Johnson noted that increases in the amount paid in property taxes may be due to tax rate increases requested by other entities.

Joseph Miller of Sandy asked if the District gets money from new growth. McBride explained that some additional funds come in, but that the tax commission then adjusts the tax rate to keep revenue the same.

Steve Morely expressed frustration that tax increases come from multiple entities

Paul Currie of Draper also noted tax rate increases from multiple entities. He commented that a 29% rate increase seems unreasonable and suggested that technology that increases efficiency should drive costs down. He wondered if additional development in the District would eliminate mosquito habitat further reducing costs and questioned the long-term need of a tax rate increase.

Joseph Miller suggested contracting services out.

Jeff Gates of West Jordan also associated increased property values with increased property tax. He commented that salary adjustments have not kept pace with inflation and increased cost of living, and increased property taxes add to that burden.

Johnson Agiriga of Riverton reiterated that he would prefer to prioritize cutting waste and improved efficiency to reduce costs rather than raising taxes to get more revenue.

3. Close public comment

Hearing no more comments, Green moved to close public comment on the tax rate increase. Wilding seconded the motion and the motion carried with all in favor.

#### d. Discussion

Green thanked those that participated in the meeting. He explained that certified tax rates are adjusted such that revenue received by individual entities remains constant despite fluctuations in property values and that property taxes are the sole source of revenue for the District. He noted that new growth adds some additional funds that help offset cost increases but also noted that more development can require additional mosquito treatments as for catch basins. Green stated that in his experience government entities contracting work out long-term is often more expensive than alternatives and cited a recent example from West Jordan City. He acknowledged that 29% seems like a big number, but explained that revenue, including revenue from new growth has not kept up with increased demand for services and increased costs.

Wilding noted that board members may not enjoy paying taxes. He also explained that certified tax rates are adjusted down as property values increase to maintain consistent levels of revenue for taxing entities. Wilding suggested that a service level change may not be possible without additional revenue. He noted tax association estimates that entities would be expected to raise taxes every 5-8 years to keep up with rising costs due to inflation. The District has requested adjustments less frequently than that. Wilding expressed his opinion that the District is conservative in spending and that nominal tax hikes are proposed infrequently and for good reasons including service level changes and to catch up with increasing costs.

Catten explained that demand for some services provided by the District has increased with increasing population and expressed her opinion that the District board is judicious, and that the District runs lean and has already cut costs.

Risk mentioned that her experience in the public health sector has allowed her to see the negative effect of mosquito borne disease on individuals and families and the positive impact of mosquito control. She emphasized that money spent by the District goes toward public health.

Johnson noted that the percentage increase of the proposed tax rate adjustment seems high because the District's budget is so low. She acknowledged the increased tax burden from multiple entities proposing increases.

Snow acknowledged that mechanisms for determining the certified tax rate can be confusing. She mentioned steps the District has taken to maintain transparency and comply with truth-in-taxation requirements including notifying and visiting municipalities and notifying residents and confirmed that steps were taken in public meetings.

Catten agreed that decisions were made in public meetings and noted that complying with truth-in-taxation requirements ensured transparency.

Glover expressed dislike for property taxes but acknowledged that the system is currently set up such that the District and other entities are funded through property taxes. He acknowledged that the percent increase seems high but noted that, because the current rate is so low, any increase in requested funds may seem like a high percentage; a phenomenon shared by other taxing entities, such as Midvale city, with relatively low tax rates. Glover expressed his opinion that the board has looked for the best way forward.

**e. Action**

Green moved to accept the truth-in-taxation, comments, and proposed tax rate increase. Snow seconded the motion and the motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: Anderson, Bossard, Christensen, Gilson, Glover, Green, Johnson, Overson, Price, Reynolds, Risk, Snow, Wilding

No: None

Abstain: Catten

Absent: Birrell, Brewer, Buroker

**4. 2026 Budget Public Hearing**

**a. Presentation of the proposed 2026 budget**

McBride explained that no changes had been made to the proposed 2026 budget since the tentative budget was presented in November. He also noted that funds from the proposed tax rate increase would not be available until the end of 2026 and so would be placed in a reserve fund for use the following year.

**b. Public comment**

1. Catten explained that all attendees (virtual and in-person) who wish to make comment regarding the 2026 budget must state their name and address followed by their comments, virtual participants should have their camera on when commenting, and comments will be limited to 3 minutes per individual.

2. Open the hearing for public comment on the proposed 2026 budget

Green moved to open the hearing for public comment on the proposed 2026 budget. Johnson seconded the motion and the motion carried with all in favor.

Steve Morely commented that he has not observed the amount of property tax charged to stay the same when property value has increased

Mark Tonroe asked if public comments make a difference and expressed frustration with ever increasing property tax. He asked when the District must budget like residents need to budget.

Carl expressed agreement with some others that commented, thinks that the District should budget, was not surprised that all board members voted in favor of the tax increase and stated that he believes in closed doors, the appearance of freedom, the appearance of choice, the appearance of election, stated that we could do nothing without paying a tax, a fine, a levy, a fee, and that when you think you're free, you're not.

### 3. Close public comment

Hearing no additional comments, Wilding moved to close public comment on the proposed 2026 budget, Anderson seconded the motion and the motion carried with all in favor.

### c. Discussion

Wilding explained that the state set up property taxing such that entities must complete truth-in-taxation to request additional funds to keep up with costs that increase due to inflation. Property value increases with inflation, costs increase with inflation, and entities must ask for more by increasing tax rates, so those rates will continue to increase. Wilding expressed disagreement with some tax hikes and encouraged involvement to ensure adjustments make sense. He tries to evaluate tax rate adjustments from the perspective of time since the previous increase, what the percentage looks like, and what the additional funds are for. He reiterated that taxing entities must raise rates periodically or reduce service as costs increase. Wilding offered the opinion that this District is appropriately working to improve service and hasn't raised taxes for a long time. He explained his observations that when entities do not increase the tax rate, the amount he pays in property tax for those entities decreases. He acknowledged a complicated equation to determine tax rates and observed that every year, some entities may request an increase leading to an overall increase in property tax.

Catten pointed out that all deliberations by the board have been made in open meetings and as required by law. She thanked those that participated in the meeting and confirmed that she does listen to constituents. She expressed that she agrees with the decision made by the board to sustain the District. Catten noted that most board members are elected officials in cities and appointed to the board. Board members strive to make the best decisions for their constituents, and those interests may differ among cities.

Green cited an example of when West Jordan city increased taxes but the overall amount of property tax he paid went down because of other adjustments to tax rates. He pointed out examples of adjustments to certified tax rates and the resulting impact on tax assessed. Green commented that the District is attempting to stay in front of financial trouble. He stated that the Board has been discussing this for months. Green confirmed that the additional funds won't arrive until one year from now and pointed out that the 2026 budget is about the same as the 2025 budget with the addition of \$320,000 to a reserve fund anticipating costs a year from now.

Catten expressed some appreciation that the state has some control over what entities can do regarding taxes. She noted that there have been a lot of steps to prepare to propose a tax increase and pointed out that putting forth the effort to comply with the requirements can also demonstrate that the request is not frivolous.

Anderson thanked those that participated in the meeting and noted that all board meetings are open, and meeting minutes are available for all meetings.

d. **Action**

Wilding moved to approve Resolution # 25-05 adopting a final budget for the South Salt Lake Valley Mosquito Abatement District for the calendar year 2026. Green seconded the motion and the motion carried with the following vote:

Yes: Anderson, Christensen, Gilson, Glover, Green, Johnson, Overson, Price, Reynolds, Risk, Snow, Wilding

No: None

Abstain: Catten

Absent: Birrell, Bossard, Brewer, Buroker

5. **Adjournment.** Overson and Green moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried with all in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 7:19 pm.