

**Pleasant Grove City  
City Council Meeting Minutes  
Work Session  
June 7, 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  
Deon Giles, Parks Director  
Kathy Kresser, City Recorder  
Neal Winterton, Public Works Director  
Kyler Ludwig, Human Resources Director  
Mike Roberts, Police Chief  
Drew Engemann, Fire Chief  
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director  
Aaron Wilson, City Engineer

Excused: Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director  
Tina Petersen, City Attorney  
Denise Roy, Finance 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 at 4:30 p.m. and welcomed those present.

**a. Glen Haynie Design Review Board Update.**

Design Review Board Chair, Glen Haynie, reported that the Board, which does not meet very often, includes the following: Architect, Kevin Haub (reviews projects); Engineer, Olani Durrant; Drew Armstrong (reviews documentation and Code application), and Kevin Heiner. He noted that things were going well but they occasionally wrestle with Code sections, wishing they were different, and ask questions to get a better vision for the City. He stated that they interface with Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, and share their visions. He noted that they

have concerns about parking issues. He asked the Council to let them know if they identify any issues.

Council Member LeMone suggested that all Design Review Board Members meet with the Council or its members to discuss how the Council can best assist the Board. She also thought it was important for Design Review Board to bring their questions or concerns regarding the Code to the Council to help identify important or outdated issues. Chair Haynie stated that they struggle to get a quorum as all of the members have other obligations. He agreed to inform the Council of their next meeting in the event they wish to attend. He suggested that the Board membership and length of service be explored to determine if any changes or rotations were needed. He suggested that the scope of the membership and involvement regarding developments be expanded.

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, clarified that the Design Review Board acts after the official plans are submitted and presents engineered plans. They address the design only to ensure that the request meets the Code before going on to the Planning Commission for consideration. The Design Review Committee is composed of City staff who conducts a preliminary review of project concept plans. Mayor Fugal expected them to get busier with development taking place on Main Street and throughout the City.

**b. Cemetery Fees Discussion.**

Administrator Darrington distributed a handout on Cemetery Fees and reported that they recently completed a few hundred plots on the west side. This resulted in a two-to-four-year supply of plots before the City runs out of space. They developed a Master Plan to expand the Cemetery space into the Pipe Plant area. In response to a request to explore cemetery pricing for residents and non-residents, Administrator Darrington explained that the "big ticket" item was the actual cost of the plot. The handout provided the results of a staff survey of 10 different cities including Pleasant Grove that showed resident and non-resident rates from most to least costly resident rates.

Administrator Darrington reported that both Provo and American Fork charge the same plot rate for residents and non-residents but other cities differentiated those fees. For Pleasant Grove, the current plot charge is \$1,000 for residents and \$2,000 for non-residents. He noted that excluding Pleasant Grove, the average cost for residents in the nine other cities was \$1,114, making Pleasant Grove's fees for residents slightly under the average. The non-resident rate for Pleasant Grove, however, was higher than the average rate for the nine cities at just under \$1,500. Pleasant Grove had the highest rate for non-residents with the exception of Springville, and charge \$2,400 for a plot with an upright marker. With regard to double deep plots, Administrator Darrington noted that they charge for the first casket was higher. Half of the cities that offer double deep plots had an average cost of \$750 for the first casket. Pleasant Grove charges \$1,700 for residents and \$2,300 for non-residents, making Pleasant Gove the highest cost on the survey. The disinterment fee was also the highest rate in Pleasant Grove. With respect to opening and closing fees, Pleasant Grove was on the high side. For cremation costs, Pleasant Grove was in the middle range. Administrator Darrington reported that four cremation placements per plot are allowed, which is difficult in terms of record keeping. The charge was \$1,000 for the plot in addition to charges for openings and closings. Disinterment for cremations, headstone fees, and weekend, holiday, and

hourly rate fees were listed on the handout. He noted that if the Cemetery were expanded there could be different charges for different sections.

There was a brief discussion of future recommendations regarding flat headstone costs versus upright headstones, which need to be separated for utility purposes. The comment was made that because Pleasant Grove allows upright headstones, the City has been receiving an increasing number of inquiries from places that do not allow them such as Orem City. Administrator Darrington stated that staff had not proposed any fee changes. He asked that the Council inform him if a rate increase was desired. He pointed out that rate increases would go into effect with the budget in August and would require a public hearing. There was discussion regarding transfers and rights.

There was a general discussion regarding residency policies and identifying who qualifies as residents and former residents. Council Member Williams suggested that they look at a policy regarding residency. Administrator Darrington acknowledged that it is a complicated issue that involves multiple factors. As a result, some communities have moved away from differentiating between the two. Council Member LeMone asked what other cities are doing in that regard and wanted the policy to give the advantage to residents. Administrator Darrington stated that staff would look into the policies on residency.

Mayor Fugal asked when plot sales would be opening for the north area. It was noted that some water irrigation lines need to be moved and some other issues finalized before offering them for sale.

c. **Discussion on Pipe Plant Property.**

Administrator Darrington distributed a handout and stated that Plan A, which involved consideration of the purchase of additional property, was no longer being considered. Plan B was proposed by staff to the Council regarding projects needing to be completed. He reported that Plan B involved the following:

1. Demolition of the Pipe Plant Property and road improvements. Some costs would be split with the Parks and Cemetery picking up a portion of those costs.
2. The storm drain basin is to be constructed at a cost of \$7.5 million, including demolition and road improvements.
3. The Pipe to the Lake (2000 West channel) at a cost of \$7.5 million, with \$4.5 million set aside from the Federal Government Fund and \$3 million from the General Fund.
4. A park, with a donor offering of \$5 million to be paid over time per Bond payments and a City portion of \$3 million for items not covered by the donor.

Administrator Darrington noted that the handout also listed each of the projects that would not currently be done including the Cemetery Project Extension at a cost of \$2 million, the Public

Works Building, and the Storm Drain Basin piping in the ground surrounding the property at a cost of \$3 million. He described the details of the Cemetery Expansion Project and noted that in the interim until the plots are needed, the area could be used as ball fields. He also reported that the upper portion of the Cemetery Project will be a park. As a result, the Cemetery Project would have two different components consisting of a park and an area for plots.

Administrator Darrington reported that other City financing needs that are not covered include secondary water meters, which would be done next year assuming the project is approved and the City is awarded the grant. The entire project cost totaled \$11 million, with the State funding 70%. The City's cost was \$4 million.

Administrator Darrington stated that if the Council is uncomfortable funding \$21.5 million, they would need to reduce the number of projects to be completed. If, however, they were comfortable with that amount, staff was prepared to begin the process of obtaining funding. He pointed out that the General Fund portions need to be accounted for in the budget.

With regard to costs to the residents, Administrator Darrington indicated that property taxes would not need to be increased but the storm drain rates would need to be increased by 27% (\$4.59/month) based on the cost related to the storm drain projects. The \$4 million loan for the secondary water meters at a 1% interest rate, would have a yearly cost of \$221,000, which would result in a water charge increase of \$2.70 per month beginning next year. Council Member Bullock commented that if they go with both the \$21.5 million plan and the secondary water meters mandated by the State, the costs to residents will increase by \$7.29 per month. (\$4.59 for the storm drain projects and \$2.70 for the secondary water meters).

Council Member LeMone asked if the donor had committed to the donation in writing. Administrator Darrington responded that the donor was committed to the park and agreed to the written commitment but it had not yet happened. Council Member LeMone preferred that the donor money not be considered until there is an agreement in writing.

Because prices and inflation have risen dramatically, Council Member Williams was not comfortable asking residents to pay \$7.29 in this period of high inflation. He suggested that projects be pared down. Council Member Jensen commented that if they hold off on the cost of the secondary water project, the State will cover less of the bill and the costs to both the City and the residents would only increase. Administrator Darrington reminded the Council that two of the projects need to be completed specifically the Pipe to the Lake and the secondary water meters. Council Member Andersen pointed out that the \$2.79 fee would not go into effect this year and she did not object to completing the projects as they are needed. They also will improve the quality of life within the community. Council Member LeMone asked about the actual resident cost total. Council Member Williams responded that the additional \$2.70 is a mandated cost that needs to be considered. There was discussion regarding when the fees would go into effect.

With respect to the \$7.5 million storm drain retention basis, Mayor Fugal asked what advantage there would be to doing the project now versus holding off. Public Works Director, Neal Winterton, stated that the retention basin is an integral part of the overall stormwater system and plays a vital role in moving water through the system and eventually to the St. John's property.

He further noted that construction of the retention basin would make a lot of earth available for fill for the splash pad and the playground. He stated that the intent was to balance the site, spread dirt across the total site and integrate it considering all of the potential uses within the design. He commented that having a general concept and design that includes the earthwork and creating playing fields and open space was a great asset to the community. Mayor Fugal stated that they would waste a lot of money waiting to move the dirt at an additional cost. It was noted that moving dirt is mandatory. In response to a question raised by Council Member Bullock, it was noted that the elevation difference between 600 West and the Cemetery was 25 feet.

Council Member Williams asked if the \$7.5 million Storm Drain Retention Basin cost was tied to the donor money. Administrator Darrington stated that the money was tied together as \$3 million came from the General Fund and \$5 million from the donor. A portion of the work involved moving earth to prepare future sites. Council Member LeMone stated that they cannot rely on donor money until it is promised in writing.

Administrator Darrington described the timing of the process the City goes through to get the bonding. The process begins with a parameters resolution, which if the dollar amount were agreed upon, would be presented in July. By the time an agreement is signed, it would take approximately six weeks to physically borrow the money. If the Council preferred to wait until the donor's agreement is in writing to initiate the process they could do so, however, it would change the timing by a few weeks. The resolution indicates an intent to borrow a certain amount of money, but generally, the full amount is not borrowed at once. Although the full amount of the project would be covered in the resolution, the City would not borrow what is covered by the donor. Therefore, if the donation fell through, the City would have the ability to provide notice in time to avoid borrowing the money. He pointed out that the donor seemed amenable to putting his agreement into writing. Administrator Darrington needed a number specifying the amount Council was willing to borrow. Once that figure is provided, the process of bonding can begin.

Council Member Williams asked if what they were doing was the most efficient way to complete the projects without borrowing \$21.5 million and adding a \$5.00 charge to the residents. Administrator Darrington stated that the City does not have \$3 million that is unencumbered. He pointed out that the benefit of bonding to a community is that the cost is paid over-time, which means that for the next 10 years new residents will help pay for the projects. During the time the Council had been discussing the projects, interest rates have increased from 1 to 3.5 percent and costs have increased. He pointed out that they are considering a 25-year rate. If rates go down, they can refinance. There was general discussion on the costs of loans.

With regard to the storm drain portion of the rate increase of 26.96%, Administrator Darrington stated that it is a fee related to the storm drain component. The current fee is approximately \$13, to which the \$4.59 increase would be added. Staff recommended a yearly increase of around 5% for the utility rates to keep up with rising costs.

Mayor Fugal suggested that an informal poll be taken regarding the direction to be pursued by the Council with regard to borrowing \$21.5 million for the projects. Council Member Williams was opposed to the increased fee for residents and requested a breakdown of ways to piecemeal projects. Council Members Jensen and Bullock were in favor of borrowing the suggested amount.

Council Member LeMone desired more information on the \$1.8 Pipe Plant Project including the specific work to be done. She also requested a letter from the donor regarding his donation. Administrator Darrington agreed to check with the financial advisor and would get the paperwork started.

**d. Staff Business.**

There was no staff business.

**Adjournment.**

**MOTION:** Council Member Jensen moved to ADJOURN the Work Session at 5:34 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 June 7, 2022, were approved by the City Council on July 5, 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Kathy T. Kresser, MMC  
City Recorder

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

