

**Pleasant Grove City  
City Council Special Meeting Minutes  
January 24, 2022  
4:30 p.m.**

Mayor: Guy L. Fugal (joined the meeting at 4:45 p.m.)

Council Members: Dianna Andersen  
Brent Bullock  
Eric Jensen  
Cyd LeMone  
Todd Williams

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator  
Tina Petersen, City Attorney  
Marty Beaumont, Public Works Director  
Kylar Ludwig, HR Director  
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder

The City Council and staff met in the Community Room, 108 South 100 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah.

---

**1) CALL TO ORDER**

In the absence of Mayor Guy Fugal, Mayor Pro Tempore Brent Bullock called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. Mayor Fugal joined the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

**2) DISCUSSION ON PUBLIC WORKS POSITION.**

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, announced they would be covering the content of the job description and timeline of events pertaining to the position of Public Works Director. The job description was to be prepared and posted the following day by 2:00 or 3:00 p.m. He recommended that the application process remain open for three weeks with all applications due by February 16, 2022. The initial review of applications would occur on February 17, 2022, and the first round of interviews would be set for February 24, 2022. Council Members would interview the applicants on March 1, 2022, with the position to start April 1, 2022.

Council Member Jensen asked if three weeks was the normal timeframe allowed for executive positions. Administrator Darrington reported that four weeks is the normal period for executive positions. He would not recommend less than three weeks. He wanted to make sure there is a robust response to the job advertisement, and he preferred to have an Interim Director for one month, versus eliminating steps in the process. The longer the job is posted, the greater the opportunity will be to get better responses.

Council Member Williams stated that he hires by posting job notices when hiring people but in addition, he usually has five to seven people he wants to contact. He asked, in addition to the job posting, what the City is doing to search for qualified candidates. Administrator Darrington responded that they have a list and Public Works Director, Marty Beaumont has made suggestions in that regard. Council Member Williams also thought the process could be shortened. He did not want this to be a three-month process and preferred it be less than three weeks so the new person can work with Director Beaumont before he leaves. Administrator Darrington stated that the process, as currently set, has a two-month and one-week timeframe. He did not think it could be done any faster, as the person who is selected will need adequate time to give proper notice.

Council Member LeMone commented on the length of time and asked about obtaining more information regarding an Interim Director. Administrator Darrington stated that they need to first discuss the timeline.

Human Resources Director, Kyler Ludwig, was asked to address how the job listing will be circulated. He explained that the job posting will be sent to 20 to 25 different job sites. Additionally, there was discussion about listing it with the Utah Engineers Association and the American Public Works Association (“APWA”), both of which are the primary posting sites for these types of positions. Another posting site is through the Utah League of Cities and Towns (“ULCT”). They will also be calling qualified individuals to invite them to apply, which is common practice for high-level positions.

Council Member Andersen asked who will be reviewing and screening the applications received. Director Ludwig reported that they will be screened by Administrator Darrington, City Attorney Tina Petersen, himself, and staff members. The Council can also be involved but warned that it could slow down the process. He expected the screening to take one day. They will narrow the field down to about 10 candidates who will be initially interviewed by staff, the Mayor, and a few City Council Members. From that group, three to four candidates will be interviewed by the full City Council on March 1, 2022. A job offer will be extended on March 2, 2022, with a start date of April 1, 2022

Council Member LeMone asked if the interview process, which looks to be about two weeks, could be shortened. Director Ludwig stated that a one-week period for noticing the interviews was allowed so the applicants can arrange time off from work. Some applicants may require travel time from out of state. The time frame can be further revised as the process continues. If no decision can be made following the March 1 interviews, another round of interviews will be set. It was noted that the Public Works Department will not fall apart if Director Beaumont is no longer there. Mayor Fugal stated that the recommended timeline appears to be adequate. If a way to reduce it becomes evident, that step could be taken.

Council Member Williams stated that it would not be appropriate to discuss candidates in this forum, but he would like to understand what potential candidates are being considered and what options are available to enhance acceptance. Council Member LeMone responded that it would depend on the job description. That discussion could be held at another time when Director Beaumont is present. Council Member Andersen was not interested in speeding up the process and wanted to make sure it is done properly.

Mayor Fugal remarked that it is not often that they can make this kind of appointment, and he wanted to be very comfortable with the process. It was agreed that the suggested timeline was to be used. If it could be shortened at any point, that could occur. The discussion then turned to focus on the components of the job description.

Administrator Darrington stated that at the time Director Beaumont was hired as the Public Works Director, the City Engineer was Degen Lewis. When he left, Director Beaumont assumed both positions with the understanding that they would build the Engineering Department. Once that was done, Director Beaumont's concentration would turn back to managing Public Works. The process was not as easy as anticipated. Director Beaumont instead picked up the slack in the Engineering Department to the detriment of the Public Works Department.

Administrator Darrington reported that they have two routes to advertise for the Public Works Director. The route did not have to be fully decided at this meeting. First, they could create a list of broad qualifications to get a diverse background of qualified applicants. The Council would then have more options to select the person they feel is best qualified for the job. The position being filled is for Public Works so it was thought they would not seek an engineer but someone with experience in Public Works. The description, however, would specify experience working with engineers and knowing that their requisite terminology would be of benefit. It would also be helpful for the candidate to have experience as a Public Works Director or Assistant Director. It was believed that such experience would be ideal and provide applicants with an understanding of projects and familiarity with engineering language. The advantage to this approach would be to provide more focus on Public Works and less on engineering. The downside is that Director Beaumont filled in a lot of gaps in engineering. Those gaps would need to be filled by either making sure engineering staff is highly qualified or they would need to increase the use of outside consultants for department projects.

The second option would be to ask for a person who is well versed in engineering but not necessarily a Licensed Engineer. Ideally, Administrator Darrington would like the job description to attract both types of applicants so that after the interview process, the Council could select the person whose skills best fit the job. There were to be discussions between Director Beaumont, Director Ludwig, and Administrator Darrington about the wording of the job description, however, he wanted Council input on their vision of the Department head.

The question was raised as to whether two positions could be funded. Administrator Darrington asked Director Beaumont if he thought Public Works needed four engineers if the person hired has primarily a public works background. He noted that the reality of the situation is that they are currently having difficulty hiring a third engineer. It has been difficult to fill engineering positions because of the tight market. He described the staff turnaround and unsuccessful rounds of hiring. The salary range for a staff engineer is currently \$70,000 to \$90,000. They are looking for candidates who have several years of experience.

Director Beaumont stated that if they had three strong engineers, the Public Works Director would be freed up to focus on Public Works. The challenge of finding and retaining engineers had been an ongoing issue. Consultants could also be considered, which will increase the cost.

Council Member Williams asked what the staffing needs would be to rebuild exemplary Public Works and Community Development Departments. Administrator Darrington stated that the Community Development and Public Works Departments are different. Council Member Williams acknowledged that but indicated that engineering is utilized in the Community Development Department's work.

Director Beaumont stated that he has always felt that the City needs more engineering-minded people. His opinion was that they should hire a Public Works Director who is strong in Public Works projects and competent in management coupled with a strong engineering staff of three, who are trained, competent, and knowledgeable in their jobs. This would provide relief for the incoming Public Works Director who could then concentrate on running the Department. If the Public Works Director does not have a lot of engineering expertise, the third person in the Engineering Department needs to be able to take over the types of issues Director Beaumont faces. It was stressed that it is helpful for the Public Works Director to have an engineering background.

The open position for the third staff engineer was discussed with regard to compensation. If money is the issue in retaining strong engineers, a higher salary range should be considered for current the engineering position. Once hired, the current engineers should get a pay increase. Director Beaumont noted that the two staff engineers work hard and do an excellent job. A pay increase would do a lot for morale. Consistency of staff relieves pressure on the Director. Staff turnover has also been an issue for the engineers. The Interns in the department, are still in school and are not qualified to fill a full-time position.

Director Beaumont was optimistic that they will be able to hire a third engineer. They are looking for someone with experience and who is prepared to pay a higher salary. It was noted that it would be helpful to bring someone on board who is knowledgeable and competent in the use of Geographic Information Systems ("GIS") and Computer-Aided Design ("CAD").

Council Members Andersen and LeMone preferred a job description that aligns with Option One which is Public Works heavy as recommended by Administrator Darrington. Salary issues for the Public Works Director were discussed.

When discussing the role of the Engineer in the Community Development Department, Director Beaumont stated that to decrease burnout, the engineers are assigned 75% of their work in engineering and 25% in Community Development. Administrator Darrington stated that they will seek a Public Works Director with a B.S. degree. It would be preferable if the candidate has a secondary interest in engineering.

**MOTION:** At 5:45 p.m., Council Member Bullock moved to CLOSE THE SPECIAL MEETING AND GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION to discuss the character, professional competence, or physical or mental health of an individual (UCA 52-4-205 (1)(2)). Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Anderson, Bullock, Jensen, LeMone, and William voting "Aye."

The City Council was in Executive Session from 5:45 p.m. to 7:20 p.m.

**MOTION:** Council Member Bullock moved to COME OUT OF THE CLOSED MEETING at 7:20 p.m. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Anderson, Bullock, Jensen, LeMone, and William voting “Aye.”

3) **ADJOURN.**

**MOTION:** Council Member Jensen moved to ADJOURN the meeting at 7:22 p.m. Council Member Bullock seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Bullock, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting “Aye”.

The City Council minutes of January 24, 2022, were approved by the City Council on February 15, 2022.



Kathy T. Kresser, MMC

City Recorder

*(Exhibits are in the City Council Minutes binders in the Recorder's office.)*

