

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF CEDAR HILLS
Tuesday, May 6, 2025 – 6:00 PM
Community Recreation Center
10640 North Clubhouse Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah**

Present: Mayor Denise Andersen, Presiding
Council Member Mike Geddes
Council Member Laura Ellison
Council Member Bob Morgan
Council Member Erika Price

Absent/Excused: Council Member Kelly Smith

Staff: Chandler Goodwin, City Manager
Charl Louw, Finance Director
Greg Gordon, Recreation Director
Kevin Anderson, Public Works Director
Hyrum Bosserman, City Attorney
Coleen Mulvey, City Recorder
Lieutenant Kevin Doyl

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

1. Call to Order, Pledge, and Invocation.

The City Council Meeting of the City of Cedar Hills, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mayor Andersen.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Boy Scout Patrol Leader, Bennet Davis.

The Invocation was offered by Mayor Andersen.

2. Approval of Meeting Agenda.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to APPROVE the Meeting Agenda. Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Absent. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment.

Susan Proctor gave her address as 4096 West Cedar Hills Drive and explained that she has concerns about speeding on Cedar Hills Drive. Something needs to be done on that road, as there have been many instances where vehicles are over the speed limit. A few weeks ago, she called and asked someone to come out, but it took an hour for someone to arrive. She understands

speeding is not the biggest priority when it comes to enforcement, but there needs to be more of a presence. When the officer eventually arrived, she was told there would be three or four officers assigned to address the speeding situation, but she did not know what area that would cover.

Henry Price lives at 4152 West Oak Road North and commented on the options for Mesquite Park. He saw that some ideas were targeted to an older demographic, and some were targeted to toddlers. He suggested that one of the less expensive alternatives be selected that applies to the older demographic while also saving some money for a toddler area. Council Member Geddes asked what someone his age would like to see at the park. Mr. Price explained that people his age want to see slides and places to climb. He mentioned the ropes course at Harvey Park. For younger children, Heritage Park has a section with logs and climbing rocks.

Shantell Kanigan gave her address as 10167 North Pinion Drive. She knows there have been issues in the past with teens wanting to use the golf course after dark. Additionally, she has heard about issues with teens at Walmart and the mischief that happens. She suggested there be a volunteer program where after 10 hours of volunteer time, teens are given a round of short-course golf as an incentive. Cedar Hills can promote volunteering, which connects to the Year of Kindness. However, it can also distract from the mischief that has been happening. The program would provide alternatives for teenagers and also benefit the community with volunteer hours.

Kristen Trelz lives at 4064 West Cedar Hills Drive and shared a comment about the excessive speeding that is happening. The speed hump was taken out, which she and her husband spoke to the Mayor about. At that time, they were informed that speed humps are not beneficial and more will not be added. She referenced Cedar Hills Drive and Canyon Road. On Cedar Hills Drive, there has been excessive speeding, and it has gotten worse since the paving was completed. It is difficult for those living on Cedar Hills Drive to safely pull out of their driveways.

There is speeding happening, but there is no police presence in the area. It is an unsafe environment. Ms. Trelz would like to see the speed hump go back in or see something added to show drivers what their vehicle speeds are. City Manager, Chandler Goodwin, reported that a few speed humps were removed, including one on Redwood Drive. One will likely be taken out on Deerfield Lane as well. Ms. Trelz pointed out that Cedar Hills Drive is busier and there are issues there. Mr. Goodwin clarified that Harvey Boulevard and Cedar Hills Drive are classified as regional collector roads and are similar in terms of the average daily traffic counts. There have been speed signs on both of those roads before. There is awareness of the problems that exist, and the City is doing everything possible to address them. A flashing speed sign can be added.

There were no further comments. The public comment period was closed.

CITY REPORTS AND BUSINESS

4. Mayor and Council, City Manager, and Staff.

Mr. Goodwin reported that on May 20, 2025, there will be a Pressurized Irrigation (“PI”) Town Hall Meeting at 6:00 p.m. The City Council Meeting will be moved to 7:00 p.m. to accommodate the Town Hall Meeting. During the meeting, there will be a presentation from the engineer about

the rate structure. There will also be information shared about the rationale, how to read a bill, the allotment, and how to use the PI calculator. Information is currently available on the City website, so residents can start to educate themselves ahead of the Town Hall Meeting. Mr. Goodwin next shared information about Municipal Candidacy filing. The filing dates are from June 2 through June 6, 2025. There are two Council seats open and one Mayoral seat for four-year terms.

Council Member Morgan attended the Utah League of Cities and Towns (“ULCT”) conference in St. George. It was a meaningful experience and there was a lot of information shared about security. For example, issues with websites, emails, and social media platforms.

Council Member Ellison thanked everyone for their help with the Easter Egg Hunt. She feels the event was successful and expressed gratitude to all who assisted and attended. There was a strong turnout with a lot of children. She is open to hearing feedback about the seasonal event.

Mayor Andersen reported that at a recent ULCT meeting, there was a mention of the last Legislative Session. During the session, there were a record 959 bills introduced, and 582 bills passed. ULCT tracked 279 of those bills, which were bills that impacted cities in one way or another. She explained that ULCT does a good job of tracking the bills and keeping cities informed. Mayor Andersen recently attended a UTOPIA Board Meeting. She reminded Council Members that UTPOIA is a fiber provider. An update was provided on the health of the company. UTOPIA currently has 73,000 customers, cities are being added all the time, and it is a reliable service. Mayor Andersen next shared information about the recent Winter Response Task Force Meeting. This is the Task Force that deals with warming centers for the unhoused population. The Winter Response Task Force is currently working on a plan for the 2025/2026 winter. Last winter, the warming centers serviced over 600 unique individuals and there were over 500 unique volunteers. The warming centers averaged 77 people per night and had a peak of 113. There are three warming centers in the County and the night that each center is used alternates.

Council Member Price reported that volunteers are being gathered for the Beautification, Recreation, Parks and Trails Committee. Anyone interested is asked to reach out. Council Member Price had the opportunity to register as a Merit Badge Counselor so she could work on citizenship in the community with Boy Scout Troop 100. As for the behavior at Walmart that was mentioned during the public comment period, she met with the manager there who confirmed that there is a problem with teenagers. The current policy at Walmart is to not ask anyone to leave. However, some teenagers are climbing the shelves, bouncing balls across aisles, and causing safety issues. Shoplifting is another concern. The manager hopes that by not asking people to leave, there will be enough time for the police to arrive, issue tickets, and call the parents.

Council Member Geddes reported that the Family Festival is approximately three weeks away. Based on what he has heard from the Committee, everything is currently moving forward as planned.

Recreation Director, Greg Gordon, reported that the night golf tournament, Tee Party After Dark, will take place on May 20, 2025. Vista Room Events Manager, Becky Galloway, is currently attending a Wedding Expo. The Golf Course has been extremely busy and has not stopped since

the course opened for the year. Some staff was hired and now it is a matter of training. There are three tournaments this week and 65 tournaments are booked this year, which is more than last year.

Mr. Gordon noted that tot soccer and kindergarten through the second grade are currently in season. Registration just closed for T-ball and Coach Pitch. The programs still open for registration include the pickleball tournament, summer camps, and bowling. The second hockey clinic is coming up soon. Mr. Gordon reported that the Family Festival Magazine should be out shortly and will likely be received by the weekend.

Public Works Director, Kevin Anderson, asked residents to notify the City if there are issues seen with the sprinklers in the parks. On Cedar Hills Drive, the manholes will be collared in two weeks. There will be striping before the Family Festival. Work started earlier in the day with the SCADA company that was hired for the water system and there is excitement for that to move forward.

Finance Director, Charl Louw, reported that on Monday there was a Contractors' Meeting hosted in the City Council Chambers related to improvements to that building. There was a decent turnout, and bids are due by May 15, 2025.

SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

5. Review/Action and Public Hearing on Final Plan Approval for Milkshake Madness, Lot 6 Plat C Phase II Cedar Hills Gateway Subdivision, Located in the SC-1 Commercial Zone.

Mr. Goodwin explained that this is the Final Plan approval for Milkshake Madness. He shared a map of the area and pointed out the location. The property is currently where Swig queues their drive-thru line, but there has been outreach to Swig asking for a new drive-thru plan since the current one does not work effectively. The applicant building in this case is a 5,000 square foot retail building that will house a drive-thru and two retail tenants.

The main issue has to do with how the drive-thru will interact with everything else in the area. Milkshake Madness will have the menu boards on the east end of the building and the window for pickup will be located on the northwest corner of the building. It is possible to stack nine vehicles there. There is also room to stack another five vehicles before they spill out into the common drive for the retail pads. This means 14 vehicles can be stacked before it starts to obstruct traffic. The traffic study shows there is a maximum of 34 drive-thru vehicles during their peak PM period. It is anticipated that the service rate will be 132 seconds. Based on that rate of service and the expected queue, there will be a maximum of seven vehicles queued in the drive-thru at a time.

Mr. Goodwin shared the architectural renderings and pointed out the red brick and black trim. That style of building is quite popular and there has been positive feedback received. He explained that this location would have a limited menu with milkshakes and fries. Mr. Goodwin presented the Photometric Plan, which shows the amount of light at any given spot on the property. This is not next to a residential property, so he is less concerned about the lights, as homes will not really see this building. There is some light that spills into 4700 West, but light spilling into a public street is not problematic. He does not have any concerns about the Photometric Plan that has been

submitted by the applicant. When a motion is made, it is his recommendation that the language mention the need to follow the red lines related to the engineering feedback and that the correct palette of appropriate landscaping plants be selected. Mr. Goodwin noted that the Final Plan approval language needs to be subject to final engineering review and final building, zoning, and code compliance.

Council Member Price asked about the construction start. Mr. Goodwin believes there is a desire to move forward in the next several months. Building Plans are expected to be submitted shortly.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing was closed.

MOTION: Council Member Geddes moved to APPROVE the Final Plan for the Commercial Development, Milkshake Madness, Lot 6 Plat C Phase II of the Cedar Hills Gateway Subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Final engineering review.**
- 2. Final zoning review, including compliance with City Code 10-6A, and a landscaping review with a selection of appropriate palettes.**
- 3. Verification of water rights conveyed to the City.**

Council Member Price seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Absent. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Review/Action and Public Hearing on Preliminary/Final Lot Split Plan for a Commercial Development at 4773 West Cedar Hills Drive, Located in the Cedar Hills Retail Center Subdivision.

Mr. Goodwin explained that this is a Preliminary and Final Lot Split Plan for property located at 4773 West Cedar Hills Drive. The property is 1.47 acres, and the proposal is to split the parcel into two separate commercial lots. He pointed out the location on a map of the area. In 2014, an American First Credit Union was approved for this site, but the development never took place. However, there are now some proposals moving through the Planning Commission process. In order for those proposals to move forward, a lot split is needed. There are two representatives from the engineering firm working on this portion of the project available to answer Council Member questions. Mr. Goodwin reiterated that the request is to split the lot. There would not be any new access points beyond what is already seen.

The intention is to have two separate entities submit applications for development on the parcel in the coming months. Both projects will have a drive-thru. As for the utilities, the lot is ready to be connected to all City utilities except stormwater. All of the stormwater would need to be retained on site. Mr. Goodwin explained that those kinds of details will be considered in the future. At this time, the City Council is considering the lot split proposal to shift from one to two parcels.

Mayor Andersen referenced the survey that was conducted recently. There seems to be a perception that the City brings businesses in, but that is not the case. Developers are the ones that bring in the businesses. If a business use complies with the City Code, then it must be approved. She understands there is some frustration from residents about repeat business types, but the City does not choose what businesses come in. The City is grateful for all businesses that want to operate in Cedar Hills. She feels the commercial zone is turning out well as far as the overall look.

Council Member Ellison noted that dividing the parcel into two will allow two businesses to be in the area. She asked about having two drive-thru formats in the same location. Mr. Goodwin explained that there will need to be a traffic study to determine the anticipated traffic flow through each portion of the site. He pointed out that this is three times the size of the Milkshake Madness location. Even if this parcel is divided in half, both of the parcels will still be larger than the Milkshake Madness one. However, it is important to make sure there is no queuing on roads.

Drive-thru areas are designed to accommodate the expected average demand. However, when there is a special promotion, the lines will likely be longer than the expected average demand. One example is when Swig had a drink promotion for one dollar. That was something the City had to manage. Under normal circumstances, the drive-thru areas are expected to operate within the capacity. It is not possible to design a drive-thru for an event with a higher volume.

Council Member Geddes asked whether the lot is being split into four or two. Mr. Goodwin explained that it is currently one parcel, and the proposal is to split it into two. Lots 1 and 2 already exist with that split down the middle. He reported that the Planning Commission's concern had to do with a recorded mechanism that allows for shared access. It is common for retail pads like this to have shared access. Mr. Goodwin reiterated that the lot split needs to be finalized ahead of the other applications. Council Member Geddes asked if there is any indication of what businesses will be located there. Mr. Goodwin clarified that there has been information provided about the businesses. He believes those Planning Commission discussions will take place this month. Council Member Geddes wanted to know about water rights. Mr. Goodwin reported that some residual water rights were left over. There likely would have been enough water for a credit union, but for two restaurant-style retail pads, there is not enough. Work will need to be done to determine how the water rights will be divided. There will need to be a conveyance of some water rights to the City.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing.

Susan Proctor gave her address as 4096 West Cedar Hills Drive. She expressed concerns about the traffic in the area and discussed the existing traffic associated with Walmart. Ms. Proctor also noted that she has seen vehicles make a U-turn to access the nearby dollar store.

Mr. Goodwin shared a diagram with those present and pointed out the accesses. There is full access in and out on the south end of the property. In addition, there is a full access in and out on the east end of the property. There is also a right-in-right-out on the north end of the property. There is a stub out for a full access on the south end of the property as well. There is awareness of the existing traffic issues, such as U-turns to enter the area. Work is being done to revamp the

stacking capabilities of the intersection as people move through. However, there are three parts associated with that project, including the realignment of the intersection. During the last round of Transportation Improvement Program financing the City went through with the Mountainland Association of Governments (“MAG”), the City put forward a proposal to have this issue addressed. Work has been done on a proposed plan and there has been collaboration with Highland, Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”), the County, and Alpine School District.

Shantell Kanigan gave her address as 10167 North Pinion Drive. She believed that doubling the businesses would mean doubling the taxes for the City. Mayor Andersen stated that each business will contribute sales tax. Mr. Goodwin explained that a lot depends on the nature of the business.

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

MOTION: Council Member Morgan moved to APPROVE the Preliminary and Final Plan for the Lot Split Plan for a Commercial Development at 4773 West Cedar Hills Drive, Located in the Cedar Hills Retail Center Subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Final engineering review.**
- 2. Common Access Agreement between the owners.**

Council Member Ellison seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Absent. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Review/Action and Public Hearing on Amendments to the Moderate-Income Housing Element of the Cedar Hills General Plan.

Mr. Goodwin stated that Utah Code Sections 10-9a-403 and 17-27a-403 require municipalities and counties to include a Moderate-Income Housing element in their General Plan. As part of the Moderate-Income Housing element, the City has to show the trends and demographics in the community compared to the average median income (“AMI”) of the County. It is also necessary to show what the housing stock looks like and what the needs are in the community for moderate-income housing. Cedar Hills is working to comply with the State requirements. It takes a lot of time to do so, and he feels this element is an ineffective way to promote moderate-income housing. However, the City has to choose three strategies to pursue in order to promote moderate-income housing within the community. The three strategies were:

- Allow for accessory dwelling units (“ADU”) throughout the community;
- Allow for single-room occupancy;
- The mixed retail component where part of the commercial zone allows for mixed-use commercial/residential.

Mr. Goodwin shared additional information about the mixed retail component. That resulted in Lone Peak Lofts, but none of that is considered affordable. The City received direction from the

State that a new strategy needed to be selected. At the end of last year, there was work done with the Attainable Housing Agency (“AHA”). He asked the State whether a partnership with AHA qualifies as one of the strategies, which was confirmed. The three strategies are now as follows:

- (E) Create or allow for, and reduce regulations related to, internal or detached accessory dwelling units in residential zones;
- (I) Amend land use regulations to allow for single-room occupancy developments;
- (O) Apply for or partner with an entity that applies for State or Federal funds or tax incentives to promote the construction of moderate-income housing, an entity that applies for programs offered by the Utah Housing Corporation within that agency’s funding capacity, an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by the Department of Workforce Services, an entity that applies for affordable housing programs administered by an association of governments established by an interlocal agreement under Title 11, Chapter 13, Interlocal Cooperation Act, an entity that applies for services provided by a public housing authority to preserve and create moderate income housing, or any other entity that applies for programs or services that promote the construction or preservation of moderate income housing.

Mr. Goodwin reported that as part of the Moderate-Income Housing Plan, there needs to be a five-year implementation plan. This outlines the goal, promotion, and outlined action steps. The City also needs to tell the State what barriers there are to implementation. Since the third strategy is a new one for the City, he is currently unable to speak to the barriers that exist. There have been residents who have asked questions about AHA and information has been sent out, but he does not know that an application has been made to AHA at this time. Mr. Goodwin informed the Council that the Moderate-Income Housing Plan has been rewritten to update the local conditions. He explained that some ambiguities were clarified, and some sections were reworded. The strategies were also updated, as mentioned. The Planning Commission has already reviewed the element.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The hearing was closed.

MOTION: Council Member Geddes moved to ADOPT the Moderate-Income Housing Element of the Cedar Hills General Plan. Council Member Price seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Absent. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Discussion on the 2025 Decisions Survey.

Mr. Goodwin explained that this item relates to the Cedar Hills community survey, which gathered resident feedback on the quality of life, City priorities, facility usage, service satisfaction, and demographic information. He reported that the survey is released every two years. Some of the same questions are asked each time to see what trends and patterns there are. The survey also attempts to address some more topical issues, such as public safety and parks. The survey results make it possible to understand areas of focus and budget priorities.

Overall, residents are satisfied with life in Cedar Hills, as the Quality of Life rating was an average of 4.5/5. Residents like the schools and the atmosphere of the City. The natural setting, mountain views, and small-town atmosphere were frequently praised in the open comment sections. As for recreation options, there is a desire to see more, especially when it comes to active recreation for teenagers. As far as priorities in the communities, the main ones mentioned include parks and trails enhancement, fiscal responsibility, and open space preservation. Residents were asked how many times they visit a park, and the responses indicate that there is a lot of park use. The trail system is also something that residents are interested in. When it comes to golf, a lot of the use is coming from out of town. The City could choose to focus on bringing more residents to the course.

Mr. Goodwin noted that the survey asked whether the City is taking adequate measures in certain areas. Areas with lower satisfaction include: street construction and maintenance and tax/utility rate limitations. Mr. Goodwin reported that the City has not raised taxes in approximately 17 years. The City can further communicate to residents how the property tax amount breaks down. There is an opportunity to discuss where the communication efforts should be focused in the future.

Mr. Goodwin shared information about the street conditions results. Another survey question that has previously been used to benchmark relates to the City's communication efforts. There are many different communication types, including the newsletter, City website, and City emails, which are the three highest-rated methods of communication-based on the survey results. Other communication types include: public meetings, social media, automated text messages, and automated phone calls. There is not a lot of support for automated phone calls. It is not something that the City does often and normally only happens when something needs to be communicated immediately. The survey asked residents whether they would watch City Council Meetings if the meetings were available via livestream and a lot of survey respondents indicated that they would.

The City services were rated in the survey. Mr. Goodwin reported that garbage collection always scores highly. Code enforcement is usually lower because those who have interacted with code enforcement usually do so when there is a difficult or troubling situation. Mr. Goodwin noted that park maintenance scored high on the survey. As for a future City priority, protecting open space is important to the residents. There is a desire to protect the quality of life. Something that was mentioned frequently in the comments was the desire for recreational opportunities. Council Member Ellison asked about the overall return rate for the survey. Mr. Goodwin reported that there were 365 responses. In 2023, there were 341 responses, and in 2021, there were 651.

Council Member Geddes asked about the number of ADUs that are registered. Mr. Goodwin reported that there are between 50 and 60 that are registered with the City. He estimates that 8% to 11% of the homes in Cedar Hills have an ADU.

Mr. Goodwin reported that he took the surveys from 2021, 2023, and 2025, to compare some of the results. Based on the analysis, community priorities have evolved significantly with open space preservation rising to the top. Reducing taxes used to be the priority. Street maintenance satisfaction has declined substantially, indicating some infrastructure challenges. Parks and trail usage has increased dramatically, which is wonderful to see. The golf course sentiment has also evolved over time. In 2021, most of the open-ended questions related to golf were negative. In 2025, there were a lot of positive comments. In 2021, there were 27 comments related to a library,

but in 2025, there were 49 comments. Based on the survey results, it is clear there is information that can be communicated to residents to help them better understand the challenges the City faces when it comes to infrastructure and streets. It is also possible to explain the tax bill, utility rates, and other items. There are areas the City can focus communication efforts on moving forward.

9. Review/Action on an Ordinance Enacting a Moratorium on Inter-Judicial Road Connections to Cedar Hills.

Mr. Goodwin explained that this ordinance would impose a 180-day moratorium on processing or approving any applications that seek to create new connecting roads or access points between Cedar Hills and adjacent municipalities. There are no active applications at this time. The moratorium would allow the City Council time to review and update the General Plan, ordinances, and policies related to inter-municipal connecting roads. Mr. Goodwin explained that during the 180-day moratorium period, the City Council will:

- Review and study potential impacts of inter-municipal connecting roads;
- Seek input from the Planning Commission and City Staff on potential issues;
- Update the General Plan and related ordinances and policies to address concerns;
- Consider whether to permanently prohibit new inter-municipal connecting roads.

City Attorney, Hyrum Bosserman, referenced some boundary disputes with Pleasant Grove, which will be discussed at the next City Council Meeting. There have been discussions about potential new roadways coming into the City. One past example was a road from the charter school, which was discussed in 2024, but no formal application was submitted. There was a traffic study that indicated there would be significant traffic concerns if that road was approved. It is wise and prudent to pause any applications related to inter-municipal road connections. There are not any currently, but the moratorium is necessary in the event that there could be an application of that kind.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to APPROVE Ordinance No. 05-06-2025A, an Ordinance Enacting a Temporary Zoning Regulation, Placing a Moratorium on New Applications for Access Points Between Cedar Hills and Adjacent Municipalities, and Direct Staff and the Planning Commission to Make Recommendations to the City Council. Council Member Morgan seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Yes, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Absent. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Review/Action and Public Hearing on a Resolution Adopting Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Amendments.

Mr. Louw explained that Staff is proposing some budget amendments for Fiscal Year 2025. He explained this relates to Capital Project adjustments. The first is a \$60,000 increase in professional fees for John Fought Design to create construction documents. This is a one-time expenditure that would use Golf Fund reserves. There is also a \$50,000 increase to capital outlay for increased water pressure on Holes 13, 14, and 15. This one-time expenditure would also use Golf Fund reserves. There is a \$250,000 increase for park renewal to replace equipment that has reached its

useful life and is developing cracks. This is funded by PARC tax revenues and Capital Project Fund unrestricted reserves. There is also a decrease listed for building improvements, eliminating the addition at the golf course and converting the Public Safety Building into City Council Chambers instead. There is a \$50,000 decrease in expenditures because the landscape improvements for the new addition have been eliminated.

Mr. Louw shared information about playground equipment. He explained that playground equipment is built for ages 2 to 5 and ages 5 to 12. He asked for clear guidance on what age group to focus on for Mesquite Park. Mr. Louw noted that it is possible to expand slightly north without adding significant costs, but there is a narrow footprint. Council Member Ellison commented that swing sets are nice but acknowledged that there are footprint limitations.

Council Member Price asked if the current equipment is showing dangerous signs of wear. Mr. Louw reported that there is cracking. There is better quality equipment out there now, which will look new a lot longer and will also last longer. Council Member Price explained that some of the previously presented plans were reviewed by her family members. There was no agreement about anything except for the need to have shade. Mr. Louw stated that his main recommendation is to do something different than the other parks so something else is offered to residents. When it comes to shade, it is important to remember that there are associated maintenance needs. Staff is not being expanded for the parks and shade structures have to be taken down in the winter.

Additional discussions were had about shade sails and different ways to provide shade. Mr. Louw pointed out that there are costs associated with those kinds of additions. Mayor Andersen feels it is important to determine the priorities. It might make sense to table this discussion because the City Council needs to determine what the priorities are and the order of those priorities. Council Member Geddes stated that Mesquite Park is popular for soccer, flag football, and field uses.

Mayor Andersen noted that the City Council does not need to make a decision about the park at this time, as the Fiscal Year 2025 budget amendments are currently before the Council. There will need to be additional conversations about the equipment and the priorities. At the last City Council Meeting, it was determined that Mesquite Park seemed like a priority, but there was not a determination made about the budget. It was noted that Council Member Ellison left the City Council Meeting at 7:35 p.m. Council Member Morgan agreed with Council Member Geddes that Mesquite Park is mainly used for the field. It seems that the playground is more of an afterthought. He does not believe it makes sense to spend more than what has already been budgeted there.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing.

Susan Proctor gave her address as 4096 West Cedar Hills Drive. She believes a Recreation Center would be beneficial for residents of all ages, including teenagers. It would also be good for seniors. Mayor Andersen reported that during the open comments in the survey, there were a lot of similar comments made. However, the survey respondents also did not want to see taxes raised. Something like a Recreation Center could cost as much as the annual budget for the City. It is hard to provide everything there is a desire to see in the community without raising taxes.

Ms. Proctor stated that she has spoken to people in her neighborhood about these kinds of issues. Many of the people she has spoken to have expressed a willingness to see taxes raised for certain additions to be made. Mayor Andersen believes some would agree with that and some would disagree with that. It is hard to balance the different needs of residents.

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

MOTION: Council Member Morgan moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 05-06-2025A, a Resolution Adopting Fiscal Year 2025 Budget Amendments. Council Member Geddes seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Absent, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Absent. The motion passed unanimously.

11. Review/Action and Public Hearing on a Resolution Adopting the Tentative Fiscal Year Budget (July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026).

Mr. Louw explained this item relates to the Tentative Fiscal Year Budget for July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2026. The City is required to hold a public hearing and approve a Tentative Budget by the first City Council Meeting in May. The Final Budget is not required to be approved until June, so discussions will continue.

Mr. Louw explained that this is a difficult budget year. Each time that he presents budget information, he focuses on a different fund. During the current City Council Meeting, he will review the Golf Fund. He shared a PowerPoint presentation titled Golf Fund Review: Tentative Budget. It includes a comparison to other cities, including Springville and Payson.

Mr. Louw stated there is strong demand for golf in north Utah County and Cedar Hills is part of that. Mr. Louw reviewed some of the City's golf course highlights:

- Cedar Hills Golf opened without a permanent building for operations or maintenance in 2003. A GO bond was issued in 2005 for \$6.25 million;
- Up to Fiscal Year 2012, the Golf Fund was allowed to run a negative operating cash balance and not have realistic budgets;
- In Fiscal Year 2013, the City adjusted sales tax calculations appropriately, refinanced golf bonds, and the City Council approved the use of all the reserves in the Capital Projects Fund to pay off the negative cash balance of \$2.3 million and to provide an operating subsidy of \$140,000 from the General Fund to offset operating losses;
- Between 2015 and 2024, there was an equipment replacement plan initiated for \$757,000;
- In 2016, the State Auditor required all City properties to pay utility funds for water and sewer use, which was estimated at \$31,000 based on the bulk commercial water rate;
- In 2016, the Golf Course Committee confirmed the golf course was an asset to the City and recommended supporting the course with \$200,000 from the General Fund with inflation of approximately 3% going forward to fund the maintenance equipment that needed to be replaced;

- Between 2016 and 2018, there was \$300,000 put aside for the golf maintenance building needs;
- In 2019, there was \$176,000 needed for a taller, more durable practice range fence;
- In 2022, there was \$1.1 million needed to build a short course instead of a driving range, increase the putting green size, and make adjustments to Hole #1;
- In 2024, there was \$226,000 needed to replace the golf cart bridge.

Mr. Louw shared a graph for the Cedar Hills Overall Related Revenues - Fiscal Years 2013-2025 Projected. It looks at golf, events, and concessions. He next shared a graph for the Golf Fund Net Revenues (Expenditures) Excluding Subsidies and the Historical Golf/Events Subsidy Amount Each Fiscal Year. There is a trend of the golf course being able to pay for most of its improvements in the last few years. Mr. Louw reported that there has been some discussion about a golf simulator, so he looked into some that are in the area. There are some in Pleasant Grove, Highland, and American Fork. He wanted to determine whether the market was saturated in this area. It was noted that most of the golfers are coming from neighboring cities where there are already simulators. Given the availability, he is not sure someone would come to use a simulator here.

Mr. Louw reviewed some of the Golf Fund Budget Highlights with the City Council:

- Overall revenue growth has been strong since 2020, which is higher than Springville's Hobble Creek course and slightly lower than Payson's Gladstan course, which means there is potential for better or worse revenues depending on the level of course maintenance and the management of the pro shop;
- There is a three-year average for golf and event revenues. The expectation is for the actuals next year to be higher if the demand and business model remain the same;
- There is strong potential to improve operating margins, which has been difficult in the past with some inflationary costs. It is important to be mindful to improve the operating margins going forward to fund future needs with conservative revenue budgets and strategic spending for operations;
- The Cedar Hills course needs a healthy nursery green. To repair and expand is \$90,000;
- The Cedar Hills course Holes #13, 14, and 15 need better pressure either through an additional pump or connection to the City's upper PI system;
- The Cedar Hills course needs to replace the irrigation system, because of failing PVC, which will cost approximately \$4 million;
- Many sand bunkers were no longer maintained in 2022, but most have not been regraded and sodded. Some of the par 3 tee boxes still need to be expanded to handle the higher volume and the wear and tear. After 20 years most of the green footprints have shrunk;
- The Community Services Director allocation changed from 75% to 90% for the next fiscal year events and golf;
- The golf administrative support is \$85,000 in wages and benefits;
- The golf simulator project is estimated to have a one-time cost of \$250,000. Golf staff estimates \$360,000 a year in revenues and \$94,000 in annual expenditures;
- Golf operations were subsidized for several years by the General Fund and Capital Projects Fund. Staff proposes a contribution of \$40,000 from the Golf Fund to help while sales tax revenues are trending down.

Mr. Louw next reviewed the General Fund Budget Priorities and Budget Updates:

- Maintain stable service levels for most line items with inflation and flat or declining tax revenues;
- Staff merit and cost of living adjustment ("COLA") is proposed at 2.89% for Tier 1 and 3% for Tier 2 salary increases with 3% health insurance;
- Sales tax revenues three-year average is \$36,000;
- Passport staff has adjusted the schedule to bring in another \$25,000;
- Cell phone tower revenues are \$26,000;
- Golf Fund operations to transfer \$40,000 to the General Fund;
- General Fund to use rainy day reserves of \$10,000;
- Legal and litigation increases;
- Potential increase of \$19,000 for welfare-related items, such as Meals on Wheels;
- Building and zoning functions were consolidated in the current fiscal year;
- The Community Services Director's allocation was adjusted;
- \$24,000 in library reimbursements eliminated.

The Capital Projects Fund Highlights were shared with the City Council:

- \$1.6 million in unrestricted reserves and \$250,000 in restricted street reserves;
- No contributions from the General Fund or Golf Fund;
- Minimal impact fees;
- Flat PARC tax revenues of \$95,000;
- \$260,000 for the Harvey widening project funded by the Mountainland Association of Governments, Pleasant Grove, and restricted impact fee reserves;
- Mesquite playground equipment replacement and wood fiber is listed as \$250,000;
- City Council Chambers and other offices in the Public Safety Building up to \$400,000.

Mr. Louw reviewed some of the Water and Sewer Fund Highlights:

- The Timpanogos Special Service District ("TSSD") Board approved a 15% increase for January 2026;
- Water conservation expected with Aquatrax app usage;
- Storm drain expected to be flat without housing growth;
- New seasonal irrigation usage adds uncertainty to \$261,000 in budgeted water revenues;
- Grant projects and related revenue should be completed in the previous fiscal year;
- Four utility revenue bonds with \$748,000 in total debt service costs;
- \$616,000 vacuum truck purchase;
- Staff water, sewer, and storm drain allocations updated to reflect more time spent on water line repairs and meters;
- A minimum debt service coverage of 1.25 is attainable if there are no material expense adjustments to the budget.

The Motor Pool Fund Highlights were shared with the City Council:

- Flat motor pool charges to other funds expected;
- Pickup truck replacement for golf staff;
- Pickup truck replacement for Public Works staff;
- Heavy-duty pickup truck replacement for Public Works staff, if pricing makes sense;
- Breakout of General Fund expenses for Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Louw reported that some challenges face bedroom communities. Some examples include limited revenue sources, infrastructure costs, economic dependency, housing market fluctuations, and service demand. Not all apply to Cedar Hills, but some do. For instance, Cedar Hills has a heavy reliance on sales tax revenues. Maintaining infrastructure is expensive and smaller projects are usually more expensive than larger projects without the economies of scale. Mr. Louw explained that the City relies on contracted partners to keep overall costs stable for items such as sewer processing, supplementary water, public safety, and garbage removal.

Mr. Louw reviewed information about the limited resources available. He next discussed the purpose of rainy day and insurance reserves. These are also known as budget stabilization funds and are crucial for small governments to manage unexpected financial challenges. These funds should be used when there are economic downturns, natural disasters, unexpected expenditures, and revenue shortfalls. Mr. Louw reported that this is the first time since he started with the City that sales tax is down annually. There have been some flat years, but it has never been down. He noted that there are also some unexpected funding requests, such as Meals on Wheels. The recommendation is a minimal drawdown of the rainy day reserves for these types of items, but there is no recommendation to fund planned contractual increases from public safety or refuse services. Planned operations should be funded with revenue increases or service cuts. Utah's economy has a reputation for rebounding faster than some other states. Once the economy has stabilized, Staff recommends no longer relying on reserves for ongoing expenditures, but only for one-time expenditures.

Council Member Price asked about the library reimbursement and how many are actually being reimbursed each year. Mr. Louw reported that the full budgeted amount was being used. Mayor Andersen stated that the only item that makes her pause is the library reimbursement. As for Meals on Wheels, the City has not been asked to fund that yet, but there is a projection included based on what could happen. Federal financing is still possible and there is some private fundraising happening. Discussions were had about the library reimbursement. Mayor Andersen noted that the number of reimbursements could be lowered, or the amount of the reimbursement could be lowered. Mr. Louw pointed out that residents will be upset about the situation whether it is lowered or eliminated. Mayor Andersen stated that there are often complaints that there is not a library. She is torn on the issue and does not know what the best path forward is for the reimbursements.

Mr. Goodwin reported that communities with a library are paying for that service through their taxes. He added that there were a lot of comments about a library in the recent survey. Mr. Louw asked if there was something that could be cut elsewhere instead of the library reimbursement. Council Member Price stated that based on earlier discussions, it sounds like the play area in Mesquite Park is a secondary concern because the field is the focus there. If that play area is secondary, then it might make sense to put in something simple. Mr. Louw expressed concerns about that approach.

Additional discussions were had about library reimbursement. Council Member Geddes referenced the demographics outlined in the resident survey and expressed support for eliminating the library reimbursement. Council Member Morgan asked whether the number of residents who received the reimbursement has been steady. Mr. Louw believed it was going down when it was at \$40, but when it was raised to \$60, it trended up a little bit. It increased to \$60 a couple of years ago. Mayor Andersen reminded those present that this is a Tentative Budget and there can be additional discussions before the Final Budget is adopted by the City Council.

Mr. Louw believes there can be communication efforts to explain that sales tax revenues are down for the first time in the City. Residents might better understand the rationale for the budget decisions with that information. Feedback can be received ahead of the Final Budget adoption. Council Member Price referenced the three priorities based on the survey results. If the library reimbursement is eliminated, then the three priorities identified will still be covered in the budget. Mr. Louw acknowledged that it is a difficult year and there can be a re-examination in future years. Mayor Andersen noted that the Tentative Budget can be passed now and there can be additional discussions in the future.

Mayor Andersen opened the public hearing.

Susan Proctor gave her address as 4096 West Cedar Hills Drive and noted that there are 400 people currently participating in the library reimbursement. She asked if there was a way to find out whether those who received the reimbursement were using the service. Mayor Andersen explained that there is no way to check that. The library card is purchased, a receipt is brought in, and the reimbursement is provided. Ms. Proctor asked whether tickets issued by Police Officers resulted in revenue for the City. Mr. Goodwin clarified that most of the money received is not related to tickets. He shared information about vandalism and pointed out that Cedar Hills does not have a Justice Court.

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

MOTION: Council Member Morgan moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 05-06-2025B, a Resolution Adopting the Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2026. Council Member Geddes seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Absent, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Absent. The motion passed unanimously.

12. Review/Action on a Resolution Adopting Specified Restrictions on Fireworks and Open Fires.

Mr. Goodwin explained that every year the City adopts a map that informs the public where there can and cannot be fireworks and open fires. This is to encourage safety in the community. Every possible measure is taken to prevent issues related to fires. The map shows areas in orange and yellow. Mr. Bosserman reported that the Fire Chief previously reviewed the map and the restricted

areas. Mr. Goodwin reported that Pleasant Grove has restrictions in place as well. Pleasant Grove also takes a proactive approach to fireworks, because there is a lot of hillside development.

MOTION: Council Member Price moved to APPROVE Resolution No. 05-06-2025C, a Resolution Adopting Specified Restrictions on Fireworks and Open Fires in Portions of the City. Council Member Geddes seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Absent, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Absent. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

13. Adjourn.

MOTION: Council Member Geddes moved to ADJOURN. Council Member Price seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Council Member Ellison-Absent, Council Member Geddes-Yes, Council Member Morgan-Yes, Council Member Price-Yes, Council Member Smith-Absent. The motion passed unanimously.

The City Council Meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Approved:
June 10, 2025

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC, UCC
City Recorder