

PROPOSITION # 3

Shall Pleasant Grove City enact an ordinance requiring the transfer every year of TWO MILLION SIX HUNDRED TWENTY FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$2,625,000.00) from the General Fund to fund road repair and maintenance as the primary budget priority? Road repair and maintenance would be funded before other general fund services which include: library, parks, swimming pool, cultural arts, and senior citizen services. FY 2017 General Fund Budget is \$12,581,333.00, the required transfer represents a 20.86% budget reduction for general fund services without additional funding. The ordinance states services other than roads could be funded by pursuing tax increases or other means.

For

Against

A full text version of the Ordinance can be obtained at the Pleasant Grove City Office, or by calling the City Recorder at 801-922-4528.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION #3:

Prioritize Roads and Stop Kicking the Can

For years, residents of Pleasant Grove City have been the victims of a chain of broken promises by our city council: we were promised a recreation center with an indoor pool, unlimited secondary water with no price increase, a public safety building that would not exceed \$11M of taxpayer dollars, and that economic development would fund our roads.

Year after year, the majority of our city council broke every one of those promises, and we have been left with staggering tax increases, utility bills that constantly increase and exceed neighboring communities, and our city roads are embarrassing. Our historic buildings are demolished without regard for heritage, proper procedures, economic value or more cost effective alternatives.

People who want accountability and wise management of citizen resources are attacked and abused online and in public meetings, vilified and criticized at every turn for trying to make our community better, stronger, and more professional. Thanks to the courage and engagement of thousands of registered voters in Pleasant Grove, and residents willing to offer a solution to a critical need, when the elected body kept kicking the can and ignoring public outcry, we have an opportunity to vote for action instead of more empty and false promises.

Every attack against addressing a real need with a modest and moderate approach is an outright lie. Here are ten reasons you should vote YES and ask that Roads be given a meaningful place in the city budget:

- On February 28, 2017, the majority of the council was not willing to put one cent of new money toward roads! See: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OGPhuq3C_IQ
- Prop 3 is flexible and adaptable, yet brings us to the \$3.8M minimum necessary to prevent further deterioration of our roads.
- Prop 3 protects the role of the elected body to implement any solution they want.

- Prop 3 ensures something finally gets done for roads.
- Roads get more expensive every day they are neglected (costs increase \$6,340 per day they are underfunded) -- the greatest risk to the city services is to ignore our rising infrastructure costs until they consume our entire budget.
- Action is better than the many years of inaction and grossly insufficient action we have seen.
- Budgeting and prioritizing by minimally funding critical needs is essential. A city's highest priorities should be the health and safety of its citizens, which includes roads.
- Road repairs and basic maintenance has been the highest priority and request of the public on the city's own surveys.
- All the evidence shows the majority of the council has no intention of minimally maintaining roads. This can be seen in lack of funding and refusals to have roads discussions. See June 20, 2017 Council Meeting
- The city has provided no other option!

"It's not because things are difficult that we dare not venture. It's because we dare not venture that they are difficult." – Seneca

VOTE YES ON PROP 3

Jacob Zonts
Nathan Stoker
Blaine Thatcher
Karl Kuhni
Wendy Morgan

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION #3:

Proposition 3 is an untested, irresponsible, permanent, and extreme proposal. It would require \$2.6 million—nearly 20%—of the city's General Fund budget to be transferred to a road fund every single year. A 20% cut would be devastating to Pleasant Grove's already tight budget. Our General Fund is one of the smallest per capita in the state and is less than half of Lindon's or American Fork's. What's more, Proposition 3 is a fundamentally flawed law riddled with holes.

Proposition 3 is bad for our city because of its hidden costs. By design it prioritizes one essential service—roads—over all other city needs, including vital services like public safety and other infrastructure. Hyper-funding roads without increasing fees for utilities could lead to new pavement over old, weak pipes. Consequently, utility repairs could damage new roads. Proposition 3 also forbids its funds from paying for administration expenses, shifting those costs elsewhere.

Proposition 3 is bad for our city because it was hastily written and poorly thought out. Laws drafted by the City Council go through a rigorous approval process. Proposition 3, however, had no transparency, no deliberation, no public hearings, and no input from city experts. One example of its shortcomings is that it ignores road construction timeframes. Proposition 3 requires that all money be spent during the City's fiscal year, which begins July 1—the middle of construction season. This makes funding summer-long projects a budgeting nightmare. It also doesn't allow the city to save year-to-year for larger projects or spend money in the most efficient way. Fixing roads is crucial, but Proposition 3 is an unwise way to do it.

Proposition 3 is bad for our city because siphoning 20% of our General Fund creates a budget deficit that could be filled only by raising taxes or cutting services. The services most at risk are the library, pool, recreation programs, senior citizens' center, and city arts and celebration programs. Only a household property tax increase of about \$18 per month could fill the financial hole left by Proposition 3 and maintain city services at their current level. Pleasant Grove's daily operations and services are threatened by an untested plan that will, at best, only gradually improve our roads over 20 years.

Fortunately, there is a prudent, sustainable way to fix roads. The City Council has studied funding roads through a combination of a transportation utility fee and sales tax revenue, which is growing rapidly due to economic development. Businesses generating the most road use would pay their fair share through a road fee, allowing households to only pay about \$5 monthly for every million dollars raised. Additionally, a road fee is flexible; as sales tax revenue continues to increase the road fee can be reduced.

There are better ways to fund roads. Vote against Proposition 3.

(For more information and supporting data, visit www.fixPGroads.com.)

Todd Fugal
Tamara Oborn
Dani Rowan
Heather Pack
Hillary Stirling

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION #3

FIX OUR ROADS – NO NEW TAXES

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 3

The city has known for at least 5 years about the massive levels of underfunding regarding our roads. We have watched wants take precedence over our needs, the city has become further divided: city employees feel unappreciated, citizens on fixed income wonder where their tax dollars go, and citizens are unaware of what is happening in the city.

In response to Proposition 3 the city has:

- NOT looked at city finances
- Turned to fearmongering
- Vilified citizens
- Claimed \$3.8M is “hyper-funding” (when in fact it is the bare minimum needed to keep our roads from getting WORSE)
- Refused to acknowledge that their own plan of \$5/month only gets us to \$1M (you do the math)
- Refused to acknowledge that no city services were shut down during the recession, so why would they now?

The extreme approach of four-fifths of the city council has damaged our community. The city has tried their way the last six years, golfing on our tax dollars (at a course in AF we pay a quarter million dollars a year for), while continually putting other wants before needs.

It’s time to return to the responsible approach of those that preceded us, and take care of essentials. Let’s take care of our roads, rebuild our Grove, and make our city a community we can be proud of again. Fix our roads, save our services through common sense budgeting and NO NEW TAXES. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 3.

Jacob Zonts
Nathan Stoker
Blaine Thatcher
Karl Kuhni
Wendy Morgan

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION #3

The sponsors of Proposition 3 are commendably passionate about roads. However, laws should be crafted using facts and clear-headed debate, not frustrated impulse.

Proposition 3 paints a picture of government waste and dishonest politicians, but the current Council can’t be blamed for the errors of the past several decades. In fact, they are earnestly dedicated to putting Pleasant Grove on the right track by fixing our roads without neglecting the City’s other priorities. If you reach out to them, as we have, we’re confident you’ll discover how capable, concerned, and transparent they are.

The current Council has made roads a top priority. They’ve budgeted more city money for roads than any previous Council, and they’ve aggressively pursued economic growth to increase city revenue. On February 28, they deliberated on a road fee—a flexible plan to provide additional transportation funding. Many cities across Utah have successfully implemented similar road fees because they give roads a meaningful place in the budget, but not at the expense of everything else.

The City HAS a plan to fund roads; the sponsors simply don’t like it. Within 24 hours of the road fee meeting, they hastily wrote and filed an initiative (Proposition 3) in response, hijacking the road funding discussion until after Election Day.

Proposition 3 is inflexible, unprecedented, and radically different from the moderate, do-no-harm approach of the City Council. We invite you to vote “no” to protect our community. Let’s work with, not against, our city and fund roads the responsible way.

Todd Fugal
Tamara Oborn
Dani Rowan
Heather Pack
Hillary Stirling

FISCAL IMPACT ESTIMATE SUMMARY

The City Council is already actively considering various funding options to fund road repair and maintenance needs in Pleasant Grove using mechanisms that will be less impactful on current services provided out of the general fund budget. The approach to funding roads mandated by the Initiative could result in the loss or extreme reduction of various municipal services currently being provided to the citizens of Pleasant Grove. Facilities and services that could be eliminated or severely curtailed are: Public Library, Swimming Pool, Parks and Outdoor Recreation Programs, Senior Citizens Center, City Celebrations, Cultural Arts Programs, Custodial Services.
