

**Pleasant Grove City  
City Council Meeting Minutes  
Work Session  
March 29, 2022  
4:30 p.m.**

Mayor: Guy L. Fugal

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

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator  
Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director  
Deon Giles, Parks Director  
Tyler Wilkins, Recreation Director  
Tina Petersen, City Attorney  
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder  
Neal Winterton, Public Works Director  
Kyler Ludwig, HR Director  
Mike Roberts, Police Chief  
Denise Roy, Finance Director  
Drew Engemann, Fire Chief

Excused: Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director

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

---

**4:30 P.M. WORK SESSION**

Mayor Guy Fugal called the meeting to order and welcomed those present.

**a. Presentation to Marty Beaumont.**

Mayor Fugal recognized former Public Works Director, Marty Beaumont for his service to Pleasant Grove City over the past seven years. Mr. Beaumont also was presented with a plaque and two street signs named Beaumont Way. His entire family was also recognized.

**b. Introduction of New Employees.**

Recreation Director, Tyler Wilkins, introduced New Assistant Recreation Director, Shaun Whitaker, from Orem. Mr. Whitaker graduated from Utah Valley University (“UVU”) with a

degree in Recreation Management and has worked in the area for 10 years. He worked the last four years in Provo City Recreation. Mr. Whitaker resides in Orem with his wife and four children, aged seven to 16.

Public Works Director, Neal Winterton, introduced Engineering Inspector, Tim Boren, and Staff Engineer, Gary Thornton. Mr. Boren grew up in Provo and is married with two children, aged nine and five. Mr. Thornton was born and raised in Chico, California, and moved to Pleasant Grove last year. He received a B.S. in Civil Engineering in 2002 from the University of Nevada and worked for 3½ years at a private engineering firm in Reno, Nevada. He also worked for the City of Belknap as an Engineer.

Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, introduced Permit Technician, Paul Douglas, and City Planner, Jacob Hawkins. Mr. Douglas is from Orem and has a degree in Urban Planning. His experience has been in home design as well as reviewing and drafting building plans. Mr. Hawkins was born in Provo but has lived and worked in several other states. His last position was as a City Planner in Texas. His degree is in Community and Regional Planning.

**c. Update on General Plan Consultation.**

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, introduced General Plan Consultant, Sam Taylor, and reported that the Consultants will hold an Open House on Thursday, from 5:00 to 7:30 p.m. to get public input on the General Plan. Mr. Taylor is with Landmark Design, a landscape architecture and planning group that does a lot of General Plan work. Both he and his wife grew up in Pleasant Grove. He was pleased to be working with the City. He described a multi-faceted process that will be used to gather input from the community, staff, the City Council, and the Planning Commission and reflect the vision of Pleasant Grove. It will be a document that can be used as a guide when making policy.

Mr. Taylor reported that an Advisory Committee was established consisting of several members of the City Council, Planning Commission, business community, and Pleasant Grove residents. The group will meet every few months to provide the consultants with guidance and assurance that their interpretations and the direction of the General Plan are correct. Mr. Taylor stated that they will also have an online presence, including website tracking of the project and providing opportunities to receive public comments. Mr. Taylor reported that three public meetings will be held. The first was an Open House scheduled for the following Thursday. At this meeting, they will seek public input regarding the pros and cons of the City. With this feedback, Mr. Taylor stated that guiding principles for the plan will be formulated for the overarching framework.

A second meeting scheduled in May will involve the basic concepts and alternatives being considered and allow for public input. They were contemplating holding the meeting at the same time as Strawberry Days to increase participation. A third public meeting was scheduled for September where the final direction for the General Plan will be presented and input taken. The final recommended document will then be prepared and reviewed by the Planning Commission before submission to the City Council for formal adoption. There will be an ongoing opportunity for the public to get involved through social media platforms and widespread notice. He hoped to involve the City Council in the process.

Council Member LeMone inquired about the role of the Advisory Committee going forward. Mr. Taylor stated that the Committee will help guide the Consultants. Advisory Committee Meetings will likely be held after public meetings. He anticipated the draft General Plan to be completed by early October.

**d. Discussion on Public Works, Storm Drain, and Cemetery.**

Administrator Darrington reported that staff prepared a Recommended Funding Options Plan to address the following major projects:

- The purchase of property for and the construction of a new Public Works Facility;
- Construction of a Storm Drain Basin on the Pipe Plant Property;
- Installation of a pipe to the lake;
- Road improvements for the Pipe Plant; and
- Expansion of the Cemetery.

Administrator Darrington acknowledged that feedback was received from the City Council on the aforementioned projects. The anticipated cost was \$40 million. While the work needs to be done, it does not need to be done all at once. He identified the following five options being presented by staff for the Council's consideration:

1. Project 1 includes demo and road improvements on the Pipe Plant Property. The work would include clearing the property, installing street improvements such as curb, gutter, and sidewalk, and upgrading the road surrounding the Pipe Plant. The work could be piecemealed. For example, if it was determined that the Storm Drain Basin needs to be constructed, improvements related to the project could be completed but not at the same time as the remaining property improvements. He recommended the property be cleaned up as soon as possible and the street improvements completed. Because most of the street improvements are tied to the park development and the park project is still ongoing, the timing was uncertain. If the work was done this summer they would need to determine where to relocate the equipment currently being stored on site. One option was to tear down most of the buildings but leave a few buildings intact where the items could be stored until the Public Works Facility is completed.
2. Project 2 included the 2000 West Channel to the lake (pipe to the lake). The cost was estimated at \$6 million. \$4.5 million was in the form of federal funds that were set aside. The remaining \$1.5 million was needed to fund the project. Administrator Darrington reported that the project must be funded this year. He reported that when there is excess water it flows to The Grove area and onto the old atrium property and collects there. If the area were developed in the next few years, the excess water flow would need to cease. He reported that the culvert under I-15 had been installed.

Council Member Williams stated that in recent Pipe Plant planning, there was discussion about keeping the water on the Pipe Plant property. He wondered if keeping water on the property requires a change in pipe size. Administrator Darrington stated that the issue had been resolved some time ago. The storm drain basin will retain water and the additional water diverted via the pipe to the lake were identified as the means to control the water flow. He noted that the 54-inch culvert under I-15 was installed 10 years ago as part of that plan and there was no change in pipe size.

3. Project 3 involved the purchase of property for the Public Works Facility. The specific property they were considering was under contract with another purchaser. The sale was expected to close the following week making it no longer available. He reported that a donor was willing to fund the purchase of the property. He and Mayor Fugal planned to meet the following day with the prospective donor to discuss whether there is a willingness to fund it this year. Administrator Darrington stated that the property for the Public Works Facility, as well as the property needed for Project 2, should be secured as soon as possible. He noted that for Project 3 the City would carry the bond with the funding coming from the donor. Staff would check with the donor to determine if there was any objection to delaying construction of the Public Works Facility after the property purchase.
4. Project 4 involved construction of the storm drain basin. Administrator Darrington reported that there was a new concept plan for the park that incorporated the storm drain basin. Engineering needs to review the plans and what the Landscape Architect was proposing for the storm drain. The anticipated cost was \$5 million. He noted that the Park and Storm Drain Basin Construction Projects could be done separately if one of the projects was delayed.
5. Project 5 included the Cemetery Expansion. Administrator Darrington noted that there is a five-year window in the need for additional cemetery plots, making this project more easily delayed. He suggested getting the funding in place and then moving forward. Such action was expected to take a couple of years.
6. Project 6 involved construction of the Public Works Facility, which would require the largest bond.

Administrator Darrington next reviewed each of the five options recommended by staff. The intent was not to make a decision today but provide ideas to consider.

Option #1: Complete Projects 1 (road improvements), 2 (pipe to the lake), and 3 (purchase property for Public Works facility). The bond total was \$9.7 million. Debt service would be \$686,000 with the General Fund portion of the debt service being \$176,000. The donor was expected to pay \$367,000 for the property. The storm drain basin with pipe to the lake would be \$142,000 with annual payments. The asterisk on the General Fund portion identified funding from other categories. The Cemetery Fund would be required to contribute \$46,931, which would be its share if the roads were fully improved. The General Fund amount would be \$130,000. The

Storm Drain Fund would also contribute a 5.6% increase to this option. The cost to the public to fund the project would be an additional \$0.89 per month.

Option # 2: Complete the same three Projects and add Project 5 (the Cemetery Expansion). The bond in this instance would be \$11.5 million. The General Fund portion would be \$303,000 of which \$75,000 would come from the Cemetery and \$228,000 from other General Fund monies. The storm drain increase would be \$0.89 per month per residence.

Option #3: Administrator Darrington reported that this option would include Projects 2 (pipe to the lake), 3 (purchase property for Public Works facility), and 4 (storm drain basin). There were no General Fund contributions as everything would be run through an Enterprise Fund. The storm drain portion would be \$701,000, which would increase to \$4.39 per month per residence.

Option # 4: Complete Projects 1 through 4. The bond would be \$17.5 million. The General Fund portion would be \$98,524. The Storm Drain Fee increase of 27.7% would equate to an additional \$4.39 per month per residence.

Option # 5: Complete Project 2 (pipe to the lake), 3 (purchase property for Public Works facility), and 6 (construction of the Public Works Facility). The bond in this scenario would be \$24 million. The General Fund portion would be \$410,000. The Storm Drain Fund would be \$311,000. Also impacted would be culinary and secondary water funding. The resulting utility bill increase would be \$2.94 per month per residence.

Administrator Darrington reported that there were additional options available as well. He noted that they initially budgeted \$750,000 from the General Fund when working on funding the total \$40 million cost of all projects. It was unlikely that they would spend the entire amount. \$350,000 was moved from the General Fund to roads. He suggested that money be kept with roads as unallocated. The \$75,000 yearly budget amount from the Cemetery could be designated as unallocated. That left approximately \$300,000 unallocated.

Council Member Williams asked about the impact of not doing the storm drain basin and pipe to the lake. Administrator Darrington stated that the water that normally collects on the atrium property would be diverted to the lake by way of the pipe. He stated that it is critical to get the water to the lake. He noted that the Pipe Plant Storm Drain Basin itself is not critical and could be delayed. They need to decide if they want to develop the parking at the same time, as there was an issue of timing. With the park funding, it would take time for the landscaping to be completed. If the donor is willing to fund the property now, then they would not have to bond for the park. He also reported that they had not yet had discussions with the donor and there were outstanding questions. Administrator Darrington's preference was that no vote be taken and that the Council take time to review all of the documents and consider the options. Donor, park, and property information would be provided at the next meeting.

Council Member Williams was interested in seeing an option addressing Projects 1, 2, 3, and 4. Administrator Darrington stated that the Council should review all of the materials available, which would be presented again at the next meeting.

**e. Discussion on FY 2023 Budget.**

Administrator Darrington provided the Council with two different budget pages for review. One referenced a base raise of 5% for all employees. The other identified an 8% base raise. The first page was presented a few weeks ago and included a 5% raise for each employee, which equated to \$525,000 from the General Fund. He noted that the bottom portion of the page referenced property taxes. Staff recommended holding the rate. By holding the rate, because of upward pressure of the market rates of larger cities, they would need an additional 3% raise for public safety officers, particularly for police retention for a total of 8%. The issue was not fully resolved. Administrator Darrington stated that they hoped to get advice on these issues. If a greater salary increase was required for public safety personnel beyond the 8%, a recommendation may need to be revisited.

Since the last meeting, Administrator Darrington reported that \$150,000 was built into the budget to go toward the bond payment for the Hale Center Theater. The structure of that bond requires no payment for the first two years, which results in receiving revenue before any bond payment is due. That payment structure means that the \$150,000 was not needed this year or next. The money would need to be accounted for in three years but could be used elsewhere in the interim. He commented on the status of identified additional allocated and unallocated funds and noted that last year they were \$200,000 out of balance. With the extra \$150,000, and by going through some personnel and benefit costs, they were able to reduce the General Fund deficit to \$9,700 unallocated. They could explore options considering the \$750,000 budgeted for major projects, including salaries and budgeted items.

Administrator Darrington addressed the budget page reflecting an 8% raise and acknowledged that he had concerns. He spoke with representatives from American Fork who informed him that they plan to recommend an 8% raise for all of their employees. He stated that if Pleasant Grove gave an 8% raise and all other similar cities gave an 8% raise, that would still leave them about \$1.50 lower in salaries. They sent out another salary survey regarding wages, which was to be returned by April 12. That information was to be provided at the next meeting.

Administrator Darrington reported that the second budget page proposed an 8% base raise with an additional 3% for public safety officers for a total of an 11% raise. This action would put them more than \$300,000 out of balance. He stated that they could potentially make up that difference but did not have enough information to be definitive. He wanted to make sure the Council was aware of the issue. In his experience, he had never seen an across-the-board 11 or 12 percent raise. Such numbers were unprecedented and concerning.

A Tentative Budget was to be adopted at the May 3 meeting and published for public comment. The final budget was to be adopted at the second meeting in June. If they do not adopt a budget and go through the Truth in Taxation process, they would need to announce that intent and would adopt the budget in October.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the Supplemental Summaries and referenced one previous change regarding an ambulance. Originally, the cost of the ambulance was estimated at \$320,000 and included the heart monitor. That increased to \$350,000 and a heart monitor is now \$30,000

additional. As a result, the heart monitor purchase was put in the unfunded portion of the capital expense. He invited feedback from the Council. There was discussion about whether to delay the purchase of the ambulance by one year and other potential alternatives. Deputy Fire Chief, Drew Engemann, stated that the equipment is aging with two older ambulances and boxes that are 18 to 20 years old. He stated that the Department could go one more year without a new ambulance but would incur maintenance costs. He acknowledged that there are staffing issues pertaining to running the ambulances. There was discussion regarding the pros and cons of purchasing an ambulance this year and completing other projects such as work at the cemetery. A question was raised as to whether the ambulance could be ordered this year but funded next year. After further discussion, Administrator Darrington confirmed that the consensus was that the cemetery sprinkler system be done this year and the ambulance delayed one year.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the second page of the Supplemental Summaries which showed capital-unfunded, operational-proposed, and operational-unfunded categories. He identified the remaining unfunded potential hires and stated that if additional money becomes available they could fund another police officer, a cemetery worker, and a recreation worker. He also noted that the heart monitor is now in the operational-unfunded category.

**f. Staff Business.**

**MOTION:** Council Member Williams moved to ADJOURN the Work Session at 5:37 p.m. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Bullock, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting “Aye”.

The City Council minutes of March 29, 2022, were approved by the City Council on May 3, 2022.



Kathy T. Kresser, MMC

City Recorder

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

