

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
Work Session
Tuesday, April 8, 2025
4:30 p.m.**

Mayor: Guy L. Fugal

Council Members: Dianna Andersen
Eric Jensen
Cyd LeMone
Steve Rogers (arrived at 4:37 p.m.)
Todd Williams

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Deon Giles, Parks Director
Wendy Thorpe, City Recorder
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Andrew Engemann, Fire Chief
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director
Neal Winterton, Public Works Director
Kyler Brower, Assistant to the City Administrator
David Packard, Human Resources Director
Keldon Brown, Police Chief
Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director
Megan Zollinger, Recreation Director

Excused: 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 4:33 p.m. and welcomed those present.

a. Open and Public Meetings Act (“OPMA”) Training.

City Attorney, Tina Petersen, presented the Open and Public Meetings Act Training that is required to be provided annually. She reported that training is based on the policy that the people's business should be conducted in public. The actions of elected officials should be taken openly with their deliberations conducted openly. The Act also requires elected officials to be trained at least annually on how to comply with the Act. All meetings are open to the public except for very narrowly defined exceptions. It is clear from the public policy statement that all meetings of the official bodies of cities, with very limited exceptions, are to be open to the public. The Powers

and Duties Handbook issued by the Utah League of Cities and Towns (“ULCT”) includes a comment that if someone cannot or will not comply with the Open and Public Meetings Act, they may not be cut out for public office.

A meeting is defined as the convening of the public body where a quorum is present. In the case of the City Council, that includes three members. The Mayor and two Council Members do not constitute a quorum because the Mayor in Pleasant Grove’s form of government does not vote except in the case of a tie. It includes workshops, executive sessions, and electronic communications. Attorney Petersen warned again engage in group texts, phone trees, and groups to discuss an item of public business or an item on the agenda of a City Council Meeting.

The definition of “meeting” is qualified by the description that it must be for the purpose of discussing, receiving public comment about, or acting on a matter over which the public body has jurisdiction or advisory power. “Convening” is identified to mean the calling of a meeting of a public body by a person authorized to do so for the purpose of discussing or acting on a matter over which the public body has jurisdiction. These very broad definitions are intended to include almost all gatherings of the City Council. Exceptions to the definitions are very specific and narrow. They include chance meetings, the convening of the public body that has both legislative and executive responsibilities where no public funds are appropriated, and where the meeting is convened just to implement administrative matters. Social meetings are also not subject to OPMA.

The City is required to provide notice of any meetings. The Act requires that annually the City post a notice of when normal meetings are held. They must include the schedule of the time and place. Each meeting must have its own notice at least 24 hours prior consisting of the agenda and the date, time, and place of the meeting. Posting requirements for notice include posting at the principal place of business, at the building where the meeting is to take place, sending the agenda to the Public Notice Website, and posting it to the City’s website. The statute also encourages public bodies to develop additional methods of notifying the public such as posting on the City website and social media postings.

For an emergency meeting, the noticing requirements may be suspended and the statute requires the City to use the most practicable notice possible. An emergency meeting cannot be held unless an attempt has been made to notify all members of a public body and a majority of the public body must approve of calling the meeting. The intent is to prevent political coups. With respect to agenda items, it is not sufficient to provide the date, time, and place. It is also necessary to post an agenda that provides adequate detail to notify the public as to the topics to be discussed and the decisions that may be made. If an item is not on the agenda, no final action can be taken and an item brought up by the public can be discussed but would have to be scheduled as an agenda item at a later date before final action can be taken.

Attorney Petersen next addressed Closed Meetings and stated that there are a few narrow exceptions to the OPMA where a meeting may be closed to the public. The exceptions are very narrow and spelled out in the Act. Every meeting, even if anticipated to be closed, must be convened as a public meeting before a motion is made to close the meeting to the public. If a workshop or closed meeting is to be held on the same day as a regularly scheduled meeting, the Act requires that they both be held in the same location as the regularly scheduled meeting.

Minutes must be kept for all meetings. The only exceptions are for personnel discussions and deployment of security apparatus. The Minutes must include at a minimum the date, time, and place of the meeting, who was there, any members of the body who were excused, the substance of what was discussed or decided, and a summary of comments made by the members of the body and the public. The Minutes of an open meeting which includes a portion of a closed meeting, must state the reasons for the closed meeting, where the closed meeting was held, and the vote by members to close the meeting. The closed meeting minutes or recording must include the date, time, and place of the meeting, the names of the members present, and those who are absent except where disclosure would infringe on the confidence necessary to fulfill the purpose of closing the meeting.

Attorney Petersen reported that it is a criminal offense to knowingly and intentionally violate OPMA. The State Attorney General is charged with enforcement of the Act. Private individuals can enforce the Act by bringing a private lawsuit. Any information in a closed session is confidential and not to be discussed outside the meeting. Violations of this confidentiality requirement are a criminal offense. She noted that it is not appropriate for members of public bodies to conduct their deliberations privately outside the public meeting and then in the public meeting, perfunctorily hold a vote.

Attorney Petersen reported that the training is contained in the Powers and Duties book published by the ULCT. An updated 23rd edition was published in 2024 that the Council Members should have received a copy of.

b. Budget Discussion for FY 2026.

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, presented the one-pager and noted that Finance Director, Denise Roy was not present. He reported that the intent is to adopt the budget on May 6, 2025. Once that is done, it will become public. The Final Budget will be adopted at the second meeting in June. At that time, it will become finalized. This was the third meeting where the budget was discussed. He reviewed the revenues and stated that the Sales and Property Tax estimates have increased slightly. Property taxes track growth and history has shown that they get new revenue on Property tax of \$180,000 and \$200,000 per year. Charges for services were discussed. These include revenue items that Director Roy reviews and changes as needed for the upcoming budget. The Administration allocation is the City's Enterprise Funds. Some of the operations such as water, sewer, storm drain, and garbage services are Enterprise Fund even though there is some General Fund administrative time spent. As a result, the General Fund is allowed to charge the Enterprise Funds for that time. That equates to an increase of \$121,000. Director Roy also reviews expenses and looks at personnel benefits operating lines and observed that they had about \$60,000 in savings there. Cultural Arts used to be paid out of the General Fund but it was recommended that it be paid out of the CARE Tax going forward rather than out of the General Fund. The Hale Center Theater Contract was referenced in the amount of \$300,000 per year. Last year \$200,000 was paid out of the CARE Tax and \$100,000 out of the General Fund.

Expenses were next reviewed consisting of increases to various line items. To full-time and part-time wages there was a 5.05% increase this year. A full-time position was presented that involved making a part-time position full-time for Social Media Special Events. A couple of part-time positions were proposed for Fire Inspector and Custodial. Staff was looking to implement a 2%

401K match for the first time in the City. In surveying employees, this was something that kept coming to the forefront. For the City to be competitive in recruiting it was noted that many other police and fire departments in other cities offer a 401K match.

In response to a question raised by Council Member Jensen, Administrator Darrington stated that if the Social Media position is funded it has to be opened. A figure was not yet available for the Custodial position. Staff has been working with the contractor who currently does work on the City Building to get an estimate for the entire City. If the City Council decides to move forward, bids will be obtained after the amount is compared to what the City is currently paying. The hope was to have that information available by April 22.

It was reported that with regard to the Social Media position, it is costing the City \$60,000 per year for 10 hours per week of work because this person receives full benefits. Council Member Williams recommended that they look at the situation in more detail and perhaps have two or three part-time employees for the same amount of money. Administrator Darrington explained that he would like to have one person provide the City with social media that promotes the City. An individual who works in the City is very good at that but they do not have the time to do more. The money could also be used to hire someone else. His preference was to use a person who already works for the City and has a proven track record of success. The current cost was calculated at \$115 per hour for the 10 hours per week being provided. Additional details on the specifics of the position were requested.

Council Member Rogers noted that there have been several discussions about the Social Media position. He would like to know what the job description is of the person who is currently handling the work in-house as well as what Assistant to the City Administrator, Kyler Brower, was doing previously. In addition, he would like to see a job description for the proposed full-time position. There needs to be clarity about what is being done currently and what is desired. Administrator Darrington reported that he will put together a matrix. What he is presenting to the Council is not the cheapest option, because there would be benefits involved. However, he believes this individual would benefit the City and feels strongly about the presented option.

Council Member Williams expressed concerns about asking the residents to pay more per year and pointed out that it can be difficult for senior citizens to do so. It is necessary to reduce some expenses. Administrator Darrington reported that in the past, he has received feedback from the City Council indicating that more should be done as far as promotion. He offered to put together more specific information for Council Member review. He can better outline the exact roles and responsibilities. From there, the Council can determine the best path forward to fulfill those needs.

Council Member Jensen pointed out that it might be possible to utilize someone else. He is confused about the need for a full-time position to handle social media. Council Member Rogers has spoken to some residents about this and there is still confusion about the need for a full-time position. Administrator Darrington clarified that he is not recommending a full-time position specifically for promotion and public relations. This person is already doing 30 hours per week for the City in Special Events. The suggestion is to add 10 more hours to assist with promotional needs. He reiterated that the information will be put in writing so there is more clarity provided.

Council Member Rogers is still not clear on what goal the City is trying to accomplish with the additional hours. Administrator Darrington explained that the intention is to promote the City. Council Member Rogers feels there needs to be a clear definition of what the City is trying to accomplish. There also needs to be communication about what is currently being accomplished. Council Member Andersen pointed out that the responsibilities would likely be fluid. For example, there might be some weeks where there are more special events to handle and other weeks where there is more of a social media focus. This position could be somewhat flexible. Administrator Darrington informed the Council that he would write down all of the details.

Council Member LeMone asked to further discuss the Custodial position. She noted that there might be another company out there that could submit a better bid. It makes sense to have more than one estimate. Administrator Darrington is not sure how to do that without providing a lot of detail about everything that needs to be cleaned and all of the special events that need to be attended. There would need to be a bid package created, which would be a time-consuming process. He explained that a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) would take a few months, but it is always possible to do a budget amendment in the future. He does not want to rush this process in order to meet the budget deadline. A request was made for additional comments on the one-pager.

Council Member Rogers wants to make sure that with the 401(k) match, there are contingencies in place. He agrees with offering this to employees who are loyal and want to be part of the Pleasant Grove team long-term, but he wants to make sure the desired goals are accomplished. Administrator Darrington explained that the City has been following what Provo has done. In Provo, certain criteria are outlined for employees. The idea is to match the 401(k) if there is a commitment in return. Council Member Rogers explained that at his firm after someone works there for 60 days, the employee becomes qualified. There is a match after that, but it does not vest until that employee has worked for the company for a certain amount of time. He could see something similar being effective in Pleasant Grove since employee turnover is expensive.

Administrator Darrington reviewed what will be done before the next City Council discussion. The matrix will be created and the criteria will be clearly outlined for Council Member consideration. There will also be information presented about the 401(k) match. That should be available ahead of the meeting on April 22, 2025. There will also be a custodial estimate.

The second page of the budget was reviewed. Administrator Darrington mentioned the proposed utility rate increases. What was proposed to the Council three weeks ago was \$9.28 per month for the increase, with the majority of it being a sewer, but also some increases in garbage and recycling. Most of the sewer increase is a fixed cost related to the Timpanogos Special Service District (“TSSD”), but there is a small portion related to the City budget. The TSSD portion is for treatment and the portion collected for the City is related to the collection system. The City portion was removed from that, which reduced the amount by \$0.56 per month per utility bill. As for the garbage, he spoke to the contractor, Republic Services. A reduction in rate was brought back to the City. Instead of the 6.8% for both, there is now a 2.4% and 4.7% for garbage and recycling.

Administrator Darrington reviewed the bottom chart. On the far left, it shows the city contract price per can. This is what cities are paying to their garbage hauler. On the far right, it shows the Pleasant Grove contract price per can and there is \$7.08 paid to Republic Services. The average

in other cities is \$8.82. This indicates that Pleasant Grove is currently receiving a fair deal with solid waste services. There is comfort that the Republic Services cost is fair at this time.

Administrator Darrington further reviewed the chart and pointed out what other cities charge per can. He explained that cities are charging their residents an average of \$15.50 for their monthly can. It is approximately \$10.50 for a second can and \$7.50 for recycling. In Pleasant Grove, the charge is \$14.08, which is around \$1 less than the average city. It is approximately \$10.68 for the second can and \$8.04 for recycling, which is slightly above the average amount. He is not certain why the recycling is slightly higher than the regular solid waste services, but overall, the amount is below average as far as what the City is being charged and what the residents are being charged. After seeing that data, he recommends remaining with Republic Services at this time.

Council Member Rogers asked about the higher margin on the second can. He wanted to know if there was a reason for that. Administrator Darrington was not certain. The assumption is that this is the way it was set up initially and it has remained that way over the years. Council Member LeMone wanted to know if this is something Republic Services could clarify. Discussions were had about second cans. Administrator Darrington offered to look into the number of second cans there are in Pleasant Grove. He noted that what is charged to residents includes tipping fees as well as the City cleanup. It was noted that the City cleanup costs tens of thousands of dollars.

c. Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (“MWPP”) Presentation by Director Winterton.

Public Works Director, Neal Winterton, reported that annually the Council is to review the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (“MWPP”) document. The document was emailed in advance to each of the Council Members. The purpose of the program is to assist municipalities and help guide them in sewer planning. It needs to be presented to the City Council. Drew Hoffman was identified as the Water and Sewer Division Manager and Jared Barnett is the Sewer Foreman. Others assist and help as needed as operators. The City is a member of the TSSD. He reminded the Council that individuals and homeowners are responsible for their lateral out to and in the street to the City main. The City is responsible for the City Main. If work needs to be done, property owners are required to obtain a permit from the Public Works Department.

A photo showing a sewer before and after being lined was presented. Director Winterton stated that that is their preferred method. It is a trenchless technology that goes from manhole to manhole to rehabilitate a line. Sometimes lines have to be replaced as was the case at 1100 North. They have asked the contractor to come back and relay some of the sewer lines on 1100 North. After conducting a camera inspection and reviewing the work done, it was not accepted. 200 feet of sewer needs to be laid to do the job correctly. The work was expected to be completed in the next 7 to 10 days.

Director Winterton reminded the Council that a new water main was installed in the area and they relayed a new water main on 1160 North. 1100 North is where it ties in at the low bottom spot of the whole area. Both roads connect and go toward 1100 North and west from there. He noted that the work has to be perfect in order for them to accept it.

Director Winterton reported that the Sewer Fund is in a Dedicated Enterprise Fund with the monthly charge being approximately \$4,259. Comparisons will be made with other cities. He expected Pleasant Grove to be similar to cities that have their own treatment plants. Provo and Orem, for example, are at around \$60 per month because they are going through what the TSSDD is with upgrades. There are about 134 miles of pipe in the City that crews take care of. There are zero on the overflows and no backups due to rain, snow melt, or equipment failure. Crew members who are certified and trained are very important and familiar with practices and codes. He noted that Drew, Jared, Derek, Troy, Holden, and Jason are Certified Sewer Operators.

In response to a question raised, Director Winterton reported that the City does not have any publicly owned lift stations in the City. There are, however, some private ones. Those with a private lift station are required to lift up to a gravity sewer and flow into the City's sewer with gravity.

Director Winterton reported that there is a sewer meter for what goes into TSSD that matches what they are billed. The location was described.

d. Staff Business.

There was no Staff Business discussed.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: At 5:32 p.m. Council Member Williams moved to ADJOURN the Work Session. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting "Yes".

The City Council Work Session Minutes of April 8, 2025, were approved by the City Council on May 20, 2025.



Wendy Thorpe, CMC
City Recorder

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

**Pleasant Grove City
City Council Meeting Minutes
Regular Session
Tuesday, April 8, 2025
6:00 p.m.**

Mayor: Guy L. Fugal

Council Members: Dianna Andersen
Eric Jensen
Cyd LeMone (excused at 7:46 p.m.)
Steve Rogers
Todd Williams

Staff Present: Scott Darrington, City Administrator
Deon Giles, Parks Director
Wendy Thorpe, City Recorder
Tina Petersen, City Attorney
Andrew Engemann, Fire Chief
Sheri Britsch, Library and Arts Director
Neal Winterton, Public Works Director
Kyler Brower, Assistant to the City Administrator
David Packard, Human Resources Director
Keldon Brown, Police Chief
Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director
Megan Zollinger, Recreation Director

Excused: Denise Roy, Finance Director

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

6:00 P.M. REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

1) **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Guy Fugal called the Regular City Council Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed those present. All City Council Members were present.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council Member Todd Williams.

3) **OPENING REMARKS**

The Opening Remarks were offered by Council Member Cyd LeMone.

4) **APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA**

City Administrator, Scott Darrington, reported that there are no changes to the agenda proposed.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to APPROVE the Meeting Agenda. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting “Aye”.

5) **OPEN SESSION**

Mayor Fugal opened the Open Session.

Tamara Naylor shared comments about the budget. She is concerned about some of the decisions that have been made in Pleasant Grove over the last few years. For example, she is concerned about the half a million dollars over budget that was spent last year and was reported on last week. Her worries have to do with the fact that no explanation was provided to indicate why the spending was over budget. There was no comment on where that money went and no one on the City Council even asked. As the City looks toward the future, there is a large expenditure with a new school district. She wonders what plans are being made for the new school district expenses so the residents are not forced to endure a significant property tax increase. At the last meeting, there was a discussion about hiring someone part-time or adding hours for City communication. She believes the residents of Pleasant Grove are more interested in hearing about financial matters.

There were no further comments. The Open Session was closed.

6) **CONSENT ITEMS**

- A. **City Council Minutes:
City Council Minutes for March 4, 2025, and March 18, 2025.**
- B. **To Consider for Approval Payment No. 8 to CEM Aquatics 2024 Pool Work Project.**
- C. **To Consider for Approval Change Order No. 3 for FX Construction for the American Fork River Diversion Project.**
- D. **To Consider for Approval Change Order No. 4 for FX for the American Fork River Diversion Reconstruction Project.**
- E. **To Consider Approval of Payment Reports for March 20 and April 3, 2025.**

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to APPROVE the Consent Items. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting “Aye”.

7) **BOARD, COMMISSION, COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

A. None.

8) **PRESENTATIONS**

A. None.

9) **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

A. **Public Hearing to Consider an Ordinance (2025-004) for a Zone Change from the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone to the P-O (Professional Office) Zone, Located at 1783, 1807, 1841, and 1855 West 1100 North, on Approximately 7.53 Acres in the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. Applicant: Maple Springs of PG Holdings, LLC. Presenter: Director Cardenas (This Item was Continued from the March 18, 2025, Meeting).**

Community Development Director, Daniel Cardenas, presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is for a rezone from the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone to the P-O (Professional Office) Zone. The application was submitted by Maple Springs of PG Holdings, LLC. This is an item that was continued from the March 18, 2025, City Council Meeting.

Director Cardenas shared a map of the area and identified the location of the proposed rezone. There are four parcels associated with the application, including 1783, 1807, 1841, and 1855 West 1100 North. The applicant is proposing a shift from the R1-8 Zone, which requires at least 8,000 square feet per lot, to the PO Zone. This is a restrictive type of commercial use. The entire area is 7.53 acres. Director Cardenas shared additional maps with the City Council. The area that the applicant is proposing to rezone is adjacent to the property that is zoned PO. There are two nearby parcels that are residential and there is a property that has a residential use in a commercial zone. The latter is an example of a legal non-conforming use. In this area, the General Plan contemplates the PO Zone as a future land use. When someone asks about a rezone, he first looks at the General Plan to see what is listed there as a future land use. This indicates what the City feels is appropriate. There are different categories in the Future Land Use Map. In this case, the request made by the applicant to rezone the property from R1-8 to the PO Zone fits within the General Plan.

The Zoning Map was presented. Director Cardenas explained that what is proposed is not outside of the future vision that has been outlined for the area. This application went to the Planning Commission and received a recommendation of approval. However, the vote was not unanimous, as there was one Commissioner who voted against the application. Director Cardenas noted that there were questions about access at the last City Council Meeting. He created a map to illustrate that the access is outside of the proposed rezone. There were also some questions about a water well. The applicant was tasked with speaking to the neighbors and there was a meeting held.

Council Member Eric Jensen believed at one time, this area was all residential, but some parcels were sold off. Director Cardenas noted that some areas were previously residential and were then

rezoned to PO. He clarified that the item currently before the City Council is a rezone. There is not currently a Site Plan to review and he is not certain exactly what is envisioned for the parcels.

Commissioner Dianna Andersen noted that at the last City Council Meeting, there was a question about whether an island would be created with the rezone, as it would leave one or two parcels as residential while the rest are in the PO Zone. Mayor Fugal confirmed that there would be an island created with the rezone, but it is legal to do that. City Attorney, Tina Petersen, confirmed that this is legal because the statute was changed several years ago. Director Cardenas pointed out that the General Plan does envision a change in the zone. This normally does not happen all at one time.

The applicant, Brett Evanson, introduced himself to the City Council. After the last meeting, there was an opportunity to meet with the property owners in the three lots to the west. That meeting went well and it was possible to answer their questions. When he left that meeting, those residents seemed to be in support of the proposed rezone and felt that it was a good use of the property. Mr. Evanson reiterated that the proposal follows the General Plan for the City and he feels it is the best use of the property. It will provide services to members of the community and will maximize tax revenue. There were previous questions and concerns about access to the back lot, but there is verification that the road is not on their property and will not be impacted by the rezone.

Mr. Evanson reported that there have been concerns from some residents to the east of the property, but there was not an opportunity to meet with those residents. His understanding is that there are concerns about what the separation between the properties will look like. The code requires a certain type of fence material and height. There is a desire to work with those residents on the separation. He believes it will be more open with the PO Zone designation than if it were to remain in the R1-8 Zone. With the current zoning, the 7.53 acres would turn into 28 different single-family home lots, which would result in a lot more density than what is currently proposed with three office buildings. There is a lot more open space with that kind of plan than if it were to remain residential. While there are tentative ideas for the property, there is nothing finalized.

Mayor Fugal opened the public hearing.

Carrie Hammond gave her address as 1877 West 1100 North and explained that she owns the property in the back. It is a residential use but is zoned commercial. She has read through the zoning code and looked at the General Plan. There was also the meeting with Maple Springs of PG Holdings, LLC. After that research and the discussion, she feels the PO Zone might be preferable to a lot of homes on small lots. The PO Zone and the office buildings would create a better situation, despite the island that will be created. That being said, she still has concerns about changes to the area and asked that when the Site Plans are reviewed, the ordinances and codes are strictly adhered to. She pointed out that this is a commercial use that will border residential uses. Her concerns largely relate to dumpsters, lighting, landscaping, traffic, and parking in the area. The neighbors who live in front of her property are also in support of the rezone to the PO Zone.

Kathy Anderson lives at 948 North 1600 West and has lived there for the last 27 years. She has watched the area grow around her property. Ms. Anderson pointed out that the decisions made by the City Council impact the lives of others. She believes that smaller homes are needed in the community. This could be a lovely subdivision that is more affordable for families. While she is

not opposed to the medical uses envisioned, she feels it would be nice to consider smaller homes that would be more affordable. Those smaller homes could make a difference to others.

Gordon Jarvis stated that his home is next to the dentist's office. After the meeting, there was agreement that the PO Zone would be preferable to a lot of residential homes. That being said, he believes the City failed with the dentist's office because 17 lights are facing his house at night. Blackout curtains had to be purchased for the entire west side of his home, which was frustrating. As far as this proposal, he asked that in the future, the lighting codes and requirements be followed.

Mike Adamson lives on the south side of the subject property. He spoke to his neighbors earlier that morning and is attending the meeting to support his neighbors. Mr. Adamson does not want a medical center next to his home, but he will not be impacted as much as his neighbors will. If there is going to be a surgical center or other medical facilities there, this should be a place for hope and healing. He asked that there be landscaping, a park, a trail, or something similar to beautify the area. There could be choices made so this is beneficial to the entire community. He feels there can be something productive and aesthetically pleasing for neighbors and those coming to the area.

Steve Winter gave his address as 1727 West 1060 North. His concern relates to access and having a through road in the area. He wanted to know who will straighten out the cul-de-sac if that is what is desired. Mr. Winter wants more clarity about where the accesses will be both in and out.

Mike McClellan purchased his home eight years ago. When he purchased the property, he looked at the zoning, because he was aware of all of the development happening in Pleasant Grove. He did not want more development near the home that he chose. The current zoning is R1-8, which is the same as the residential zoning to the east. He does not see a need for more medical businesses in the area. There is a lot of development along I-15 that is appropriate for this kind of development and it is already zoned that way. Mr. McClellan is opposed to the proposed rezone. There is a high demand for residential development in Pleasant Grove and he does not see a reason why the developer cannot focus on single-family development. He would love to see some smaller homes there. Mr. McClellan supports the current zone and a focus on residential development.

Jasmine Watkins stated that she lives in a cul-de-sac and pointed out her home on a map of the area. She echoed the comments from Mr. McClellan and Mr. Adamson. She has four small children and would love to see more neighbors in the area as opposed to professional office uses. If this area ultimately becomes a medical center, she would like to see nice landscaping added.

John Johannsmeyer gave his address as 1069 West 810 North and expressed opposition to the proposed rezone. He believes the residential island will eventually cause the homeowners to be squeezed out. There is a desire to see more green space in the community. If there is something developed on the site, he feels there should be a lot of green space and landscaping added in.

Gina McClellan lives east of the neighborhood. Once the Alpine Pediatrics opened, there was a lot more traffic on 1700 West. There was a subdivision built to the east as well, but she has not noticed additional traffic from that. She is not overly concerned about additional homes in the area and is a proponent of neighborhoods. Her concern is that neighborhoods are being lost.

Walkability is important and she pointed out that 1100 North is not walkable as it is currently. Having some residential streets added into this area is likely to increase the walkability overall.

Greg Larsen explained that he is one of the developers. The land was purchased seven years ago. There were homes on it, complaints were received, and the homes were torn down. The City Council was approached with the idea of an assisted living facility, but there was no support for that. It was left as bare land and then complaints were received about that. In order to determine what the City envisioned for the land, the General Plan was consulted, which lists the PO Zone. Now that the proposal is in the PO Zone, there are still complaints being received. It is difficult to have a piece of land that there are constant complaints about, no matter what is proposed. Mr. Larsen reported that if there are professional office uses, there will be walkways and everything will meet the code requirements. He added that they are not residential developers, but handle commercial development. That is the reason that residential is not being pursued at this time.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

Council Member Jensen appreciated the open dialogue and the comments shared by residents. There have been many options considered for this piece of land in the past and a rezone is now before the City Council. Council Member Andersen commended the neighbors for attending and being civil throughout this process. She pointed out that surgical center hours normally start earlier in the morning and end earlier in the evening. The traffic flow would likely be during those time periods, which is manageable. There will be less traffic than if there are single-family homes. She likes the suggestion about the landscaping and hopes the developer will take that into consideration. She asked Staff to look into the light issue mentioned by Mr. Jarvis during the public hearing. Director Cardenas reported that he took note of the location and will look into this.

Council Member Steve Rogers noted that if the City Council approves a zone change, there is no authority to deny a plan that conforms with the ordinances. He appreciates the request for landscaping or a park, but that would be dependent on the developer. There is a vision that could work for everyone, but the City Council does not necessarily have a say in that. The only thing the City Council has a say in is what can be on this property. If the rezone is approved to the PO Zone, then the developer can utilize the property in the way that is allowed under that zone. It is the responsibility of the applicant to show why this does not materially affect the expectations a homeowner had when they purchased their property. This is a difficult decision because he understands the future use mentioned in the General Plan, but the current zone is not the PO Zone. It is difficult for him to vote in a way that usurps the expectations that surrounding homeowners had. That being said, he acknowledges that homeowners could have looked at the General Plan.

Council Member Rogers asked the City Attorney whether it is possible for the City Council to deny a rezone that conforms with an anticipated future land use. Attorney Petersen explained that the zoning of a property can be changed. The idea that someone bought a piece of property with the expectation that it would always be residential and surrounded by residential is not something that would hold up in a lawsuit. The City Council has the ability to make changes. When the City adopted the Land Use Map and determined that the area would be a good place for a professional office, that set the vision for the area. However, the City Council has discretion when it comes to rezones. The Council does not have to approve the rezone, but if it is denied, there will need to be

some findings to illustrate why this rezone request is being denied despite conformance with the General Plan. Council Member Rogers asked if there needs to be a legal reason provided for denial. Attorney Petersen explained that he can vote against the rezone, but if the majority of the Council denies the rezone, there need to be factual findings that are reasonable and arguable.

Council Member Williams believes it is important to consider the rights of owners and all of the associated impacts. At the last meeting, he was concerned that the three homes would become an island, but there has been support expressed from the residents directly impacted by that island. Based on the General Plan, this is envisioned as the PO Zone. Director Cardenas explained that his role is to provide information to the City Council so the best decision possible can be made. The residential use that is existing is more intrusive than the commercial use. If the zone remains residential, there can be a home that is 35 feet. There are not the same kind of barriers when there is residential next to residential. There is a section of the code that states when there is a professional office use next to a residential use, the setback is larger. On the other hand, a residential use against another residential use would have smaller setbacks. Director Cardenas pointed out that it is possible to have a single-family home and an accessory apartment. Based on what is allowed, the traffic would be more intense with a residential use than it would be with commercial. Additionally, in the PO Zone, the total lot coverage is smaller and has a certain amount of landscaping required. He reiterated that the commercial use will be less intrusive.

Council Member LeMone pointed out that the property owner has followed the Pleasant Grove rules and regulations to utilize the property. That property owner has rights and so do the people that live in the surrounding area. It is a difficult decision to make and she acknowledged that not everyone will be pleased with the choice. She expressed appreciation for the residents who came to share comments at the meeting. Council Member Jensen thanked Director Cardenas for outlining the pros and cons associated with the rezone. Council Member Rogers asked when the General Plan was last updated to include the PO Zone in this area. Director Cardenas stated that it has been shown as the PO Zone since he started in 2016. Council Member Andersen referenced a comment made during the public hearing by Mr. Johannesmeyer, who wanted the City Council to understand that there are families who will be impacted by the City Council vote on the rezone. She clarified that Council Members consider this and take all applications seriously.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to APPROVE Ordinance (2025-004) for a Zone Change from the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone to the P-O (Professional Office) Zone, located at 1783, 1807, 1841, and 1855 West 1100 North, on approximately 7.53 acres in the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The applicant is Maple Springs of PG Holdings, LLC. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion carried with Council Members Andersen, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting “Yes” and Council Member Rogers voting “No.”

B. Public Hearing to Consider an Ordinance (2025-006) for a Zone Change on Approximately 2.8 Acres of Land from the Neighborhood Commercial (C-N) Zone to the Commercial Sales-2 (CS-2) Zone, Located at 675 West Garden Drive. Applicant Mike Carter. Presenter: Director Cardenas.

Director Cardenas presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is for a rezone for approximately 2.8 acres of land located at 675 West Garden Drive. The proposal is to rezone from

the Neighborhood Commercial (C-N) Zone to the Commercial Sales-2 (CS-2) Zone. He pointed out the location of the subject property on a map of the area. Every zone has certain uses that are permitted. Staff looks at applications to ensure that any requested uses are permitted in the zone. Some of the uses that have been brought in to occupy the applicant building are not permitted in the C-N Zone. In the past, the applicant has requested that the zone be amended to add new permitted uses. That process can take six to eight weeks and a potential renter is likely to have moved on. It was suggested that a rezone take place to a zone that allows more uses than C-N.

Director Cardenas discussed the CS-2 Zone. There are a lot of uses allowed in the CS-2 Zone compared to the C-N Zone. As a result, the applicant is proposing a rezone of the property at 675 West Garden Drive to the CS-2 Zone. Since the applicant is looking for a wider variety of uses, the rezone has been requested. Director Cardenas clarified that both the C-N Zone and CS-2 Zone are commercial zones, but one allows for more uses. Administrator Darrington noted that he has spoken to the applicant and there has been interest in renting the space. However, the uses did not fit into the zone and the interested renters had to be denied. There is a desire to have more flexibility in the uses that are allowed. CS-2 will provide additional opportunities for the applicant to lease out the space. Some of the uses allowed in the CS-2 Zone were reviewed, which include a print shop and tire shop. In the Staff Report, there is a matrix that reviews the allowed uses.

Council Member Rogers asked if there has been any feedback from residents that border the area. Director Cardenas denied this but pointed out that some of those residents might be present for the public hearing. The applicant, Mike Carter, introduced himself to the City Council and explained that there are five spaces to lease. There are different businesses that have been interested, but in the time that it took to move through the City process, those interested found another location. It is necessary to be mindful when it comes to noise and odors given the proximity to residential. He offered to answer Council Member questions about the request.

Mayor Fugal opened the public hearing.

Jason Belnap lives near the subject property and noted that there are noise issues around his home. The garbage collection is already noisy. As for mitigating odors, it is difficult to do that. There are currently traffic issues in the area and he is concerned about the additional uses proposed.

John Johannesmeyer stated that his main concern relates to traffic. He asked if there had been a Traffic Study conducted in the area. 600 West is already busy, but it will only become busier with the park and other uses. He wondered if there had been discussions about widening the road. Adding more commercial uses in the area will make the traffic levels worse. If there is not already a plan to address this matter, he encouraged the City Council to plan accordingly to address traffic.

Michelle Belnap stated that she was supportive of Tabitha's Way because it seemed like the best option at the time. However, something she has noticed since it went in that makes her hesitant about the rezone is the amount of foot traffic. There are a lot more people walking in the area, people have thrown things into her backyard, and people are hanging out around the wall. It is also difficult to get into the neighborhood as there are existing traffic issues. Ms. Belnap explained that she has trees that line the fence, but she has noticed that kids are climbing those trees. There is a lot of disruption associated with the use already and she is concerned about additional issues.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

Council Member Williams noted that this property has been discussed by the City Council before. The City Council twice said no to multi-unit housing developments there. He believes the rezone will help the land owner, residents, and the City. He is in favor of allowing more uses in this location so that the current landowner can rent the property. Council Member Rogers pointed out that this is already in a commercial zone. A lot of the concerns expressed by residents will not be made worse through a rezone. For instance, in the C-N Zone, most retail is already allowed as are professional services. The list of items that are not allowed currently but would be allowed under the CS-2 Zone, will not create more of a nuisance. He believes CS-2 is appropriate for the location.

Council Member Andersen pointed out that there are some things that can be done to mitigate some of the hardships for residents. For instance, the trash removal could take place at a later time. Administrator Darrington reported that there have been complaints received in different areas of the City about that same issue. There can be outreach to the carrier to inform them that there needs to be a later collection time. He reiterated that the collection schedule can be changed.

Mayor Fugal asked that information about 600 West be shared. Public Works Director, Neal Winterton, shared an update with the City Council. He explained that a lot of study has been done on the intersection of Center Street and 600 West. Traffic counts were conducted to determine what the intersection should look like. Details are still being finalized, but plans are being pursued. He pointed out a road on a map of the area and explained that it will be widened and the curb in place. There will be a new waterline put in and a new storm drain line. The intersection needs to be closed to route vehicles around to the 800 North entrance for Cook Family Park. Additional discussions were had about access and the work that is planned. Certain access will be allowed on a local basis. There is a fair amount of summer construction work that will take place in the City.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved to ADOPT Ordinance (2025-006) for a Zone Change on approximately 2.8 acres of land from the Neighborhood Commercial (C-N) Zone to the Commercial Sales-2 (CS-2) Zone, located at 675 West Garden Drive. The applicant is Mike Carter. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting “Yes”.

10) **ACTION ITEMS READY FOR VOTE**

- A. **To Consider for Adoption a Resolution (2025-011) Authorizing the Mayor to Sign an Amended Public Utility Easement in Favor of Enbridge Gas, d/b/a/ Dominion Energy, for the Construction, Reconstruction, Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, Enlargement, or Removal of Underground Natural Gas Utility Lines On, Across, or Under Property Owned by Pleasant Grove City located approximately at 70 South 100 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah, and Providing for an Effective Date. Presenter: Attorney Petersen.**

Attorney Petersen presented the Resolution and explained that this is a housekeeping item. A

public utility easement for this piece of property was previously granted and the legal description was inaccurate. It needs to be moved over a few feet in order to be accurate. The new drawing was shared to indicate where it needs to be. She reiterated that this is a legal description correction.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved to ADOPT Resolution (2025-011) Authorizing the Mayor to sign an Amended Public Utility Easement in favor of Enbridge Gas, d/b/a/ Dominion Energy, for the construction, reconstruction, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, enlargement, or removal of underground natural gas utility lines on across or under property owned by Pleasant Grove City, located approximately at 70 South 100 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah, and providing for an effective date. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting “Yes”.

B. To Consider for Adoption a Resolution (2025-012) Authorizing the Mayor to Execute an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement Between Utah County and Pleasant Grove City for the Administration of the 2025 Municipal Elections. Presenter: Attorney Petersen.

Attorney Petersen presented the Resolution and explained that this relates to an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Utah County and Pleasant Grove. It has to do with running the municipal elections in 2025. Several years ago, the City decided that it was more cost-effective and efficient to have the County be in charge of running the municipal elections. It relieved a lot of pressure from City Staff and ensured that the elections were run consistently. This agreement outlines what the Utah County services will entail for the primary and general elections. The costs are included in the Meeting Materials Packet. It is a little over \$100,000 for both. The fee is based on the number of voters that are anticipated. There are 20,198 active voters and it costs \$2.75 per voter per election, which results in \$55,544.50 for the primary and the same amount for the general election. As a result, the total cost to the City for the service is \$111,089.

ACTION: Council Member Jensen moved ADOPT Resolution (2025-012) Authorizing the Mayor to execute an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Utah County and Pleasant Grove City for the Administration of the 2025 Municipal Elections. Council Member LeMone seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting “Yes”.

C. To Consider for Adoption a Resolution (2025-013) Amending the Personnel Policies and Procedures Previously Approved by the City Council. Specifically, Amending Section XVI “Leaves of Absence” Subsection 3 “Holiday Leave” by Amending Subsection “B” Juneteenth Observance; and Amending Section XIV “Benefits” by Adopting Subsection 7 “Cell Phone Reimbursement Policy” and Providing for an Effective Date. Presenter: Attorney Petersen.

Attorney Petersen presented the Resolution and explained that this relates to a proposed amendment to the Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual. The first proposed amendment has to do with the observance of the Juneteenth holiday. A few years ago, the State decided to observe

Juneteenth. There was a provision in the manual to state when that would be observed, but the State has since clarified how it will be observed at that level. The City has decided to follow the State so there is consistency. It will always be on a Monday, so it will be observed either the Monday before the 19th or the Monday after the 19th. If the 19th falls on a Monday, then it will be observed on that date. The second proposed amendment came from the HR Director and Finance Director. The Directors have been approached on several occasions about when there is reimbursement to City employees for the use of personal cell phones to conduct City business. In the past, there has been one general amount and it was normally reserved for Executive Staff, with a number of minor exceptions for employees who have to use their phones regularly. However, there was not a clear policy or criteria established. A survey was conducted and cell phone policies in several other cities were considered. The proposed language states that an employee can either be designated as someone who qualifies for a City-owned cell phone or be reimbursed for personal cell phone use for City business. Three tiers have been created and are as follows:

- Level One: Some interaction with the public and other employees while out of the office. Some use of cell phones after business hours. (\$20.00 per month);
- Level Two: Extensive interaction with the public and other employees via phone, text, and email during and after regular business hours. (\$45.00 per month);
- Level Three: City Administrator/Directors/Executive Staff. (\$70.00 per month).

There are other criteria listed in the Meeting Materials Packet as well. Attorney Petersen explained that the language provides clarity that even though there is reimbursement, the City is not responsible for lost, stolen, or damaged cell phones. The use of a personal or City-owned cell phone is prohibited while operating any moving motor vehicle. There is also language to remind employees that if their devices contain information regarding City business, those could be subject to GRAMA requests. The City reserves the right to monitor electronic devices used by employees after notice for compliance with this policy. Attorney Petersen noted that the proposed amendments will establish a uniform policy when using a personal cell phone for City business.

Administrator Darrington shared an example and noted that Public Works employees are out in the field. In order to talk to someone about a situation, their personal cell phone might be used. The City should be covering some of the costs in that case. Attorney Petersen explained that there are currently Public Safety and Public Works employees who have their own cell phone plans with city-issued phones. It is her recommendation that this be maintained for Public Safety employees. However, there are a number of other employees who use their personal cell phones for City business on a regular basis. The language would cover those employees through the different tiers.

Council Member Rogers asked if the employees who are reimbursed sign some sort of agreement. This was confirmed. Attorney Petersen explained that there is a form that acknowledges the policy. It will also designate the tier level that the employee falls into and will be signed by the Department Head and HR. This is a one-time designation and the amount will be added to the payroll once a month. If something changes, then it is up to the Department Head to monitor that.

ACTION: Council Member LeMone moved to ADOPT Resolution (2025-013) Amending the Personnel Policies and Procedures previously approved by the City Council, specifically, amending section XVI “Leaves of Absence” Subsection 3 “Holiday Leave” by amending

subsection “B” Juneteenth observance; and amending section XIV “Benefits” adopting subsection 7 “Cell Phone Reimbursement Policy” and providing for an effective date. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, LeMone, and Williams voting “Yes”.

D. To Consider Awarding Staker & Parson Companies d/b/a Staker Parson Materials & Construction the 500 East Reconstruction; 200 South to 1100 North Project, with a Base Bid Price of \$587,128.35 and Authorize the Mayor to Sign the Notice of Award, Notice to Proceed, and the Agreement. Presenter: Director Winterton.

Council Member LeMone was excused and left the meeting at 7:46 p.m. Director Winterton explained that the item before the City Council relates to a bid from Staker & Parson Companies. This is for the 500 East reconstruction work and includes the area from 200 South to 1100 North. The base bid is \$587,128.35 and it includes all of the base items. The recommendation is to award this to Staker & Parson Companies based on the bid received during the competitive bid process.

ACTION: Council Member Williams moved to Sign the Notice of Award, Awarding Staker & Parson Companies d/b/a Staker Parson Materials & Construction, the 500 East Reconstruction; 200 South to 1100 North project, with a base bid price of \$587,128.35 and Authorize the Mayor to sign the Notice of Award, Notice to Proceed, and the Agreement. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, and Williams voting “Yes”. Council Member LeMone was absent.

E. To Consider Awarding Hall Engineering and Construction of the Murdock Drive; 1500 East to 1600 East Waterline & Roadway Reconstruction Project with a Base Bid Price of \$597,320.00 and Authorize the Mayor to Sign the Notice of Award, Notice to Proceed, and the Agreement. Presenter: Director Winterton.

Director Winterton explained that the item before the City Council relates to a bid from Hall Engineering and Construction for Murdock Drive. This has to do with the 1500 East to 1600 East waterline and roadway reconstruction project. He reminded Council Members that a homeowner reached out about long-term flooding. There is now an opportunity to address the issue in this area. There will be a new waterline installed and the curb and elevations will be fixed to eliminate the flooding. Seven qualified bids were received. One of the bids was high and the City asked for clarification about that number and it came down to the quality of work that is expected in the City. He believes Pleasant Grove is on the right path. Director Winterton recommended that the project be awarded to Hall Engineering and Construction with a base bid of \$597,320.

ACTION: Council Member Rogers moved to Authorize the Mayor to Sign the Notice of Award to Hall Engineering and Construction the Murdock Drive; 1500 East to 1600 East Waterline and Roadway Reconstruction project with a base bid price of \$597,320.00 and Authorize the Mayor to sign the Notice of Award, Notice to Proceed, and the Agreement. Council Member Jensen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, and Williams voting “Yes”. Council Member LeMone was absent.

F. To Consider a Proclamation Declaring April 24, 2025, Arbor Day. Presenter: Director Giles.

Parks Director, Deon Giles, reported that the Beautification Commission and the Parks Department decided to hold the Arbor Day celebration on April 24, 2025, at 8:00 a.m. at Hill Park. The celebration has been held at different parks over the years. It was noted that Council Member Williams left the City Council Meeting at 7:51 p.m. and returned to the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

ACTION: Council Member Andersen moved to Sign the Proclamation Declaring April 24, 2025, Arbor Day. Council Member Rogers seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, and Jensen voting “Yes”. Council Member LeMone and Council Member Williams were absent.

G. To Consider Resolution (2025-014) Authorizing the Mayor to Sign a Sales Agreement with Clark Shane Johnston for 540 Square Feet of Property Located at Approximately 180 North 900 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah, and Providing an Effective Date. Presenter: Director Cardenas.

Attorney Petersen explained that the City was approached by Clark Shane Johnston, who is developing a one-lot subdivision. Mr. Johnston needed some property from the City. She shared a map to indicate the 540 square feet proposed to be purchased and stated that it would cost \$15 per square foot for a total of \$8,100. Staff determined that the piece of property was not essential to the use of the water tank property and could be declared surplus, which is what the Resolution does. There are some conditions contained in the Sales Agreement from Community Development and Engineering. Some conditions are that Mr. Johnston submit the one-lot subdivision plat, pay for the legal description for the Quit Claim Deed, and build a retaining wall or something similar between the property. All of the conditions are listed in the Meeting Materials Packet.

The applicant introduced himself to the City Council. Mr. Johnston explained that when the home was built, there was work done with the previous engineer. The original idea was to put in a turnaround at the end of the street, but that later shifted to a turnaround in the middle of the street. The home design changed based on past discussions with the engineer. He reviewed a map of the area and stated that the previous engineer had a portion re-piped. The plan now is to remove the old gate and build a 2-foot retaining wall. A new fence would be added to the area as well.

ACTION: Council Member Williams moved to ADOPT Resolution (2025-014) Authorizing the Mayor to Sign a Sales Agreement with Clark Shane Johnston for 540 square feet of property located at approximately 180 North 900 East, Pleasant Grove, Utah, and providing an effective date. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, and Williams voting “Yes”. Council Member LeMone was absent.

11) ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

A. **Continued Items from the Work Session, if Needed.**

Mayor Fugal explained that there will now be continued budget discussions. Administrator Darrington acknowledged the comment made during the Open Session that stated the City was \$500,000 over budget. He is not sure where that statement came from but believes it might have been in reference to the review of the budget that took place three weeks earlier. The City has actually turned a surplus every year. Last year, the surplus was over \$2 million. The Finance Director does an excellent job and the City is on firm financial footing. Three weeks ago, there was a discussion about the one-pager document and it showed the expenses versus the revenues. He believes the number shown at that time out of balance, but it is normally is until the Final Budget is adopted. The City is required to adopt a balanced budget. What was shown in the one-pager document earlier in the meeting was balanced. Discussions were had about Staff taking time to clarify comments and providing information more immediately during future meetings.

Administrator Darrington shared additional comments about the PR position. He explained that the employee serving in that position would handle more of the promotional items to let residents know what is being done in the City. For example, events and things that are happening in Pleasant Grove. He noted that the word “fluffy” is not an accurate description of what is envisioned.

Information about the school district was shared. Administrator Darrington reported that Legislation was passed approximately one month ago. Two weeks ago, there was a sit-down meeting with Senator Keith Grover to discuss the next steps. The key date is when the new School Board takes office, which will be at the end of November. The law has been changed, so when the new School Board is elected in November and the results are certified, they can be sworn in and take office. There does not need to be a wait until January. That has been put in place so it is possible for the School Board to move forward sooner rather than later. There is an understanding that the cities have limited power as far as what can and cannot be done. What the City has been trying to do is advocate for policies that will be beneficial to the south district. He clarified that the south district includes Pleasant Grove, Lindon, Vineyard, and Orem. There are meetings with those cities every other week to talk about how to ensure those elected are in the best position possible. In the Legislation that was adopted, there were four points there was a desire to see addressed, but none of those were. After speaking to Senator Grover, it was indicated that future Legislation will be proposed that will be more helpful. There are various opinions on what should be done between now and when the new School Board takes office.

Administrator Darrington feels the City should be prepared for advocacy in the Legislature. The City is doing its best with the limited powers there are at this time. Any tax increases related to this decision are not up to the City Council. He hopes that residents understand that. The new School Board will need to make some difficult financial decisions. This includes whether schools will be closed, if taxes will be raised, or if capital projects will be put on hold. There are a lot of decisions that need to be made and all of those have financial consequences. Ultimately, it is the School Board who will make those decisions. Council Member Williams explained that the City previously tried to advocate directly with Senator Brady Brammer. He expressed frustrations about the process that has taken place, but also feels it is important to be proactive with the School

Board so the residents are protected. Administrator Darrington stated that his understanding is that the new Legislation does not require the new school district to reimburse for expenses. There are still some issues being worked through. As soon as decisions are made that have financial consequences or any major policy decisions are made, the City Council will be informed. Council Member Jensen reminded those present that Alpine School District is still a resource. Administrator Darrington stated that until July 1, 2027, Alpine School District is still functional.

Council Member Rogers shared a comment about utility rate increases. He acknowledged that these increases can happen as the cost of living goes up. However, if it is possible to forego some projects to mitigate impacts on residents who live on fixed budgets, that is something he would like to be considered. Staff could look into different options and come back to the City Council with budget changes that can be made. There is a desire to mitigate some of the rising costs. Council Member Williams wants to be very careful this year. Administrator Darrington explained that Staff receives certain budget requests and those requests are then pared down based on the resources available. He shared additional information about the utility needs. Council Member Andersen pointed out that it can become more expensive to handle certain projects later on.

Administrator Darrington reported that there will be another Work Session on the budget. The Tentative Budget will be adopted and then there will be additional discussions on the budget ahead of the adoption of the Final Budget. It is also possible to hold a Special Meeting if more discussion is needed. There are still two months until the Final Budget will be adopted by the City Council.

Council Member Williams believes it is important to consider what is truly needed. Administrator Darrington pointed out that the role of the City Council is to determine what is needed and what is not. Staff is a recommending body, but ultimately the City Council makes the decisions. The City Council determines how the money is spent and the Staff makes sure that the City Council is able to make an informed decision. Administrator Darrington asked to further review the utility rate information. In two weeks, there will be a review of the operational costs and capital costs.

When the City Council provides feedback to Staff, the intention is to look into the matter and return with answers. There are still some items that Staff is looking into, such as the custodial and 401(k) information. Administrator Darrington explained that Staff looks into ways to reduce certain numbers before anything is ever presented to the City Council. As for the utility rates, his preference is to stay with the rates, because there are costs that need to be taken care of. The water, sewer, and storm drain needs can be costly. Council Member Williams would like to see information about revenues and expenses based on the current utilities. Administrator Darrington explained that this information is available and shows what is generated with the revenue and what the expenses are. Additional discussions were had about the utility rates.

Director Winterton reported that the projects that have been awarded in the last couple of months are mostly budgeted in Fiscal Year 2026. In the last few weeks, he has engaged with a company that does a lot of rate studies and performs a lot of Master Plans. Currently, Horrocks Engineers is updating Utility Master Plans for all of the utilities. That will then transition into a Rate Study that will look into the Five-Year Plan. From there is an Impact Fee Facility Plan. There is also a mandate for tiered rates associated with pressurized irrigation (“PI”). Council Member Andersen asked if the tiered rates have been mandated as part of the metering, which was confirmed.

Administrator Darrington thanked the City Council for making difficult decisions. It is not an easy position to be in and he appreciates their willingness to serve. Council Member Rogers asked for an update on the downtown area. Administrator Darrington reported that TestOut has a mandate that the front must be done by July 1, 2025, or there will be a fine received. He also reported that there is a meeting with the Mountainland Association of Governments (“MAG”) about a grant. The next step is to hold the first meeting with the business owners and property owners in order to receive input. There is a list compiled of all the business and property owners in the downtown area. The intention is to meet on May 2, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. in City Hall to start those discussions.

Additional information was shared. Director Cardenas reported that there is a steakhouse restaurant coming to The Grove. There was also a pre-construction meeting held recently and the final stages are underway for a new hotel. Discussions were had about access locations.

Human Resources Director, David Packard, reported that the annual recognition event will take place on Thursday. There will be awards and raffle prizes. It will take place at the Recreation Center from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. Council Member Jensen reported that the Discovery Park cleanup is scheduled for April 22, 2025, at 11:30 p.m. One hour will be spent cleaning the playground area. Mayor Fugal shared the 2025 City Council assignments with Council Members.

12) **REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE APRIL 22, 2025, CITY COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA.**

It was reiterated that the next City Council Meeting will include additional budget discussions.

13) **MAYOR AND COUNCIL BUSINESS.**

There were no additional items discussed.

14) **SIGNING OF PLATS**

15) **REVIEW CALENDAR**

16) **ADJOURN**

ACTION: At 8:44 p.m. Council Member Williams moved to ADJOURN. Council Member Andersen seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Council Members Andersen, Rogers, Jensen, and Williams voting “Yes”. Council Member LeMone was absent. The City Council Minutes of April 8, 2025, were approved by the City Council on May 20, 2025.



Wendy Thorpe, CMC
City Recorder

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