



**1. WELCOME AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Cox Opened the public meeting at 5:30 p.m.  
Chair Cox led the pledge.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS – Non-Agenda Items**

Chair Cox opened the public comments.  
No comments were made.  
Chair Cox closed the public comments.

**3. ZONE CHANGE – The Kenneth H. Adams Living Trust - PUBLIC HEARING**

Consider a request for a zone change from Residential 5 Acre (R-5) to Commercial (C) on approximately 15.58 acres. The property is generally located at the southwest corner of 200 S and 2200 W, Parowan, UT; C-1069-0000-0000

*Applicant: Ray Adams*

**Introduction:**

Brett Hamilton shared the following:

- The applicant is the Kenneth Adams Trust represented by Ray Adams who is in attendance.
- The Property is currently zoned R-5. The property to the west is zoned R-5.
- The property is within the Tier II boundary. Everything to the east is Tier II and everything to the west is Tier IV.
- The property is located west of the Parowan City boundary near the new Maverick west of the Parowan’s south interchange. The road called 200 S runs along the north side of the property, Interstate-15 is to the south.
- One year ago, the County rezoned this property from Commercial to R-5, now the owner wants to revert it back to Commercial.
- The property owner to the west submitted a public comment that they were opposed to the zone change due to the potential of becoming boxed in by commercial development.
- A zone change requires the staff to review 13 criteria including access to utilities. The Maverick brought those utilities to this area so this request could be considered based on availability of those utilities.
- If the County approves the change to the Commercial zone, prior to development, the owner would need to contact Parowan City to discuss possible annexation. If annexed by Parowan City, the development guidelines for Parowan City would be used.
- The Planning Commission needs to determine if the change is in the best welfare for this area.
- The Planning Commission will be making a recommendation to the County Commission on this agenda item.

The applicant clarified the following:

- There are no current plans for developing this property and the applicant is not asking for utilities at this time. They will leave it as pastureland until the family decides otherwise.
- Parowan’s land map shows they expect this to be zoned Commercial if they annex it.
- The applicant does not have an issue disclosing the lack of utilities to a potential buyer.
- County approval would create an island of a Commercial zone, but the applicant feels it would allow them to do what they want with their own property.
- The property to the west was zoned Commercial when the owner purchased it 5 years ago.
- They are aware of a recent zone change of a property nearby that the commission recently approved from R-5 to Commercial.

**Open public hearing:**

Chair Cox opened the public hearing and shared the rules of the public hearing. The following comments were made:  
No comments were made.  
Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

**Planning Commission and Staff Discussion:**

The following comments were made:

- Brett shared that the findings for the rezoning are in the commissioners packets and asked if there were any questions.
- Roger Thomas shared he feels that the zoning is incongruent rather than creating an island due to the City zoning & County zoning at that property.
- Terry Palmer clarified that the applicant would need to do their due diligence regarding annexation once they know their plans.

**Planning Commission Action: Recommendation to the County Commission or continue the item**

**Motion:** Mike Platt made a motion to recommend to the Iron County Commission that the zone change from R-5 to Commercial, for the 15.58 acre property identified in agenda item #3, be approved.

**Second:** Seconded by Michelle Tullis.

**Motion Passed:** (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Jared Christensen, aye; Mike Platt, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Michelle Tullis, aye; Roger Thomas, aye)

#### 4. **ZONE CHANGE – Escalante Farms, LLC - PUBLIC HEARING**

Consider a request for a zone change from Agriculture 20 Acre (A-20) to Intensive Agriculture (I-A) on approximately 1,106 acres. The property is generally located west of 1600 W (Bar-V Road) and north of 2400 S, Newcastle, UT; E-1399-0001-0000 (160 acres), E-1399-1430-0001 (388 acres), E-1427-0030-1431 (478 acres), and E-1427-0002-0000 (80 acres).

*Applicant: Jared Holt*

##### **Introduction:**

Brett Hamilton shared the following:

- The parcels are located near Newcastle in the Tier 3 area, which is a Special Planned Area (SPA).
- The property is on the south side of Hwy 56, west of 1600 W (Bar V Road) and east of 1000 E (Jones Road).
- The 1,000 acres is currently zoned A-20 and the applicant is requesting it to be rezoned to Intensive Agricultural (IA).
- Other IA property is in the area that includes a dairy and lagoons.
- This property consists of four parcels of various shapes and sizes.
- Two public comments were received:
  - Ashley Christensen, a Newcastle resident shared that she is concerned about the nitrate saturation, well proximity, and policy inconsistency. Also, the impact on Newcastle regarding quality of life, broken promises, as well as noise and safety. She requested the Planning Commission reject the location and ask the applicant to find a site that is less populated.
  - Kyle Christensen, water master of the Newcastle drinking water company, shared concerns about the proximity of the feedlot to the well, the location being near the Source Protection Zone, and the potential long-term contaminants leaching into the well. The Holt Dairy has already affected the quality of life, and this will add to the impacts for the residents.
- The drinking water Source Protection Zones are identified as follows:
  - Zone 1 is a 100-foot radius from a wellhead or margin of the collection area.
  - Zone 2 is the area within a 250-day groundwater time of travel to a wellhead or margin of collection area, the boundary of the aquifer(s) which supplies water to the groundwater source, or the groundwater divide, whichever is closer.
  - Zone 3 (waiver criteria zone) is the area within a 3-year groundwater time of travel to a wellhead or margin of the collection area, the boundary of the aquifer(s) which supplies water to the groundwater source, or the groundwater divide, whichever is closer.
  - Zone 4 is the area within a 15-year groundwater time of travel to a wellhead or margin of the collection area, the boundary of the aquifer(s) which supplies water to the groundwater source, or the groundwater divide, whichever is closer.
- The administration and enforcement of the Source Protection Zone is in Iron County Code Chapter 13. The regulations for the zones are reviewed during the permitting process, whether it is through a CUP or an ALUP.
- The vast majority of the proposed 1,106 acres is not within any of those protection zones, but there is a portion that does fall within Zone 4. Any regulations would apply to any portion that was developed within Zone 4.

Chair Cox asked and Brett explained that information related to Intensive Agricultural operations and nitrate levels, were included in the septic density study that was done in 2022-2023.

Rich Wilson shared:

- The mentioned septic density studies showed what the nitrates were “doing” from all sources of water at the aquifer level, whether they were surface or septic, etc.
- Utah does these studies a little differently than other states, they do areas in circular zones, which are simple and quick, but they don’t take into account the topography. Utah probably takes the most conservative approach by saying anything downhill might flow uphill too.
- Other states create a well zone based on the smallest circle being a 100 or 200-foot radius depending on what type of well it is (private or public) and they create a topographical cone as it were. Then the cone sweeps the upslope area because that is where rain or other water is expected to go and will bring it and materials directly to the wellhead.
- To clarify, Zone 4 is what is expected or what is possible in a certain area over a 15-year time of travel.

**Declaration:** Jared Christensen stated he would not be voting since he works for the Holt’s and it is a conflict of interest.

Roger Thomas & Erik Cox asked and Jared Holt explained the County approved a CUP a few years ago for a digester within the existing Intensive Agricultural (IA) area. When the digester was put in, the stage was being set to bring all the effluent into a covered lagoon. A biogas flare system was included to burn off the gas.

Jared Holt shared detailed information for the project on the Type 2 feedlot:

- Each of the 3 types of feedlot are different:
  - Type 2 is less than 1,000 animals units.
  - Type 4 is over 1,000 animal units.
  - Type 6 is over 2,000 animal units
- The County ordinance states that if the feedlot is not on 20 acres it cannot be permitted.
- They currently have one grandfathered Type 2 feedlot with less than 1,000 cows.
- They realized, after reading the County ordinances, that when two feedlots are next to each other, they have to count the animal units together, which amounts to two Type 4 feedlots.

- The challenge is the ordinance also says that if the feedlots are on adjacent parcels, you have to count them together again and then those four feedlots become one Type 6 feedlot.
- The reason for this zone change request is that a Type 6 feedlot is considered Intensive Agriculture, which must be in the IA zone.
- They have no plans for adding more animals, just plans to add a digester.
- The Newcastle residents are concerned about how this would affect the expansion of their well so they (the applicant) are willing to do whatever Newcastle feels comfortable with such as adding a stipulation to the CUP to add more feet of protection area to give Newcastle an additional 1,320 feet to expand their well to the south.
- Regarding concerns of the smell, he shared an example from the Milford area. When the digester was fully operational in Milford, the anecdotal evidence shared was that it decreased the smell by half.
- They plan to do additional procedures to keep the lagoons active all year, such as bringing water from Mill Grove, keeping it at approximately 125 degrees, and injecting it into the lagoons during the winter. This will eliminate the problem of smell that arises if the gas is only burned off seasonally; otherwise, the odor builds up during the winter. If they inject warm water into that digester, they are also building a heat exchanger, which can make gas year-round, so when it dumps over into the storage lagoon, that gas has already burned off. This additional step was not done in Milford, but it should help with the smell issue significantly more.

Michelle Tullis asked how much the digester has helped with the smell of the cows.

Jared Holt replied that it has helped a lot, almost half of what the odor was before and he hopes it will significantly reduce the odor even more if this request is approved.

Roger Thomas asked how the County would go about including a stipulation that would protect the existing or future growth in that area.

Brett explained that typically the County does not stipulate zone changes. This conversation would lead to a condition within an ALUP that would state that no animal operation is allowed north of 1600 S.

Eric Cox asked and Jared Holt clarified the entire parcel has to be part of the zone change because of how the County ordinance reads not because they need the whole thing rezoned. They are just trying to do the feedlot and bring it into compliance.

Brett added the County does not recommend splitting zones on one parcel, but if the Planning Commission wants to just rezone a portion of the whole parcel they could split the zone and leave the rest of the parcel as A-20.

Dennis Gray asked and Brett clarified that if the parcel had 2 zones, the applicant could record a document stating the property has 2 zones and what those zones were intended for. The applicant was agreeable to that if the parcel was split into 2 zones.

#### **Open Public Hearing:**

Chair Cox opened the public hearing and shared the rules of the public hearing. The following comments were made:

- Cindy Cluett shared that she sold her house in Newcastle due to the dairy because the smell made it hard for her to breathe. She is shocked to see that the County would allow the applicant to extend the dairy because she feels it is dangerous to the public and the water supply. She is genuinely worried that within 15 years the people may be affected by contaminated water and is completely opposed to the project.
- Rich Wilson clarified that the 15-year water time travel to a wellhead is meant to regulate the water protection rules so that by the time the water arrives at the wellhead, it is clean, not that it takes 15 years to get there.
- Steve Holm shared that a simple solution to the problem is to split the 20 acres without a rezone. He appreciates what the dairy is doing and supports it. He feels his recommended solution would help eliminate everyone's concerns on water usage.
- Jeremy Hunt stated that he does not like to complicate things and tell people what to do with their private property, but the smell from the dairy is an issue. He lives out by the Junction, which is about 6 miles away from the dairy and thinks if the dairy expands, the smell will only get worse so he is firmly opposed to it.
- Berke Jones stated he has lived in Newcastle for 20 years and has watched a lot of growth in the area, including the dairy and their efforts to combat the smell noting that the digester was costly. The issue with the smell is something they are aware of and want to make better. He and his family enjoy living in the agricultural area and are excited for the changes and improvements moving forward.
- A.J. Hall explained he is neighbors with Jared Holt. He is worried about the traffic, the roads the cattle trucks will use, and what would be done about the excessive dust that the hauling trucks would create.
- Jared Holt responded that many of these animals are already at the dairy. They are just rezoning to come into compliance with the County ordinance because the animals have been aggregated. There will be some additional animal units brought in, but the trucks will follow the same traffic patterns noting they are always willing to help reduce dust.
- Roger Thomas asked about animal overload and wanted clarification on the zone change. For example, he asked if the property were changed to the IA zone, would it be able to accommodate a greater animal load even though the group talked about aggregating to a Type 6.
- Brett explained that the number of animals could possibly go higher because it would become an IA Type 6 operation, but the applicant would have to apply for an ALUP. In the A-20 zone, a Type 6 animals operation is only allowed with the approval of a CUP. The difference is more about the permitting process than it is about the animal units.

#### **Closed Public Hearing:**

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

#### **Planning Commission and Staff Discussion:**

The staff discussed and clarified the following:

- With the various types of animal operations, Type 6 is the most intense and the most congregated.

- There are separation and distance requirements in IA, which could potentially place more animals in a concentrated area than it would within an A-20 zone where there would have to be more separation distance between them.
- The applicant would not be able to put as many animals as they wanted on the property because there is a permitting process they would have to go through, which may or may not be approved.
- An ALUP would be permitted through the County, but for the animal operations itself; there are many other agencies that are involved in making sure the area is not negatively impacted.

**Planning Commission Action: Recommendation to the Commission or continue the item**

**Motion:** Roger Thomas made a motion to recommend to the Iron County Commission that the zone change from Agriculture 20 Acre (A-20) to Intensive Ag (I-A) for the 1,106-acre property be approved.

**Second:** Seconded by Dennis Gray

**Motion Passed:** (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Mike Platt, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Michelle Tullis, aye; Roger Thomas, aye, Jared Christensen; abstained)

**5. COUNTY CODE AMENDMENT; R4K and Vehicle Storage Lot – PUBLIC HEARING**

Consider a request to amend Section 17.36.320 (R4K General Requirements) to modify standards for lots 10,000 square feet or greater, and to amend Section 17.36.700 (Vehicle Storage Lot) to expound on hard surface requirements and lighting standards.

*Applicant: Iron County*

**Introduction:**

Brett Hamilton shared the following:

- This agenda item includes two different sections proposed to be amended.
  1. Section 17.36.320 and 17.36.700 are for R4K zoning and the 4,000 sq. ft. lot general requirements.
    - The staff is looking to make some changes to R4K because the lots are usually more than 4,000 sq. ft. in the developments currently being proposed.
    - The purposed changes include:
      - Single-family lots in R4K, greater than 10,000 sq. ft. do not need additional parking or additional outside storage.
      - Narrow lots would not be required to have additional parking or outside storage.
  2. Vehicle storage proposed changes include adding to the ordinance the following:
    - Hard surfaces would include impervious surface including asphalt, concrete, compacted gravel for driving, parking, vehicle storage, or storage unit access, which reduces infiltration of water into the ground.
    - Lighting must be downward directed, fully shielded, have limited maximum height, include setbacks, limit the amount of kelvin, limit the amount of illuminance-controlled lighting, and have automatic timers that would automatically shut off. Motion sensors and photocells will be encouraged. Manufactured specification sheets to be required.

Chair Cox asked the difference between 3,000 kelvin and 4,000 kelvin.

Brett explained that that there is no specific requirement but depending on whether the storage was adjacent to residential or commercial properties would determine the kelvin requirement.

Michelle Tullis asked and Brett explained that current businesses would be grandfathered in until or unless they come in to make a change.

Terry Palmer clarified if an existing business's lights are too bright, the County could address it as a nuisance complaint to get it resolved.

Roger Thomas suggested that the ordinance include more than just set back lighting. The light should not trespass outside of the property line.

Brett agreed and thinks the ordinance should set the standard, but the property owner has to determine how to meet that standard.

Terry shared that the building department would need to inspect the lighting before issuing a certificate of occupancy.

Rich Wilson suggested the light be at an angle or have a shield to direct the light so it does not go past the edge of the property.

Roger Thomas suggested the County establish lighting zones to protect the night sky.

**Open Public Hearing:**

Chair Cox opened the public hearing and shared the rules of the public hearing. The following comments were made:

- James Munn complimented the County on the new conditions that have been placed on the lighting ordinances. He mentioned how he has seen some nice lights with a cold blue hue that were working really well in Washington County. The lights did not seem to affect the people or the animals. Farmers & ranchers have complained about other lighting affecting the animals to where they could not bed down for the night, so it seems the change will be for the better for all.
- Jason Dodds recommended that the County develop clear standards for what adverse impacts really are so the standards are easily identified.

**Closed Public Hearing:**

Chair Cox closed the public hearing.

**Planning Commission and Staff Discussion:**

The staff discussed and clarified the following:

- Dennis Gray would like to talk more about the details of the lighting, because he feels it needs more work.
- Roger Thomas agrees with adding more specifics to the ordinance so that it will help code enforcement. The IES standards would be a good guide for the County ordinance.

- Chair Cox clarified this is specifically for the vehicle storage ordinance, but the County could use this for the general lighting requirements. He agrees that the County should review this again at next month's meeting.
- Terry Palmer indicated the County would look into doing some additional research.
- Brett explained that both ordinance changes do not have to be approved at this meeting. Whoever does the motion can specify moving one of them forward and continue the other.
- Rich Wilson stated that the Planning Commission could approve both amendments at this meeting so that any permits that are applied for now can at least have these standards. Then they could potentially be changed again at the next meeting. The County has been researching other municipalities' lighting ordinances. The County included in the amendments the standards that were repeated most often.
- The Planning Commissioners discussed several options for changes to the wording in Section 1e, items 6 & 8.

**Planning Commission Action: Recommendation to the Commission or continue the item**

**Motion:** Roger Thomas made a motion to recommend to the Iron County Commission that ordinance 17.36.320, R4K Parking District Standards be approved as written, and that Section 17.36.700, Vehicle Storage Lots, be approved with the following amendment; Item 1)e.6 language stating "a correlated color temperature CCT of 3000 kelvin or less and" be stricken and all of item 1)e.8 be stricken.

**Second:** Seconded by Jared Christensen.

**Motion Passed:** (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Mike Platt, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Michelle Tullis, aye; Roger Thomas, aye, Jared Christensen; aye)

**6. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT; Antelope Data Center – Discussion Item**

Planning staff will review questions related to the proposed project. Staff will review the Planning Commission's responsibility to determine whether the proposed use complies with County ordinance standards and whether identified impacts can be reasonably mitigated through conditions of approval.

For discussion purposes only, staff will present draft example conditions to demonstrate potential mitigation measures that could be considered if the Planning Commission finds the project capable of meeting ordinance requirements. Presentation of draft conditions does not imply a recommendation for approval and is intended solely to assist the Commission in understanding the scope of possible conditions.

No action will be taken, and no public hearing or public comment will occur at this meeting.

**Introduction:**

Brett Hamilton and the staff shared the following:

- The proposed data center is located on a portion of a 640-acre parcel.
- The County is not funding the project, not putting the improvements in, and is not promoting this project to be built in the County.
- The applicant is responsible for the infrastructure associated with the data center. The County will make sure it complies with current code.
- The applicant provided an economic impact analysis that shows both a tax revenue that would be generated for the County and a tax revenue if the project is included in the Utah Inland Port Authority (UIPA).
- The Planning Commission is not responsible for the decision of whether it is part of the Inland Port, although improvement of the road infrastructure might benefit everyone if it goes through the Inland Port.
- Danny Stewart would be a good resource to gain additional knowledge of how the funds are transferred.
- Regarding power, the applicant plans to use natural gas. This means the natural gas bills will not increase because they are not going through Enbridge Gas. Emergency backup power needs to be discussed further.
- The water needed for the data center would come from the Beryl/Escalante Water Basin, which is already 100% allocated. The applicant would have to purchase existing water rights from a water rights owner to be able to use them. Monitoring water usage may be added as a requirement to the CUP.
- Regarding water usage, Commissioner Gray shared some of his research; the data center could use 4 million gallons per year, which is equivalent to 13 acre feet. When compared to Three Peaks Elementary who uses 9.3 million gallons per year, the data centers estimated amount is not an issue according to the Water Conservancy District.
- The data center plans to use a closed loop cooling system, which reduces water usage.
- Iron County's recent recharge efforts, within a two year period, put over 3 billion gallons of water back into the ground.
- Maintenance issues would be identified within a few feet of the issue and the leak detection system notifies the faculty right away, so the issue would be addressed immediately.
- The CUP could include mitigation requirements to help alleviate the public's concerns of water usage and gas leakage.
- Regarding sound, for every doubling of distance away from the source, the decibel level drops by 6.
- Utah Code says a Land Use Authority shall approve a CUP if reasonable conditions are proposed or can be imposed to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in the accordance with applicable standards.
- Iron County Code, Chapter 17.28 states the CUP requirements. Section 17.37 specifically describes the data center and power plant standards. In Iron County, the Land Use Authority is the Planning Commission for making decisions on a CUP.
- The data center may not be denied outright if it complies with applicable ordinances and standards; however, reasonable mitigation measures may be required to reduce detrimental effects. If the applicant cannot meet those mitigation requirements, the Land Use Authority may deny the CUP based on substantial evidence in the record. The staff and Planning Commission have reviewed all of the

- following standards to determine mitigation including site and development plans, details of the structures, local economic benefits, visual impacts, wildlife habitat and migration, environmental analysis, solid and hazardous waste, height restrictions with FAA review, transportation plans, public safety, noise limitations, and other probable impacts.
- The County currently does not have an expiration on the CUP, but the conditions of a development agreement could include specific deadlines or extensions. The County is continuing to discuss various options and expiration dates so that old requirements are not allowed once the project actually begins.
  - Projects that are no longer in use must be decommissioned, which have very specific requirements.
  - Regarding water...
    - The applicant does not currently have water rights. When they do purchase water rights, they are required to be from the Beryl/Escalante Water Basin. Only water rights with a priority date of 1945 or prior may be purchased. Verification of that water right is required and must include use for culinary, domestic, fire protection, construction, dust mitigation, concrete, and tilt-up wall curing.
    - Water use would comply with the existing Beryl/Enterprise Groundwater Management Plan and any curtailment requirements that the State would put into place.
    - Approval of the CUP would not constitute approval of any water rights or groundwater withdrawal.
    - The State regulates water, but the County could look at various requirements of water use, such as metering for each phase, reporting on a quarterly or annual basis, dust suppression, landscaping, and one-time fills of the system.
    - The changes in the water use numbers that were originally given were changed because the applicant's initial estimation of employees was 175 and water use was estimated at 3.13-acre feet of water per year. The applicant has done a more in-depth analysis of potential employees and has increased that number to a maximum of 672 employees so the estimated water usage is now 7.83-acre feet per year. Conditions of water use would depend on the number of employees they have.
    - Provisions regarding water use could include penalties for non-compliance or incentives for using less. Such as, not allowing the purchase of additional water rights to resolve overuse, rather a reduction in use to meet the agreed upon amount. Also, unused allocations of water per year would not carry forward. Continuous overuse of water could cause a CUP to be revoked.
    - In drought conditions, when water is restricted, the data center would be subject to the same restrictions as everyone else.
  - The number of public comments the County has received is up to 92. These were compiled and given to the Planning Commissioners to view. The Planning Commissioners have done additional research as well. The Planning Commissioners are taking it seriously in an effort to make sure any concerns are addressed.
  - Regarding road improvements:
    - Antelope Springs Road would need to be improved all the way from Iron Springs Road to the project site.
    - The County requirements, the engineers suggested improvements, and the applicant's road plan must be followed.
    - The road would be built prior to the data center being built.
    - Higher road standards or maintenance of the road may be required during or after the data center construction due to the number of trucks on the road. Coordination with the current Iron Springs Road widening will be considered when determining the requirements for Antelope Springs Road.
  - Utah is a fence out state so the property would require a fence to keep livestock off the property.
  - Regarding power, the applicant will not tie in to the local power supply lines. They will provide and supply themselves with 100% of the power they use.
  - Current building location set back requirements are 60 feet. The project would likely be 300-400 feet inside the property boarder. A 100-foot fire protection zone would exist around the entire data center.
  - The 24 inch proposed pipeline requirements would include a detailed plan of the alignment, easement valve, safety set, and emergency shut off. Additional specifications could be required when reviewing the impact of the existing pipelines in the area.
  - An example of a condition that could be included in the CUP would be to require a routine testing of generators, but limit testing to certain hours of the day and to once a week for a maximum of 15 minutes.
  - Conditions for wildlife and cultural resources would need to be fine-tuned.
  - Other conditions would include mitigation for grading, drainage, hydrology, utilities, dust control, vegetation, weeds, dust and landscaping.
  - This CUP is not tied to any tax incentives or reimbursements.
  - The applicant is responsible for any infrastructure cost for any damage or maintenance done during construction.
  - Lighting mitigation would include fixture standards, color, temperature, intensity, light trespass, and photometric analysis. Every effort to preserve the night sky would be included in the conditions.
  - All State and Federal regulatory standards would need to be met. The County could require additional standards.
  - All State & Federal permits must be approved before beginning construction, even if the CUP is approved. The County is responsible for only the CUP portion of the approval process.
  - The County Landfill will require a construction solid waste management plan prior to construction due to the impact the construction waste will have on the landfill.

- A wildfire mitigation plan is required to address fire mitigation, and an emergency management plan must be approved by the fire warden.
- An analysis on the noise levels and vibration of machinery is required to be submitted by the applicant.
- The applicant could include in their economic analysis more than just the benefit of new jobs.
- Building standards for data centers could potentially be tied to LEED certifications and be a condition of a CUP.

Scott Cuthbertson, with Alpen Associates, the spokesperson for Pronghorn Development/Antelope Springs Data Center project shared the following:

- The \$35 million in tax revenue is an accurate number and averages over 20 years after the incentives. They modeled the revenue two ways: One with the Inland Port incentives and one without. Both were modeled with the understanding the majority of the funding would go back to the community.
- When determining their benchmarks, the applicant included numbers regarding new jobs, fiscal and economic impact, and the economic gain using the latest modeling software.
- Job benefits include opportunities for high paying jobs such as software, mechanical, electrical, and power engineers averaging a salary of \$115,000 a year. Over 10 years, you are looking at \$581 million dollars of revenue to the community. Over 20 years, it is \$7 million.
- The construction impact would be \$2.3 billion in gross regional projects.
- Lastly, Scott thanked the Planning Commission and staff for their time and efforts made to the understanding their project.

Brett Hamilton stated that feedback and questions are still being accepted and may be submitted via email to him at [bhamilton@ironcountyut.gov](mailto:bhamilton@ironcountyut.gov).

## 7. COUNTY CODE AMENDMENT; Data Centers & Solar Power Plants – Discussion Item

Review possible code revisions and receive feedback from the Planning Commission regarding whether amendments to Chapter 17.33 and 17.37 should be prepared for future consideration. This item is for discussion only. No formal action will be taken at this meeting.

### Introduction:

Brett Hamilton shared possible discussion items to amend with the County Code regarding Data Centers and Solar Power Plants for future applicants, including:

- A review and possible update of the regulations and design standards.
- A review and possible update of the 13 provisions, including items A through M.
- Asking a third party to review the technical studies.
- Require the applicant to do public outreach prior to submitting an application so they can gather public feedback and tailor the application to the public concerns.
- Notify the applicant, prior to application submission, of their responsibility for road improvement to their site location.
- Notify the applicant, prior to application submission, whether or not to provide more information on emissions, geotechnical reports, storm water and drainage reports, fiscal impact analysis, and detailed designs.
- To address public lands (SITLA) being used for solar that is currently being used for cattle and how to mitigate those impacts.
- Creating the ordinance so that the Planning Commission can make educated decisions.

Brett asked if the Planning Commission would like to discuss these ordinance changes at a future meeting and the consensus was yes.

## 8. MINUTES... consider approval of minutes for the March 5, 2026 meeting.

**Motion:** Dennis Gray made a motion to approve the March 5, 2026 minutes.

**Second:** Seconded by Michelle Tullis

**Motion Passed:** (Voting: Erick Cox, aye; Jared Christensen, aye; Mike Platt, aye; Dennis Gray, aye; Michelle Tullis, aye; Roger Thomas, aye)

## 9. STAFF REPORTS...

### A. Building Department:

Terry Palmer thanked the commissioners for their time and thanked the public for coming.

Commissioner Gray thanked staff for all the information they provide to the Planning Commission

### B. County Attorney: No report given.

### C. County Planner: No report given

Jared Christensen shared that he is going to resign his position on the Planning Commission. He thanked the staff and Planning Commissioners for all their time and effort during the time he has been on the board.

## 10. ADJOURN

Chair Cox adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Minutes Approved April 2, 2026 by the Iron County Planning Commission

*Lisa Woolsey*

5/7/2026