

**RICHMOND CEMETERY MAINTENANCE DISTRICT**

**NOVEMBER 19, 2015**

A regular meeting of the Richmond Cemetery Maintenance District was held on Thursday, November 19, 2015 at the Richmond City Office Building, 6 West Main, Richmond, Utah at 7:00 P.M. Chairman Jeff Young was in the chair.

The following board members were in attendance: Denise Allen, Paul Thatcher and Amy Sadler.

Kevin Graham was excused.

The opening remarks were made by Amy Sadler.

Visitors: Darek Kimball, Ronald B. Natali, Bruce Godderidge, Lee Anderson, Elbert Sweeten, Ed Herrmann

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE OCTOBER 12, 2015 MEETING**

\*\*\*A motion to approve the cemetery district meeting minutes from October 12, 2015 was made by Denise, seconded by Amy, and the vote was unanimous.\*\*\*

Yes Vote: Young, Thatcher, Allen, Sadler

No Vote: None

Absent: Graham

**PRESENTATION ON INFRASTRUCTURE AND FINANCIAL NEEDS FOR THE DISTRICT.**

Justin went line by line through the budget and financials explaining revenues and expenditures for the last five years.

\*\*\*See included document Exhibit "A" at the end of these minutes.\*\*\*

Justin explained what portion of the property tax collected per parcel is paid to the district. Justin used his residence as an example. Of the \$1,701.33 he paid this year only \$18.83 or 1.11% came to the district. If the proposed property tax increase were to pass Justin's fee to the cemetery would increase to \$46 per year.

Justin Lewis Property Tax Breakdown for his residence

Richmond Cemetery	18.83	1.11%
Richmond City	158.53	9.32%
Cache County General Fund	254.55	14.96%
Cache County School District	922.46	54.22%
Cache County Health Fund	19.98	1.17%
Multi County Assessing & Collect	1.72	0.10%
Cache County Assessing & Collect	63.38	3.73%
Statewide School Levy	249.52	14.67%
Cache Mosquito District	12.36	0.73%
Total	\$1,701.33	100%

Jeff reviewed a proposed list of future equipment and infrastructure needs for the district for the next one to thirty years. The list will need to be prioritized in the future if the property tax increase is approved.

\*\*\*See included document Exhibit "B" at the end of these minutes.\*\*\*

Justin informed those in attendance the district is a totally separate entity from Richmond City. The district has an agreement for manpower, burials and finances with Richmond City but the district has its own board, own budget and holds its own meetings. The board consists of five members and the chairman is allowed to vote.

Richmond Cemetery Maintenance District Meeting Minutes, November 19, 2015

The district consists of all of Richmond City and some of Cove. The other portion of Cove is included in the Lewiston boundary.

**PUBLIC HEARING TO DISCUSS THE PROPOSED PROPERTY TAX INCREASE FOR THE DISTRICT. A RESIDENCE VALUED AT \$181,449 WOULD INCREASE FROM \$13.07 TO \$32.08 PER YEAR WHICH IS AN INCREASE OF \$19.01. A BUSINESS VALUED AT \$181,449 WOULD INCREASE FROM \$23.77 TO \$58.35 PER YEAR WHICH IS AN INCREASE OF \$34.58.**

\*\*\*A motion to close the regular board meeting and open the public hearing was made by Denise, seconded by Amy and the vote was unanimous.\*\*\*

Yes Vote: Young, Thatcher, Allen, Sadler

No Vote: None

Absent: Graham

\*\*\*The public hearing opened at 7:35 P.M.\*\*\*

Ronald Natali. I have lived in the city for eight years. I am not going to be buried in this cemetery. I have grave plots elsewhere. I am concerned about what amounts to a 250% increase for me. I am looking at retiring and will be on a fixed income. I will get a one to two percent increase in my retirement per year but that only amounts to around seventy to eight dollars per year. Every time you raise the bottom line you are raising the poverty line. This decision will make people decide whether or not they want to live here or elsewhere. I understand the previous boards have not raised the property tax to keep up with expenses. I do not want to see a 250% increase.

Jeff stated he wanted to clarify that the 250% being mentioned was in actual dollars around \$30 per year. An increase of 10% to 30% would not generate enough revenue to accomplish any of the tasks at hand. The board needs to be more responsible and review the property tax rate on a periodic basis moving forward. A decision has to be made and this board is willing to review and consider all options. The board is a volunteer board and no wages are paid.

Ron explained that in California a property tax increase requires a 2/3 vote by the residents in order to be passed. Ron stated he understood the need for an increase but felt 250% in this case was too much.

Bruce Godderidge. I have a cabin in the district which is located in Logan Canyon by Tony Grove. I am here representing the people that live in that area. A \$30 per year increase has been mentioned but it is still an increase. People that don't use the cemetery are being taxed. I don't think you should look at raising the property tax rate. I think you should increase the fees instead. The people that use it should pay for it. I would be willing to pay the fees. Right now I am paying for everyone else to use the cemetery through the property tax I pay. I had kids in the school district earlier in life and they have now all graduated and moved on but I am still paying the school district forever. Renters don't pay property tax, only property owners do. You are increasing the fees to those that sustain the economy. You can come up with money through other means. A constant increase cannot be sustained. You need to get creative and build a reserve.

Bruce asked how much more the increase will generate for the district? Justin stated the increase would change the yearly allocation from just over \$24,000 per year to \$60,000 per year.

Justin asked Bruce if the plot fees were changed, for example, from \$300 per lot to \$2,000 per lot would he still purchase a lot? Bruce stated he would as he will pay whatever the fees are to be buried where he wants to be buried. Justin replied he felt Bruce was in a very small minority that would be willing to pay any fee as the overwhelming majority of people cannot just pay any fee no matter what it is.

Lee Anderson asked how many people live in the district? Justin stated there are around 2,250 residents in Richmond City plus some of Cove and those cabins located in Logan Canyon.

## Richmond Cemetery Maintenance District Meeting Minutes, November 19, 2015

Ron asked if grant opportunities had been pursued? Jeff stated there were some federal grants available in the \$5,000 to \$10,000 range but by the time all of the documentation and paperwork was completed only a small portion of the funds would be available for actual work on the grounds.

Lee asked if the cemetery could be part of the city? Justin explained it is not possible since a portion of Cove is located in the district boundaries.

Lee asked how other cemeteries are getting by without raising their rates? Jeff explained some other cemeteries do not spend as much time or funding on watering and maintaining. They let the grounds burn up and do not trim around the headstones. Several cemeteries are smaller in size in acreage and the number of headstones maintained. In Smithfield, the cemetery is part of the city so the general fund subsidizes what happens at the cemetery. The Richmond District does not have this luxury since it is its own entity.

Denise explained that as soon as the grounds are not properly trimmed, watered and maintained that all of the board members get people calling them to complain. Especially around the Memorial Day holiday. Bruce stated his family comes up and maintains their family member's headstones and others should as well. Bruce felt headstone trimming and maintenance should be the responsibility of the family not the district. Jeff explained there are around 7,000 graves in the grounds and only around 100 are maintained by families.

Jeff informed those in attendance the board is a volunteer position and each board member serves a four year term. Jeff invited those with concerns to join the board when the current board members terms expire. Jeff explained that in his five years over the district this was the first meeting a non-board member had attended and he thanked everyone in attendance for attending and being involved.

Ron asked if Eagle Scout projects could be utilized on some of the projects? Jeff stated through his service with the city and district he signs off on around 14 projects per year but none of them ever involve money or raising money. The kids have no interest in projects where they have to raise money and then still do the labor. The kids only want to do the labor portion and have someone else pay for the project. Ron stated he understood one project could not raise enough funding for the entire fence around the grounds but one project at a time could be done and the fence could be installed in small increments to accomplish a long term goal.

Jeff stated there were six Eagle Scout projects that helped to digitize all of the graves in the district. Once the new section is plotted the information will be available online. The reason for the delay is that if the new section was added on after the original online posting the cost would be an additional \$4,000 or so. Gateway Mapping has helped to oversee the project.

Ed Herrmann stated he just moved to the city after being in the military for many years. Ed had lived in several places but was from Salt Lake City originally. Ed explained he had seen cemeteries that were in dilapidated condition and it is not a good thing. Ed felt the increase was a worthy investment if the grounds could be properly maintained. Ed said he did have sticker shock when he saw the amount of the proposed increase.

Ed asked if the long term objectives of the grounds could be met and if so in how many years? Jeff stated his calculations showed around 15 to 17 years would be needed to complete the vast majority of the proposed tasks.

Jeff explained watering the grounds with sprinkler pipe takes many hours of manpower and with a sprinkling system in each new section there would not be any manpower required. Right now it takes around 2 ½ hours to move the pipe in two sections of the existing grounds.

Ed asked who had information on the veteran's buried in the cemetery? Justin stated Morty Jenkins is a member of the American Legion and would be the best source of information in this regard.

Ed suggested the board meet with other local districts to see how they handle things and allocate their resources.

Elbert Sweeten stated he had attended the meeting to see what projects the increase would pay for. Elbert asked how much area is in the new section? Jeff stated around another 7,000 plots could be added.

Richmond Cemetery Maintenance District Meeting Minutes, November 19, 2015

Elbert mentioned he felt the district was fortunate to have room to expand as other cemeteries are landlocked and cannot expand. Justin mentioned Smithfield is in that situation and when the time comes they will need to purchase more land and create a new cemetery.

Elbert asked if the land was paid for? Jeff stated the district has owned the land for many decades.

Elbert asked if burials required a vault? Justin stated that was correct. Old burials did not but all new burials require a vault. Jeff mentioned the majority of the east section of the old grounds did not have vaults.

Elbert asked if people can sell their plots? Justin stated the district requires plots to be sold back to the district. Plot owners cannot sell their plots to other private parties. The district will pay the plot owner the cost of what was originally paid or \$100 if the plot owner cannot provide proof of what they originally paid.

Jeff mentioned the board is considering making the new sections in-ground headstones only. Ron stated it is more economical and California has gone that way. No above ground headstones are allowed. Jeff stated this will be a topic of discussion at the December board meeting.

Ed suggested charging a higher grave plot purchase fee for those wanting to have above ground headstones. Jeff stated the board needs to consider it and it is a great idea. Ed felt that if a plot requires more maintenance the owner should pay more.

*\*\*\*Justin read letters from Richmond City Mayor Michael E. Hall and residents Paul J. Erickson, Lynette R. Lewis and Darek Kimball. Those letters are contained at the end of these meeting minutes.\*\*\**

Jeff thanked everyone for attending and voicing their concerns. No vote would be held as there would be a discussion and vote at the December board meeting.

\*\*\*A motion to close the public hearing and reopen the regular board meeting was made by Denise, seconded by Amy and the vote was unanimous.\*\*\*

Yes Vote: Young, Thatcher, Allen, Sadler  
No Vote: None  
Absent: Graham

*\*\*\*The public hearing closed at 8:31 P.M.\*\*\**

\*\*\*A motion to adjourn at 8:32 P.M. was made by Denise, seconded by Paul and the vote was unanimous.\*\*\*

Yes Vote: Young, Thatcher, Allen, Sadler  
No Vote: None  
Absent: Graham

The next board meeting will be held on Thursday, December 10<sup>th</sup> starting at 6:00 P.M.

**RICHMOND CEMETERY MAINTENANCE DISTRICT**

---

Jeffrey D. Young, Chairman

**ATTEST:**

---

Justin B. Lewis, Recorder

**RICHMOND CEMETERY MAINTENANCE DISTRICT MEETING  
6 West Main  
Richmond, Utah 84333**

**AGENDA**

Public Notice is given that the Richmond Cemetery Maintenance District will meet in a regularly scheduled meeting at 6 West Main, Richmond, Utah on Thursday, November 19, 2015. The meeting will begin at 7:00 P.M.

Welcome and Opening Ceremonies by Board Member Sadler

1. Approval of the minutes from the October 12, 2015 meeting.
2. Presentation on infrastructure and financial needs for the district.
3. Public Hearing to discuss the proposed property tax increase for the district. A residence valued at \$181,449 would increase from \$13.07 to \$32.08 per year which is an increase of \$19.01. A business valued at \$181,449 would increase from \$23.77 to \$58.35 per year which is an increase of \$34.58.

Adjournment

---

**Letters and emails read during the public hearing and requested to be included with the minutes of this meeting.**

Dear Cemetery Board Members:

I am unable to attend the public hearing on the proposed cemetery property tax increase but have asked Justin to provide this email to all of the board members and read in my behalf during the public hearing.

As mayor of Richmond City for 10 years I have had the opportunity to watch, observe, assist and help with the cemetery grounds.

The city has had a joint partnership with the cemetery for all of my years as mayor plus before my time.

During my time the city has worked extensively to try and supply the needed manpower and make sure burials, lawn mowing, watering labor, etc. were adequate for the grounds.

The prices charged by the city for the use of the backhoe, labor, etc. have not been increased for over 10 years. The city can no longer hold the current prices and will be notifying the cemetery district of a small price increase starting

Richmond Cemetery Maintenance District Meeting Minutes, November 19, 2015

in July 2016. The city has not intended to profit off of the work at the cemetery but needs to cover the costs of the associated projects.

Price/Property Tax increases of any type are hard, especially for those on a fixed income, but with that being said I do support the proposed property tax increase for the cemetery district. I have watched for many years as the district has struggled to do projects and routine maintenance with such a limited amount of revenue. The district is in need of additional funding to preserve the memories of those that have passed on and provide a place for the living to be buried in the future.

Sincerely,

Michael E. Hall  
Mayor

---

The proposed property tax increase is necessary in order to meet the incremental expense of developing and maintaining an additional six acres of cemetery space so that needed revenue from plot purchase and burial fees can continue to flow into the district. Approximately 40% of district revenue comes from plot and burial fees, with most of the remaining revenue obtained through property tax. A tax is required since fee revenue is a one-time event, as the district does not impose annual assessments or require a cash endowment at the time of plot purchase.

Expenses for replacement of aging water and road infrastructure the past three years have exhausted the districts reserve of approximately \$135,000. Some of the reserve has also been used to replace equipment, and to begin grading and landscaping the expanded cemetery area in order to make additional plots available for sale. Without the proposed increase, the city's inventory of burial plots will be exhausted within the next two years, thus also causing a significant decrease in burial fees. Accordingly, we believe the proposal will prevent an even larger tax increase in the near future. Expansion of available plots will be done according to budget - if the increase is approved.

Although operating costs have remained within historical parameters in 2015, they will increase as the cemetery expands to meet the need for more plots. In many ways, the cemetery is similar to city water and sewer systems: large capital outlays are required to install and to replace necessary improvements, with an ongoing operating cost that is in direct proportion to the area or system maintained. With district plot and burial fees at the top-end compared to other, local districts, increasing property taxes is the last avenue the district has to pursue in order to maintain the historical cemetery (with its infrastructure), and to develop and maintain the expanded cemetery area.

Paul J. Erickson

---

Dear Cemetery Board Members:

I am writing in regards to the proposed property tax increase.

My mom and dad and grandparents as well as other family members are all buried in the Richmond Cemetery. I will be buried there in the future and would think my children will be buried there many years down the road.

Increases are hard but in this case for what will cost me around \$2.00 per month I fully support the increase. I have seen the small budget the cemetery operates with and I am amazed what has been done with so limited funding. Even with this increase the overall budget for a cemetery of thousands of graves is still very small.

I support the proposed property tax increase.

Sincerely,

Richmond Cemetery Maintenance District Meeting Minutes, November 19, 2015

Lynette R. Lewis  
31 East 200 South, Richmond

---

Dear Board Members:

I have been the Richmond City Engineer for several years and on occasion I have had the opportunity to work with Chairman Jeff Young and Justin Lewis on different cemetery projects. One of those projects was mapping, creation and entering the existing cemetery and graves into a data base which allow visitors better access and aids in finding their ancestors and loved ones. My most recent project was to help with the plotting of the new section of grounds. Careful consideration was given during the plotting process to balance the available ground with the needs for burial spaces, roads, and future uses.

I see the financial challenges the cemetery currently faces in simple maintenance and upkeep of the existing cemetery. Fortunately they are able to call on resources of outside entities for help with burials and more intensive needs. The cemetery simply could not afford do perform all services with the limited budget.

I have been involved with and seen the financial struggle of the district to come up with the necessary funds to expand the grounds properly. Expansion is expensive and a must as there are only a few dozen plots left to purchase.

Tens of thousands of dollars are needed to expand the grounds in the proper way. Please expand in the appropriate manner so big expenses are only one time expenses not just a band aid to a bigger problem. For example, asphalt the road rather than apply a temporary surface and then asphalt later. Improvements should be paid for one time, then properly maintained.

This increase will cost me between \$2 and \$3 per month but I want to say I formally support the property tax increase.

I am not only the City Engineer but also a resident of the community.

Sincerely,

Darek Kimball  
427 East 100 North, Richmond

**EXHIBIT "A"**

	<b>2014</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2015</b> through 10/31/15
<b>Revenues</b>						
CEMETERY - PROPERTY TAXES	\$ 32,618.92	\$ 25,298.08	\$ 19,850.52	\$ 22,403.16	\$ 21,377.13	\$ 7,859.72
CEMETERY - FEE IN LIEU OF	\$ 1,861.98	\$ 1,868.80	\$ 1,823.88	\$ 2,138.39	\$ 2,260.36	\$ 1,409.63
CEMETERY - BURIAL FEE	\$ 17,300.00	\$ 17,300.00	\$ 12,200.00	\$ 21,425.00	\$ 21,100.00	\$ 13,000.00
CEMETERY - GRAVE PLOT PURCHASE	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 9,500.00	\$ 11,500.00	\$ 8,500.00	\$ 8,000.00
CEMETERY - LAND RENT				\$ 210.00	\$ 210.00	\$ -
CEMETERY - INTEREST EARNINGS	\$ 225.07	\$ 278.81	\$ 1,201.27	\$ 951.70	\$ 795.11	\$ 214.16
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 55,505.97</b>	<b>\$ 47,745.69</b>	<b>\$ 44,575.67</b>	<b>\$ 58,628.25</b>	<b>\$ 54,242.60</b>	<b>\$ 30,483.51</b>
<b>Expenses</b>						
CEMETERY - SALARIES	\$ 8,522.84	\$ 19,387.67	\$ 26,577.29	\$ 19,079.72	\$ 17,963.23	\$ 23,689.74
CEMETERY - SOCIAL SECURITY BEN	\$ 1,619.42	\$ 2,978.80	\$ 3,287.87	\$ 2,248.99	\$ 2,207.29	\$ 5,571.11
CEMETERY - DUES			\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00	
CEMETERY - ADVERTISING		\$ 77.35			\$ 163.36	
CEMETERY - OFFICE EXPENSE	\$ 34.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 275.95		\$ 31.17	
CEMETERY - MAINTENANCE	\$ 11,366.90	\$ 11,395.70	\$ 18,373.77	\$ 12,440.42	\$ 5,108.33	\$ 8,835.05
CEMETERY - UTILITIES	\$ 1,372.57	\$ 1,899.13	\$ 2,224.69	\$ 1,187.22	\$ 1,662.19	\$ 2,213.29
CEMETERY - GAS & OIL	\$ 2,149.46	\$ 1,912.66	\$ 1,496.42	\$ 1,196.14	\$ 1,138.06	\$ 1,308.27
CEMETERY - GRAVE DIGGING	\$ 5,543.75	\$ 2,762.50	\$ 1,675.00	\$ 2,850.00	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 1,537.50
CEMETERY - AUDITOR	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,165.00	\$ 1,065.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,325.00	\$ 3,000.00
CEMETERY - ATTORNEY FEES		\$ 2,880.00				
CEMETERY - BONDS & INSURANCE	\$ 2,043.76	\$ 2,023.58	\$ 889.60	\$ 3,561.77	\$ 1,575.03	\$ 1,948.67
CEMETERY - IRRIGATION WATER DU	\$ 880.00	\$ 939.20	\$ 564.00	\$ 473.00	\$ 988.00	\$ 991.00
CEMETERY - SUNDRY	\$ 300.00	\$ 718.00		\$ 372.00	\$ 678.00	
CEMETERY - SUBCONTRACTOR EXPEN	\$ 15,999.96	\$ 1,333.33				
CEMETERY - PLOT MAPPING		\$ 98.21		\$ 95.98		
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 52,832.66</b>	<b>\$ 51,771.13</b>	<b>\$ 56,494.59</b>	<b>\$ 45,070.24</b>	<b>\$ 36,504.66</b>	<b>\$ 49,094.63</b>
<b>NET INCOME</b>	<b>\$ 2,673.31</b>	<b>\$ (4,025.44)</b>	<b>\$ (11,918.92)</b>	<b>\$ 13,558.01</b>	<b>\$ 17,737.94</b>	<b>\$ (18,611.12)</b>
<b>CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 32,350.48</b>	<b>\$ 109,999.08</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>NET INCOME AFTER CAP IMPROVE</b>	<b>\$ 2,673.31</b>	<b>\$ (36,375.92)</b>	<b>\$ (121,918.00)</b>	<b>\$ 13,558.01</b>	<b>\$ 17,737.94</b>	<b>\$ (18,611.12)</b>

## EXHIBIT "B"

### CEMETERY EQUIPMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE LIST

Tractor                    \$ 25,000.00  
Lawnmower            \$ 7,000.00  
Used Truck with Dump Bed     \$15,000 - \$25,000  
Backhoe Grave Compactor

Replace old steel water pipe along entire north end of existing cemetery grounds.  
Will require each road to be bored or cut.

Fence on north end of property  
\$ 20,000.00

Install Asphalt Tailing in new section from Center to West Side  
\$ 52,000.00

Install Asphalt in new section from Center to West Side  
\$ 68,000.00

Install Sprinkler System in New Section 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6  
\$ 30,000.00

Grass and excavation for each new section.

Repair Holes in Roof of Maintenance Shop  
\$ 2,000.00

### **Future Projects**

Develop new section from Center to East Side  
including roads, sprinkler system, excavating and grass

Plant Trees on north, west and east side of new section

Repair furthest road to the east. Will require complete replacement  
as well as severe tree trimming and root removal

Overlay all existing roads

Install new fence around entire parcel.