



AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
DECEMBER 9, 2025
CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

Members Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Staci Carroll	Council Member
Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Tim Holley	Council Member
Ernie John	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Assistant City Administrator
Terilyn Lurker	City Recorder
Derric Rykert	Community Services Director
Patrick O'Brien	Development Services Director
Anna Montoya	Finance Officer
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief
George Schade	IT Director
Heather Schriever	Legal Counsel
Cameron Paul	Police Chief
Sam Kelly	PW Director

Also present: Christina Tuiaki, Deb Anderson, Will John, Mike Horan, Tyler Horan, Nathan Horan, Spencer and Summerisa Stevens and kids, Royce Shelley, Reid Shelley, Laurel Shelley, Jocelyn Shelley, Matthew Dugdale, Brandon Johnson, Ann and Robert Baxter, Karen McCoy, Loren and Emilie Lybbert and kids, Doug and Kimberlee Bethers, Scott Greenhalgh, and one additional attendee

The American Fork City Council held a public hearing in conjunction with the regular session on Tuesday, December 9, 2025, in the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 7:06 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

- Public hearing to receive input with respect to the issuance of lease revenue bonds by the Local Building Authority of the city.
Mayor Frost invited any person wishing to speak on this matter to come forward at that time and state their name for the record.

Royce Shelly stated that he was signed up to speak later on other issues but wished to comment briefly on the proposed bond. He indicated that he did not have all the details regarding the bond issuance but expressed concern about the proposed \$50 million amount, and whether the full \$50 million was necessary. He acknowledged the need for upgrades, but asked the city to carefully review costs and consider whether the project could be accomplished in a more modest and realistic manner. He concluded by thanking the Council.

Mayor Frost explained that the proposed bond issuance is intended to fund upgrades to Public Works and other essential infrastructure. He assured those present that the project would not involve construction of a large or “big box” building. As the design process moves forward, the city will take a practical approach to bringing Public Works facilities up to current standards in order to support the City’s growth.

Mayor Frost further stated that while the resolution establishes an upper funding parameter, the final project cost is expected to be less, with details to be refined through the planning and engineering process. He emphasized that the project focuses on the core operational needs of the city, including water, sewer, engineering, and other essential services, and reiterated that the approach will be practical and focused on functionality.

REGULAR SESSION

1. Pledge of Allegiance; Invocation by Council Member John; roll call.
Mayor Frost welcomed everyone to the meeting. Those present recited the Pledge of Allegiance and the invocation was offered by Council Member John. Roll call was taken.
2. Twenty-minute public comment period - limited to two minutes per person.
Ann Baxter, a resident of American Fork since 2005, expressed appreciation for what she described as a verbal agreement by city officials to move forward with a Community Cat Pilot Program and thanked the council for that decision, noting it increased her pride in being a resident of American Fork. Through the experience of adopting a kitten from the animal shelter, she became involved with the Best Friends program and the TNVR (Trap, Neuter, Vaccinate, Return) program. She noted that without such programs, cats face a significantly higher risk of euthanasia. Ms. Baxter referenced the State of Utah’s designation of 2024 as the “No Kill Shelter Year” under Governor Cox and stated that while most counties in Utah have adopted “No Kill” practices, Utah County has not yet done so. She cited a May 2023 poll indicating that 72% of local registered voters support implementation of a community cat program. She again thanked the city for agreeing to move forward with a pilot program in American Fork.

Summerisa Stephens, representing the Harrington Center of the Arts, thanked Mayor Frost and the Council for the opportunity to speak and expressed appreciation for the City’s partnership and for consideration of additional PARC funding related to the *Living Bethlehem* Christmas Market. She stated that the support allows the organization to provide meaningful experiences for American Fork families.

Ms. Stephens noted that she wished to offer two brief clarifications for the record to ensure the public timeline and context were accurate, emphasizing that these comments

were not complaints. She commented that the packet indicated the city did not charge the Harrington Center of the Arts for the new rates because the special event application had been submitted prior to adoption of those rates. She stated that the new rates were adopted on June 11, 2024. Ms. Stephens provided the following timeline: on July 23, 2024, the Harrington Center requested end-of-year amphitheater dates; in September 2024, a special event permit application was submitted. Despite both actions occurring after the new rates were adopted, the Center was charged the same rate as in 2023, which she stated aligned with an off-season nonprofit rental for a community performance. Second, Ms. Stephens addressed language in the packet stating that the Harrington Center was notified of the exact cost once the application outlining event dates was submitted. She stated that records indicate the Center requested dates for 2025 amphitheater use on July 16, 2025, and first learned that *Living Bethlehem* would be classified as a special event on October 30, less than one month prior to the scheduled event. She explained that prior understanding was based on City ordinance and a June 2024 Council discussion, which described special event fees as applying to park wide activities rather than amphitheater facility rentals, specifically the South Lawn. Ms. Stephens further clarified that the rate used in the park application reflected the amphitheater facility rate, as the event was believed to be held within a designated City facility and therefore governed by facility rental provisions rather than special event ordinance rates. She stated that the use of that rate was based on that interpretation, not an attempt to apply outdated pricing.

Ms. Stevens expressed gratitude for the PARC Tax solution proposed, stating it provides essential support for the current year's event, and thanked staff and Council for working collaboratively toward a resolution. Looking forward, she welcomed the opportunity to work with City staff and Council to clarify how holiday amphitheater events are categorized and how off-season events are handled, noting that clearer policy would benefit the City, organizers, and families. She also referenced staff efforts to review comparable facilities throughout Utah to better understand off-season rental practices. She concluded by thanking the Council again for their time and continued support of the Harrington Center of the Arts.

Royce Shelly stated that he was present to speak regarding the resolution before the American Fork City Council concerning water shares. He noted that after reviewing the resolution, he initially had several questions and expressed appreciation to the Council for helping address those concerns, specifically thanking Council Member Carroll for an email that included comments from the City Administrator, which he stated helped alleviate his concerns. He also expressed sincere appreciation for the City's commitment to honor the 2007 agreement.

Mr. Shelly stated that while he appreciated that commitment, some details remain unclear regarding what honoring the agreement will entail. He expressed a desire for greater clarity on the direction the city is heading and stated that the information provided during the Council work session held the previous Tuesday was helpful in providing additional understanding. Mr. Shelly encouraged the Council, the Irrigation Board, and any other involved parties to work toward providing more detailed information to shareholders as soon as practicable. He acknowledged that the City is managing a busy schedule and that

the matter is a significant and complex project. He concluded by thanking the Council for listening, responding to concerns, and providing information.

Karen McCoy thanked the Council for the opportunity to speak and expressed appreciation to Council Members Holley and Hunter, Mr. Bunker, and Officer Archuletta for meeting with her the previous day to discuss implementation of a TNVR (Trap, Neuter, Vaccinate, Return) program. She stated her hope that the city would move forward with the program, noting that it would be beneficial not only for animal welfare but also in reducing costs to the city associated with managing stray animals. Ms. McCoy noted that there is strong community interest in such a program, referencing support from other residents and engagement from a Utah County feral cat community group. She also referenced input from Council Member Kynaston of Woodland Hills, who she stated has been implementing a TNVR program in that city for approximately one year and shared insights from that experience. She further noted participation from a representative of Best Friends, whom she stated may be willing to assist the city by providing information and support. Ms. McCoy stated her willingness to assist personally, including serving as a trap host, loaning trapping equipment, and helping residents coordinate TNVR appointments. She emphasized the importance of ensuring cats are directed to TNVR services rather than being taken to shelters for euthanasia. She stated that as of October, Utah County is among the remaining counties without “no kill” shelter status, noting a reduction in the number of shelters achieving that designation over the past year. She thanked the Council for listening and indicated her intent to remain involved.

Loren Lybbert, a resident of the area near 700 North and 200 East, addressed the Council regarding the proposed roundabout and its potential impact on his family. He stated that his family has lived in American Fork for over 20 years and in their current home for approximately 19 years. He was concerned that the proposed roundabout would significantly increase traffic and would eliminate what little yard space his family has, including an area used as a children’s playground. He stated that the project would remove all on-street parking and require the loss of mature trees, resulting in a substantial change to the appearance and use of his property. He also expressed dissatisfaction with the compensation offered, stating that it did not adequately reflect the impact on his family and home. Mr. Lybbert stated that he and his family feel they have not been adequately heard during the process and suggested that a three-way stop could address traffic concerns at a significantly lower cost. He noted that at least two other nearby families would also be affected by the project. He concluded by stating that while his family loves American Fork and has enjoyed living in the city for many years, the proposed project would substantially alter their experience and enjoyment of their home. He thanked the Council for the opportunity to speak.

3. City Administrator's Report

Mr. Bunker reported that the Police Department held its annual “*Shop with a Cop*” event the previous Saturday. He noted that it was a meaningful experience to observe the children thoughtfully selecting gifts, often prioritizing siblings or parents. He expressed appreciation to the Police Department and the officers who volunteered their time, including several who participated on their day off, to support the event. He concluded by stating that

programs such as “*Shop with a Cop*” reflect the values of the community and help make American Fork the City that it is.

4. Council Reports

Council Member Hunter expressed appreciation for the Police Department’s recent “*Shop with a Cop*” event. He shared his own experience participating in the program, stating that he was struck by how many of the children prioritized purchasing gifts for family members rather than for themselves. He noted that it was often necessary to encourage the children to select something for themselves as well.

Council Member Hunter also commented on the City’s holiday events, including seasonal activities, light displays, Robinson Park, and opportunities for families to gather and create memories. He stated that these events help define the character of the community and emphasized the importance of being able to gather in person after recent years of limited interaction. He thanked Karen McCoy and others involved in discussions regarding the TNVR program and stated that the focus of those discussions had been on finding solutions that benefit the community rather than assigning blame. While acknowledging that the program may not resolve every issue, he stated that it represents an additional tool to help address the problem. He expressed optimism that the program could make a meaningful difference over time. Council Member Hunter concluded by thanking Mr. Bunker and City staff for their extensive work on numerous complex issues, including irrigation matters, traffic planning, and other agenda items. He acknowledged that these issues involve balancing competing interests and stated appreciation for the collaborative working relationship, even when there are differing viewpoints.

Council Member Holley expressed appreciation for Ms. McCoy who brought forward ideas, set agendas, and helped create a shared vision. He noted that while it can be easy to focus on complaints, he values residents who take initiative, organize others, and work actively to help solve problems, even when those issues may seem small. He stated that increased community involvement in these efforts ultimately improves quality of life for everyone.

Council Member Holley also thanked members of the City’s boards, committees, and commissions, referencing recent gatherings, and specifically acknowledged the Cemetery Committee and the Historic Preservation Commission for their continued service. He expressed gratitude for their year-round volunteer efforts and dedication to supporting and caring for the city. He concluded by thanking all volunteers for their contributions.

Council Member John thanked the mayor and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to work closely with Mr. Bunker, noting that while they both have strong personalities and may appear to disagree at times, he values the ability to communicate openly, learn from one another, and work collaboratively.

Council Member John echoed comments made by other Council members regarding the quality of life in American Fork, stating that after nearly 24 years in the community, it is a place where he would not choose to raise his family anywhere else. He reflected on a recent presentation by the Cemetery Committee during a work session, noting that while

he originally considered southern Utah his home, he realized through that discussion that American Fork is now truly his home and where he intends to remain. He noted that he attended a transfer station conference in Ohio, where he learned about new technologies and practices related to waste management and recycling. He expressed appreciation for the community's participation in recycling efforts and highlighted examples of successful recycling initiatives, including mattress recycling programs that divert large volumes of waste from landfills.

Council Member Carroll had nothing to report.

Council Member Taylor had nothing to report.

5. Mayor's Report

Mayor Frost presented his report and reflected on the wide range of ways municipal government impacts residents' daily lives. He noted that while national headlines often draw attention, the evening's discussion highlighted local issues such as community cats, water, parks, sewer, development, transportation, roads, and irrigation. He also referenced upcoming agenda items, including initiating the process to develop a new municipal well on the other side of the city. He stated that the breadth of topics addressed in a single meeting underscored the scope of City operations.

Mayor Frost stated that he was humbled by the way City officials and residents come together to serve the community, emphasizing the importance of local government and its direct connection to the people encountered in everyday life. He noted that although Council chambers are not always full, the evening provided a renewed appreciation for community engagement.

The mayor also shared highlights from recent holiday events he attended, noting that the season brings numerous opportunities for community involvement. He referenced participation in the "Shop with a Cop" event, holiday activities at City parks, the lighting of Main Street, and various seasonal celebrations. He also noted a senior luncheon attended by approximately 250 seniors, featuring student servers from the high school, entertainment, and prize raffles. He stated that these events reflect the many positive activities taking place throughout the city during the holiday season. He expressed gratitude for the opportunity to participate in and observe these events as part of his role as mayor and concluded his report by thanking the council and attendees for their time.

COMMON CONSENT AGENDA

(*Common Consent* is that class of Council action that requires no further discussion or which is routine in nature. All items on the Common Consent Agenda are adopted by a single motion unless removed from the Common Consent Agenda.)

1. Approval of the November 11, 2025, city council minutes.
2. Approval of the November 18, 2025, special session minutes.
3. Approval of a resolution adopting written findings of fact and conclusions of law regarding the appeal of Dunn Construction's business license denial.

4. Approval of a resolution adopting written findings of fact and conclusions of law regarding the appeal of the denial of the preliminary plat application for High Pointe Apartments Phase 2.
5. Review and action on an ordinance setting the dates, time, and place of the 2026 City Council meetings.
6. Ratification of city payments (November 12, 2025, to December 2, 2025) and approval of purchase requests over \$50,000.

Council Member Taylor moved to approve the common consent agenda. Council Member Hunter seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Clark Taylor, Council Member
SECONDER:	Ryan Hunter, Council Member
YES:	Carroll, John, Holley, Taylor, Hunter

ACTION ITEMS

1. Review and action on a resolution authorizing the issuance of lease revenue bonds by the Local Building Authority of the City.
Matthew Dugdale recognized that the City’s bond counsel, Brandon Johnson, was present and available to answer legal questions regarding the resolution. He commended the city for conducting a transparent process related to the issuance of lease revenue bonds.

Mr. Dugdale explained that the Council had previously adopted an initial resolution and that the resolution under consideration represents the final Council action in the process. He described the resolution as a “parameters” resolution, noting that it establishes the maximum bond amount, interest rate, term, and other limits, while delegating authority to the Mayor, Mr. Frost, the City Administrator, Mr. Bunker and Finance Director, Ms. Montoya to finalize bond terms within those established parameters. He further explained that because the bonds are being issued as lease revenue bonds, the process also involves the Local Building Authority, requiring compliance with statutory procedures and adoption of corresponding resolutions by both the City Council and the Building Authority. He stated that once these steps are completed, the bonding process would continue.

Mr. Dugdale reported that earlier that day the City met with a third-party credit rating analyst to review the City’s financial position. He stated that the City received very positive feedback regarding its financial strength and governance, and he commended Mr. Bunker, Ms. Montoya, and the Council for their roles in contributing to a strong credit profile.

Council Member Carroll asked what steps would follow adoption of the Parameters Resolution before the City enters the bond market. Mr. Dugdale explained that the city met with a credit rating analyst, who is assessing the City’s credit rating. He stated that a higher credit rating results in lower borrowing costs and that all indications suggest the city will receive a strong rating, potentially among the lowest borrowing costs in the state. He stated that concurrently, City staff, including Mr. Bunker and Ms. Montoya, are working on preparation of the offering document, which is overseen by bond counsel

Brandon Johnson. He explained that this legal disclosure document is provided to investors and contains information about the City, the legal structure of the bonds, bond terms, and the investment itself. He compared the bond issuance process to a corporate initial public offering, noting that the city is directly engaging with the capital markets.

Mr. Dugdale stated that the offering document is expected to be finalized shortly after the New Year, with bond sales anticipated on January 14 through a competitive bidding process. He explained that investors will submit bids and the bonds will be awarded to the bidder offering the lowest interest rate, at which point the City's interest rate will be locked in. He further stated that following the bond sale, there is a short period during which closing documents are prepared, again led by bond counsel. He indicated that the current projected closing date is February 5, at which time bond proceeds would be delivered to the city and available for use on the project.

Council members discussed the timing and amount of the proposed bond issuance in relation to project design and cost certainty. Mr. Bunker explained that the bond amount would be based on construction cost estimates rather than finalized plans or bids, noting that issuing bonds before final design is standard practice and that the City could issue less than, but not more than, the authorized amount. Any excess funds could be used to pay down the bond debt.

Council Member Carroll stated she understood the bond parameters but felt the Council lacked sufficient project information, a concern echoed by Council Member Taylor, who noted that setting a specific amount could effectively establish a spending floor.

Council Member Holley stated that he shared concerns similar to those expressed by Council Member Carroll regarding the proposed bond amount. He indicated that he would like a better overall understanding of the project, noting that \$50 million is a significant amount for a city facility. He expressed concern about the cost of public buildings, noting that such projects can exceed initial estimates or include features beyond what is necessary. While he stated that he is not opposed to constructing an updated Public Works facility, he emphasized the importance of ensuring that the project scope remains focused on what is truly needed and that the city acts responsibly on behalf of residents.

Mayor Frost asked whether adoption of a \$50 million parameters resolution would allow the City flexibility to issue bonds strategically, such as issuing a smaller amount initially if additional information becomes available or if the project is approached in phases. He stated that if the Council's intent is to remain cautious while also taking advantage of favorable market conditions, he wanted to confirm whether the parameters resolution would allow the City to issue bonds incrementally within the established limits rather than issuing the full amount immediately.

Mr. Dugdale responded that the Council does have flexibility under the parameter's resolution. He stated that the resolution may be structured to allow bonds to be issued in one or more series, enabling the City to issue a smaller portion initially—such as to take advantage of the January bond market—and return later to issue additional bonds if

needed. He noted that while multiple issuances can increase transaction costs, the bonding calendar is not fixed, and the purpose of advancing the resolution was to satisfy statutory requirements and provide the City with the ability to access the market as soon as practicable, while maintaining flexibility.

Council Member John then asked a question directed to Mr. Bunker regarding the overall approach. He asked whether the intent of the proposed bond issuance is to include all related project costs—such as architectural and engineering services—within the bond financing, rather than initially paying those costs from the general fund or reserves. He further asked whether this approach would allow the City to determine more precisely what a given bond amount (e.g., \$40–50 million) would ultimately fund once design and planning are complete.

Mr. Bunker confirmed that by having bond financing available, the city would not need to cover initial project costs internally. He stated that the bond proceeds would cover architectural, engineering, and design services, allowing those costs to be rolled into the overall financing. Council Member John acknowledged that design and professional services often account for approximately 10% of a project's initial costs and expressed understanding that incorporating those expenses into the bond financing was a significant benefit.

Council Member Carroll stated that while the parameters' resolution itself made sense, there had not yet been sufficient discussion about the details of the project itself. She expressed a desire to better understand the scope of the project and noted that it sounded like additional information could potentially be provided to the Council in the near future.

Ms. Montoya clarified that a concept plan had already been prepared and that the cost estimates were based on square footage derived from that concept plan. She explained that while formal architectural design had not yet occurred, preliminary concept-level planning had been completed. She further noted that the bond would include all associated project costs, including design, land acquisition, furniture, fixtures, non-fixed equipment, and other related expenses, allowing the entire project to be funded through the bond. She stated that this approach avoids the need for additional bonding and is the most efficient and cost-effective way to proceed.

Council Member Hunter stated that, while he did not have more information on this than other council members, his professional background provided some familiarity with the bonding and procurement process. He referenced the Fire Station 52 project, noting that it was awarded to his employer prior to his service on the Council and clarified that he would abstain from participation if a similar situation arose. He explained that one of the lessons learned from that project was the value of flexibility in procurement methods. He noted that projects may be delivered through various approaches, including design-building, construction manager/general contractor (CMGC), or traditional hard-bid contracting, each with associated advantages and disadvantages. Council Member Hunter emphasized that CMGC contracts can provide added value by allowing collaboration between contractors and designers during the design phase, helping to manage costs through target value design and alternative construction approaches. He stated that even

when a maximum bond amount is authorized, the intent is not to spend funds unnecessarily, but rather to ensure the project remains within scope and budget. He expressed confidence in staff's ability to manage the process responsibly and to prevent unnecessary over-design. He concluded by noting that this process is common and does not indicate an immediate commitment to spending the full authorized amount.

Mr. Bunker responded that the Fire Station 52 project followed a similar approach, with the city securing financing prior to construction, although that project involved general obligation bonds and was subject to different requirements. He noted that construction costs escalated rapidly during the COVID period but stated that having financing in place allows the city to attract qualified architects, engineers, and contractors who are motivated to compete for a funded and imminent project. He added that this approach provides a strategic advantage to the city during procurement.

Brandon Johnson, Bond Counsel, stated that the Parameters Resolution does not obligate the City to issue bonds, nor does it require issuance in any specific amount. Rather, the resolution grants authority to the City and the Building Authority to proceed with the bond process when the City chooses to do so. He emphasized that the City retains full discretion at all times to issue a lesser amount than authorized or to decide not to issue the bonds at all. Adoption of the Parameter's Resolution represents the only Council vote required for this authorization.

Mr. Johnson explained that the parameters are intentionally set higher than the anticipated project cost to avoid the need to repeat the statutory public notice process. Following Council approval, a Notice of Bonds to Be Issued is posted on the State's public website, initiating a 30-day notice period during which the public may raise questions or concerns. The City may not issue bonds in excess of the approved parameters without repeating this notice period. He further stated that approving the resolution at this stage positions the City to take advantage of favorable bond market conditions and construction market opportunities. Mr. Johnson compared the situation to entering a purchase negotiation with financing already secured, noting that having the ability to move forward promptly strengthens the City's position. He concluded by emphasizing that approval of the resolution provides flexibility and leverage, not a mandate, and allows the City to proceed strategically based on timing, market conditions, and project readiness.

Council Member John asked whether issuing a single bond in the full authorized amount would result in a lower interest rate compared to issuing smaller bonds in phases, noting that issuing multiple bonds would also increase transaction and professional costs. Mr. Dugdale responded that, generally, larger bond issuances can benefit from economies of scale in the marketplace, as some investors prefer larger block sizes, which can result in slightly lower interest rates. However, he emphasized that this is not always the case and that interest rates ultimately depend on market conditions at the time of issuance.

Council Member Taylor stated that he had recently read about a project in Heber Valley where a one-year delay resulted in an additional \$11.4 million in costs, illustrating the financial impact of timing. While he understood the importance of moving efficiently, he

expressed concern about how quickly the city was approaching bond issuance. He stated that if the Council approved the resolution, the city would be moving forward rapidly, and he felt apprehensive due to having little understanding of the project details or concept, aside from knowing the general location.

Council Member Holley stated that he would have preferred to review the concept plan prior to voting and expressed concern that he was unaware a concept plan existed. He indicated that voting without that information was not helpful and said he was inclined to oppose the resolution until the concept plan was presented.

Council Member Carroll expressed willingness to attend an additional meeting, even at short notice, to gain a clearer understanding of the project. She emphasized her responsibility to fully understand the financial implications and structure of the bond issuance before voting, noting that issuing bonds creates a financial obligation for the City. She questioned whether there would be another opportunity for Council input before the bonds went to market.

Mr. Bunker asked whether Council Member Carroll was comfortable approving the parameter resolution but not authorizing the city to proceed to market without further information. Council Member Carroll clarified that the parameter resolution itself was not the issue, but that it represented the Council's only involvement prior to bond issuance. Mayor Frost asked whether additional information regarding the project's conceptual layout or square footage could be provided to help the Council better understand the scope. He noted that the City had discussed the need for the project for some time and had even acquired property in anticipation of it but acknowledged that the size and cost now felt larger than expected. He stated that while the parameter resolution might feel like a "blank check," he trusted the City's processes and staff to spend funds wisely and not overbuild. He questioned whether the Council was moving too far ahead of the process and asked for Mr. Bunker's thoughts.

Mr. Bunker responded that the city could proceed in either direction. He suggested that the Council could approve the parameter resolution and then hold a work session the following week to review the project in more detail. He clarified that the information available was still conceptual, with no architectural renderings, drawings, or engineering completed. However, staff could present the basis for the projected costs, including comparisons with similar public works facilities constructed by other cities and prevailing square-foot cost estimates. He emphasized that while the estimates were not guaranteed, they were grounded in comparable projects and provided a reasonable expectation of anticipated costs.

Council Member John explained that he and Council Member Hunter were involved in the bonding and property acquisition processes for Fire Stations 52 before joining the Council. He noted that, although that bond was a general obligation bond, the city similarly secured financing before completing final designs, then worked through project details afterward. He asked whether, if the Council approved the Parameter Resolution, there would be a process to move forward that would provide the Council with a clearer project vision while maintaining appropriate oversight.

Council Member Hunter responded that the Council does not yet have a complete vision of the project and that the immediate objective is to position the City to take advantage of favorable bond market conditions to secure the lowest possible interest rate. He clarified that his comments were not a lack of trust in staff, but reflected the limited information presented that evening. He emphasized the clear need for a new public works facility, citing his own experience with the outdated existing building. He stated the approach was consistent with prior projects such as Station 52, where financing was secured first and scope and costs were carefully managed.

Mr. Johnson suggested an approach that could help the Council feel more comfortable moving forward while still preserving Council oversight. He explained that the Council could approve the Parameter Resolution as presented in order to initiate the required 30-day notice and contest period. The notice reflects the stated parameters, including the maximum principal amount of \$50 million and the maximum interest rate. He further explained that the Council could include a condition in its motion requiring additional Council approval of the final principal amount, or final maximum principal amount, before the bonds are sold. Under this approach, the Council would have another opportunity—such as at a January meeting—after receiving additional project information, to approve or adjust the amount to be issued.

Council Members Hunter, Carroll, and Taylor discussed the need for additional information to feel comfortable selecting a bond amount while keeping the bond process moving forward.

Council Member Carroll stated that she did not believe she needed a significant amount of additional time to review the information once it was provided. Council Member Taylor questioned whether voting that evening would meaningfully change the amount of information available over the holidays or whether substantially new details would be provided to justify immediate approval.

Council Member Hunter suggested requesting more detailed information from staff during the interim period, clarifying that even if the parameter resolution were approved, the Council could still decide not to issue the bonds in January if concerns remained. He expressed support for an approach that allows continued due diligence while keeping the bond process moving forward.

Mr. Johnson explained that approving the resolution would start the required 30-day contest period immediately. During that time, the Council could continue gathering and reviewing additional information before any bonds are issued. He emphasized that approval of the resolution does not force the City to issue the bonds on a specific timeline; the Council could revisit the issue in late January, or even February. This approach preserves flexibility, allows the Council to obtain the information it needs, and provides another opportunity to approve or adjust the final bond amount before proceeding to market.

Council Member Carroll moved to adopt Resolution No. 2025-12-28R authorizing the issuance of lease revenue bonds by the Local Building Authority of the city with the contingency that the final bond amount will be approved by the City Council prior to the Issuing of the bond. Council Member Hunter seconded the motion.

Mr. Johnson apologized and clarified that the resolution originally contained a “whereas” clause stating that the City Council had reviewed the plans. He explained that this clause had been removed, ensuring the resolution no longer represents that the Council has reviewed or approved any project plans, which aligns with the concerns raised during the discussion.

Mayor Frost called for a vote on the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Staci Carroll, Council Member
SECONDER:	Ryan Hunter, Council Member
YES:	Carroll, Hunter, Holley, John, Taylor

Mayor Frost stated that, while the process may appear messy to the public, he felt comfortable moving forward because the resolution includes clear parameters and he has strong trust in staff’s fiscal discipline and past performance. He emphasized that the city does not overspend on unnecessary projects, that Council will remain involved throughout construction, and that he felt confident proceeding based on that trust and oversight.

Council Member Taylor acknowledged that his earlier comments may have introduced doubt but clarified that there is no lack of trust in staff. He pointed to the City’s strong credit rating and financial practices as evidence of careful oversight and responsible management, noting that any frustration stemmed from communication issues rather than concern about competence or integrity.

Council Member Holley emphasized a “trust but verify” approach, stating that while staff is trusted, ultimate responsibility rests with the Council members. He stressed that the Council has a moral obligation to residents to ensure they have sufficient information before approving the bond, as accountability for financial obligations lies solely with the Council, not staff.

2. Adjourn as American Fork City Council and convene as the Local Building Authority of American Fork.

Council Member John moved to adjourn as American Fork City Council and convene as the Board of Trustees of the Local Building Authority. Council Member Holley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Ernie John, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
YES:	Hunter, Carroll, John, Taylor, Holley

The Local Building Authority of American Fork held a public hearing in conjunction with the regular session on Tuesday, December 9, 2025, in the American Fork City Hall, 31 North Church Street, commencing at 8:29 pm.

1. Public Hearing

There were no public comments.

Mayor Frost conducted roll call.

2. Review and action on a resolution authorizing the issuance of lease revenue bonds by the authority.

Bond Counsel, Mr. Johnson, explained that legally the Building Authority cannot proceed without City Council approval. He noted that requiring multiple approvals can feel redundant and unnecessary. From a legal standpoint, he stated that a single approval—requiring City Council approval of the final principal bond amount—would be sufficient and would avoid the need for multiple meetings or duplicate approvals by the building authority.

Council Member John asked whether the approvals typically occur in multiple steps, first as the building authority and then as trustees. Mr. Johnson clarified that the Council members are technically the board of trustees of the building authority, and that the same resolution would be approved in that capacity. He explained that the City Council’s approval of the final principal amount would be sufficient, and the building authority would not need to approve it a second time.

Board Member Taylor moved to adopt Resolution 2025-BA-03R authorizing the issuance of lease revenue bonds by the Local Building Authority of the city. Board Member Holley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Clark Taylor, Board Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Board Member
YES:	Holley, Taylor, Hunter, Carroll, John

3. Adjournment

Board Member Holley moved to adjourn the Local Building Authority meeting.

Board Member Hunter seconded the motion. All were in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:34 pm

3. Reconvene as American Fork City Council.

Council Member John moved to reconvene as City Council at 8:36 p.m. Council Member Holley seconded the motion. All were in favor.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Ernie John, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
YES:	Hunter, Carroll, John, Taylor, Holley

4. Review and action on the appointment of Deb Anderson to the Parks, Trails, and Recreation Committee.

Council Member Taylor moved to appoint Deb Anderson to the Parks, Trails, and Recreation Committee with a term ending 2030. Council Member Holley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Clark Taylor, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
YES:	Carroll, Taylor, John, Hunter, Holley

5. Review and action on a resolution to accept/deny the petition for annexation of the Buckwalter Meadow View Ranch Annexation, consisting of approximately 66.36 acres at 1000 South 100 East.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the agenda item concerns a petition to annex just over 66 acres into the city. The process requires the applicant to file a formal petition, and the City Council has significant discretion to approve or deny the petition for annexation. The area is part of a large unincorporated "island" in the southern portion of the city. While city and state code prohibit creating new unincorporated islands, staff concluded—after discussions with the applicant and legal counsel—that the proposal does not create a new island but instead reduces the size of an existing one, an interpretation staff accepts and believes has legal merit.

Mr. O'Brien was concerned that the annexation would split the existing unincorporated area into two smaller residual islands. Although allowed, this could create long-term challenges, including limiting future annexation opportunities, leaving unincorporated parcels that may never annex, and complicating future right-of-way needs, connectivity, and capital projects.

From a staff perspective, there is nothing procedurally wrong with the petition, and staff generally supports annexing the land. However, staff would prefer that additional adjacent land—particularly to the east—be included now to avoid future development and infrastructure complications. Council could approve the petition as submitted, which is simpler in the short term, or deny it and request a revised petition that includes more land, which would be more difficult now but could simplify future planning. MR. O'Brien emphasized that the decision depends on what Council believes best serves the City's long-term interests and offered to provide further details or answer questions.

Council Member John asked whether there had been discussions with the property owner to the east (PRI). Mr. O'Brien confirmed that discussions had occurred, noting the owner had previously requested a land use change and intends to annex it in the future, though timing is uncertain. He explained that the current petition allows the city to potentially include additional property owners in the future. While the petition as submitted is legally

sound, Mr. O'Brien noted that from the city's perspective, it is more convenient and beneficial to handle annexations collectively rather than individually, though splitting properties could still work with some adjustments.

Council Member Carroll asked what would happen if the petition were denied and the applicant had to reapply, including whether other property owners would need to be involved and if additional fees would apply. Mr. O'Brien noted that any additional fees could be addressed if the petition were re-filed.

Council Member Hunter explained that the discussion about "islands" is intended to prevent future complications with unincorporated parcels. He clarified that his support for potentially denying the petition is not about blocking the project, but about resolving long-term issues to avoid creating fragmented or difficult-to-manage parcels. Mr. O'Brien added that shrinking one existing island is easier to manage than dealing with multiple separate annexation pieces.

Council Member Hunter emphasized that any Council requests regarding the petition should not financially harm the applicant, and that staff and Council should keep the process moving efficiently. He noted that the parcel in question was originally part of a combined application and that moving forward should remain a priority, even if the Council considers denying the petition to address long-term planning concerns.

Mr. O'Brien acknowledged the need to avoid unnecessary delays and explained that consolidating all parcels in the triangular area into a single annexation agreement simplifies planning. It allows the city to manage densities, access, internal connectivity, and review processes in one coordinated effort, rather than juggling multiple separate agreements.

Council Member Hunter moved to deny the petition of the annexation of Buckwalter Metal D Ranch Annexation consisting of approximately 66.36 acres of 1000 South 100 East. Council Member Holley seconded the motion.

Council Member John asked how the city could help the applicant move the annexation process forward. Mr. O'Brien explained that if the petition is denied, the applicant would need to start the process over, including refiling paperwork and completing required steps through the recorder's office. He noted that statutory notice periods—such as 30-day, 10-day, and 14-day notices—must be followed, but any non-statutory steps could be condensed to help streamline the process.

Council Member Hunter added that the Council could support the applicant by, for example, waiving fees or assisting in other ways to minimize delays, emphasizing that any required resubmission should not create unnecessary obstacles.

Mayor Frost called for a vote on the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	DENIED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Ryan Hunter, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
YES:	Holley, Carroll, Hunter, Taylor, John

6. Review and action on a resolution regarding American Fork Irrigation shareholder discount agreements and long-term rental agreements.
 Council Member John stated that although efforts had been made to fast-track the process, there are unresolved issues affecting both the irrigation company and the City. He expressed a desire to place the matter on hold so those issues could be clarified for both shareholders and the City. He then made a motion to table the resolution and bring it back as soon as possible for further clarification.

Council Member John disclosed that he has a conflict of interest, as he serves as a board member and chairman of the American Fork Irrigation Company. Ms. Shriever noted that, given this disclosure, it would be appropriate for another council member to make the motion.

Council Member Hunter moved to table action on the resolution addressing shareholder discount agreements and long-term rental agreements for American Fork Irrigation Company shares. Council Member Holley seconded the motion.

Council Member Carroll stated that resolving the issue should happen as soon as possible. She expressed support for tabling the item, provided the process moves forward quickly, and emphasized that she is willing to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure timely action. Council Member Hunter agreed with tabling the item, noting that there did not appear to be an immediate rush, as several related parties and issues had already been in progress for some time. He emphasized that a key reason for slowing the process was to protect the 2007 agreement and to clearly identify what that agreement includes before moving forward.

Council Member Carroll stated that, based on her understanding from the prior meeting, the remaining portion of the issue was still forthcoming. She clarified that the current item was intended only as a preventative or interim step, not the final resolution. Council Member expressed support for taking whatever procedural steps are necessary to clarify these issues before moving forward.

Mayor Frost called for a vote on the motion to table. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	TABLED [4 TO 0]
MOVER:	Ryan Hunter, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley Council Member
YES:	Holley, Taylor, Hunter, Carroll
ABSTAIN:	Ernie John, Council Member

7. Review and action on an ordinance approving additional disbursement of PARC Tax funds to the Harrington Arts Center.

Council Member Holley moved to adopt Ordinance No. 2025-12-31 approving the additional disbursement of PARC Tax funds in the amount of \$9,075, noting the applicable year was 2024/2025. Council Member Taylor seconded the motion.

Council Members Hunter and Carroll asked staff to determine how the issue could be addressed more clearly going forward, even if it was not part of the current motion. Council Member Hunter emphasized that the city should not rely on residents or developers to interpret or point out ambiguities in agreements or processes. He stated that expectations and requirements need to be clearly defined and standardized by the city to avoid confusion and ensure fairness in future cases.

Mayor Frost called for a vote on the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
SECONDER:	Clark Taylor, Council Member
YES:	Hunter, John, Carroll, Holley, Taylor

8. Review and action on a resolution revising the TSSD Impact Fee and user rates.
Mr. Bunker explained that the Timpanogos Special Service District (TSSD) Board approved two changes: an adjustment to impact fees for new system connections and an increase in user rate fees. These changes must be reflected in the City's fee schedule and adopted by the city, with the new fees taking effect in January. He noted that unless the city chooses to subsidize the costs, the city is required to pass through the exact fees approved by the district to future connections and residents. The City acts solely as a pass-through entity, collecting the impact fees during the building permit process and remitting them directly to the district.

Council Member Taylor moved to approve the Resolution amending the general fee schedule to include revisions to the TSSD impact fee and user fee rates. Council Member Holley seconded the motion.

Mr. Bunker disclosed that he serves on the TSSD board.

Mayor Frost called for a vote on the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Clark Taylor, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
YES:	John, Taylor, Hunter, Holley, Carroll

9. Review and action on an ordinance creating Section 15.04.011 and Section 15.14.015 relating to the adoption of the 2006 Wildland Urban Interface areas.
Council Member Carroll moved to adopt Ordinance No. 2025-12-32 creating Section 15.04.011 and 15.14.015 relating to the adoption of the 2006 Wildland Urban Interface areas. Council Member John seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Staci Carroll, Council Member
SECONDER:	Ernie John, Council Member
YES:	Carroll, John, Holley, Taylor, Hunter

10. Review and action on approval of a reimbursement agreement for Roderick Enterprises for Roderick Catalyst - Phase 3.

Council Member Holley moved to approve the reimbursement agreement with Roderick Catalyst for system improvements for an amount no greater than \$605,285.41 for Roderick Catalyst Phase 3. Council Member Carroll seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
SECONDER:	Staci Carroll, Council Member
YES:	Holley, John, Taylor, Hunter, Carroll

11. Review and action on approval of an American Fork Betterment Agreement with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) for work on Project F-LC49(203) BFP: American Fork City Bridge Replacements (2).

Council Member John complimented the work completed at 400 North and 400 East, noting that the area is particularly problematic during high water events. He clarified that the project involved double 8-foot culverts, which are difficult to maintain because they collect debris in the center, making them a recurring challenge for Public Works.

Council Member John moved to approve the American Fork Betterment Agreement with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) for work on Project F-LC49(203) BFP: American Fork City Bridge Replacements. Council Member Hunter seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Ernie John, Council Member
SECONDER:	Ryan Hunter, Council Member
YES:	Hunter, John, Carroll, Holley, Taylor

12. Review and action on the American Fork - Dry Creek Watershed Agreement with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).

Council Member Taylor moved to approve the American Fork-Dry Creek Watershed Agreement between the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and American Fork City, Lehi City, and Saratoga Springs City. Council Member Holley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Clark Taylor, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
YES:	Carroll, Taylor, Hunter, Holley, John

13. Review and action on the award of the contract for the FY 2026 Microsurface Project.
Council Member Hunter moved to award the FY2026 Microsurface Project in the amount of \$455,200.00 to the responsible low bidder, Intermountain Slurry Seal,

Inc. and approve the construction contract as presented in addition to a project construction and engineering contingency of \$40,000 to be held by the City. Council Member Holley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Ryan Hunter, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
YES:	Hunter, John, Carroll, Holley, Taylor

14. Review and action on approval of a reimbursement agreement for system improvements made on Grant Avenue.

Council Member Holley moved to approve the reimbursement agreement with Tyler James Perri for the amount of \$10,000.00 for system improvements made on Grant Avenue. Council Member Hunter seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
SECONDER:	Ryan Hunter, Council Member
YES:	John, Taylor, Hunter, Holley, Carroll

15. Review and action on the design contract for the 100 East Waterline Replacement Project.

Council Member John disclosed for the record that he serves on the North County Water Conservancy District Board, along with Mike Chambers.

Council Member Carroll moved that the city award the 100 East Waterline Replacement Project in the amount of \$80,295.00 to the highest scorer proposer, Hansen, Allen & Lucea and approve the design contract as presented in addition to a project engineering contingency of \$8,000.00 to be held by the city. Council Member Taylor seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Staci Carroll, Council Member
SECONDER:	Clark Taylor, Council Member
YES:	Carroll, John, Holley, Taylor, Hunter

16. Review and action on the design contract for the Dixie Well Engineering Design.
Council Member Holley moved to award the Dixie Well Engineering Project in the amount of \$377,261.00 to the highest scored proposer, Bowen Collins and Associates and approve the design contract as presented in addition to a project engineering contingency of \$40,000 to be held by the city. Council Member John seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
SECONDER:	Ernie John, Council Member
YES:	Holley, John, Taylor, Hunter, Carroll

17. Review and action on the design contract for the 860 East 1300 South Storm Drain Project.

Council Member Taylor moved to award the 860 East 1300 South Storm Drain Project Design in the amount of \$96,900.00 to the highest scored proposer, Franson Civil Engineers, and approve the design contract as presented in addition to a project engineering contingency of \$10,000.00 to be held by the city. Council Member Holley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Clark Taylor, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley Council Member
YES:	Hunter, John, Carroll, Holley, Taylor

18. Review and action on a resolution approving a General Plan Amendment, known as American Fork Station Area Plan.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the plan had previously gone through the Planning Commission and was approved by City Council "as to form" so it could be submitted to the Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG) and its Stationary Plan Policy Committee. MAG requested this preliminary approval in case minor amendments were needed. The City Council's approval included conditions, all of which have since been addressed. Updates were made to a matrix in the document to clarify where state-required criteria were addressed, and MAG requested a minor correction to a mislabeled roadway. He emphasized that these changes were non-substantive and that the document has now been returned to the City in essentially the same form, ready for final approval by resolution.

Council Member Hunter moved to adopt Resolution No. 2025-12-30R approving an amendment to the General Plan, known as the American Fork Station Area Plan. Council Member Holley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Ryan Hunter, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
YES:	Carroll, Taylor, Hunter, Holley, John

19. Consideration and action to enter into a closed session to discuss items described in Utah State Code 52-4-204 and 52-4-205.

Council Member Hunter moved to enter into a closed meeting at 9:15 p.m. Council Member John seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Ryan Hunter, Council Member
SECONDER:	Ernie John, Council Member
YES:	Carroll, Taylor, Hunter, Holley, John

Mayor Frost announced that, for the public record, the City Council would adjourn to a closed session to discuss real estate matters. He stated that once the closed session concluded, the Council would reconvene downstairs briefly and then formally adjourn the meeting.

The American Fork City Council entered into a closed meeting to discuss the purchase, sale, or lease of real property at 9:21 p.m. Those present included Mayor Frost, Council

Member Carroll, Council Member Holley, Council Member Hunter, Council Member John, and Council Member Taylor. Also present included City Administrator David Bunker, City Attorney Heather Schriever, and City Recorder Terilyn Lurker

The purchase, sale, or lease of real property was discussed and audio recorded as required by law.

**Council Member Taylor moved to return to the regular session at 11:03 p.m.
Council Member Holley seconded the motion. Voting was as follows:**

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Clark Taylor, Council Member
SECONDER:	Tim Holley, Council Member
YES:	Carroll, Hunter, Holley, John, Taylor

20. Adjournment.

Council Member Taylor moved the adjourn the meeting. Council Member Holley seconded the motion. All were in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:04 p.m.



Terilyn Lurker, City Recorder