

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, UTAH COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING
HENDERSON TRUST OUTBUILDING
8958 SOUTH 6000 WEST, UTAH COUNTY, UTAH 84651
December 17, 2013 - 6:00 P.M.

PRESENT: COMMISSIONER DOUG WITNEY, CHAIR
COMMISSIONER GARY J. ANDERSON, VICE-CHAIR
COMMISSIONER LARRY A. ELLERTSON

STAFF:

Robert J. Moore, Utah County Deputy Attorney
Bryan E. Thompson, Utah County Clerk/Auditor
Renée Huggins-Caron, Clerk/Auditor Admin. Assistant
Richard Nielson, Utah County Public Works Director

CITIZENS:

Clint Anderson	Kamden Carter	Karen Hutchison	Donna Mitchell	*Grant Schaerrer
JoAnn Anderson	Mat Carter	*Lorin Jensen	*Carl Parker	Betty Jo Sharp
*Jacob Atkin	Dave Conrad	Sue Jensen	Elaine Partridge	Leo Sharp
*JoDee Atkin	Stacie Conrad	*Matt Kalmar	*Vic Petersen	Dennis Sperry
*Tamara Atkin	Jessica Corry	Eunice Kent	Tryo Peterson	Mari Sperry
Larry Ballard	Murrie Cox	Kris Lee	*Monte Phelps	Candace Simons
*Jan Barker	Kent Curtis	Ted Lee	*Shauna Phelps	Rob Simons
Jeff Barker	Mary Lou Daley	Federiw Lier	Kelly Powell	*Michael Smith
*Mark Belk	Donnie Dunn	Alan Long	Mike Powell	Judy Snow
Sean Bell	Valeri Dunn	Dan Lovingier	Gay Pulham	Willia Kyle Stanton
David Benson	Theron Dutson	Diane Lovingier	Mark Pulham	Manuel Tafoya
Jeanine Benson	Dave Ellsworth	T.J. Lowe	Clint Proctor	Sandy Tafoya
Jo Benson	Renae Ellsworth	Tanya Macdonald	Kathy Proctor	Bailey Tarwater
Barry Bishop	*Amy Ewell	Ben W. Mangelson	Natalie Ralph	Rick Tarwater
Judy Bishop	Martin Ewell	Jay Mansanarez	Frank Richmond	*Brent Thurman
Amberly Brimhall	*Tim Ewell	Tracy Mansanarez	Lona Rindlisbacher	*Clark Turner
Cliff Brimhall	Mark Giles	Afton Mavrin	*Paul Rindlisbacher	Pam Turner
*Debi Brozovich	Jeff Girot	*Melvin Meredith	David Roger	Norene Uchytel
John Brozovich	Michelle Girot	*Paul Meredith	Dustin Rose	Jen Valdez
Lloyd Burch	Barb Gullion	Christy L. Metz	Tani Rose	Tony Valdez
*Chad Campbell	Stan Gullion	Hoby Metz	Ryan Rowley	Beth Ward
Tammy Campbell	*Dee Henderson	Carol Miller	Melanie Saindy	Rand Ward
Anthony Cardon	Roger Howells	Gina Miller	Stanford Saindy	*Tina Waters
Larry Carson	Sandra Howells	*Jacob Miller	Julie Sainsbury	Lance Wilson
		Mel Miller		

(An {*} denotes a resident that spoke during the session.)

Commissioner Witney called the meeting to order at 6:03 P.M. and welcomed those present.

PUBLIC HEARING:
WEST MOUNTAIN INCORPORATION
FEASIBILITY STUDY

Commissioner Witney introduced himself and fellow members of the Board: Commissioners Anderson and Ellertson.

UTAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WEST MOUNTAIN INCORPORATION
MINUTES - December 17, 2013

Page 2

He explained that an incorporation petition has been filed with the Utah County Clerk/Auditor; statutory requirements dictate that two Public Hearings are held to review the results of the related Feasibility Study. Commissioner Witney clarified that this is the second hearing, as the first was held on December 3, 2013. This is the last time the Board of Commissioners will be involved as part of the process for this application; they are neither opposed or in favor of the incorporation of West Mountain City and are only performing their statutory duties to facilitate the study and informal meetings. He introduced Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore, Utah County Clerk/Auditor Bryan E. Thompson, and Utah County Public Works Director Richard Nielson. Commissioner Witney also pointed out the Deputy Clerk taking notes at the meeting, who would keep record of the public comments and remind speakers of their three-minute time limits.

Commissioner Witney introduced Feasibility Consultants Susan Becker and Cecily Buell of Zions Bank, who would be presenting the results of their study tonight. Commissioner Anderson pointed out the hard work that had gone into preparing the information and the great job done by Ms. Becker and Ms. Buell. He mentioned that the study, and the individuals, were verbally attacked during the last Public Hearing on the matter; the audience was warned that is inappropriate behavior.

Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore came forward to summarize the process for incorporation of a city. First, a request for a Feasibility Study is filed with the Utah County Clerk/Auditor. If the request meets requirements, the county notifies specified large-property holders within the affected area. The large-property owners notified are given the option to be excluded from the proceedings, and the county then chooses a consultant to perform a Feasibility Study. The consultants must meet several statutory requirements within their study and present the information.

Robert J. Moore went on to explain that after the meeting tonight, the first part of the process will be completed. Next, the petitioners have one year to file the Incorporation Application. If the application is filed by mid-July 2014, the question of whether or not to become a city will be on the November 2014 ballots. If after that - but before the one year deadline - then the issue will be put to a vote in November 2016. The decision is made by majority vote, or fifty-percent-plus-one or more of the registered voters.

Robert J. Moore mentioned that the Feasibility Study is a statutory requirement modeled after some issues in Salt Lake County, related to the fact that revenue potentially exceeds costs for the proposed city. Commissioner Witney reminded the residents that they are all friends and neighbors, and encouraged them to remain civil before turning the time over to the presenters.

Cecily Buell confirmed that Zions Bank was hired by the Utah County Board of Commissioners in August 2013 to conduct the Feasibility Study for the proposed Incorporation of West Mountain City. She presented a map of the area in question, and reviewed Utah Code Section 10-2-106 defining the requirements of the study. Ms. Buell detailed the demographics, including median household incomes, projected growth, tax areas, and property values.

Susan Becker came forward to address taxing entities in the defined area. She pointed out the greatest tax differences between Service Area No. 7 compared to Service Area No. 9 based on the services provided. Ms. Becker went on to detail projected budgets, revenues, and expenditures through charts, graphs, and tables.

Susan Becker noted potential confusion regarding the purpose of a feasibility study. She explained that there is a legal requirement to gather this information if there is any likelihood that a city's revenue will be greater than 105% over expenditures. Ms. Becker reminded the audience that Zions Bank is providing factual unbiased information regarding the proposed city so that the residents can make an educated decision. She ended the presentation after providing more details related to startup costs, budgets for comparable cities, impacts on current providers, and provision of services. Commissioner Witney briefly interrupted to mention that the quotes from the Utah County Sheriff's Office are based on call responses only, and not regular patrol services.

UTAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WEST MOUNTAIN INCORPORATION
MINUTES - December 17, 2013

Page 3

Monte Phelps addressed the audience, and identified himself as one of the petitioners for the Incorporation of West Mountain City. He explained that there was no intention to surprise friends and neighbors with the application; it is only a matter of recently being provided the necessary information to move forward. Mr. Phelps mentioned that the group of petitioners initially wished to include the garbage dump within West Mountain boundaries, but Payson City preemptively filed a request to annex that land. He shared that the idea behind incorporation is to have local control; he mentioned the success of Genola and suggested that West Mountain could have the same results.

Clark Turner thanked Utah County for organizing the Feasibility Study through Zions Bank. Mr. Turner stated that he did not want to move forward with incorporation if it seemed taxes would be increased as a result. Mr. Turner became involved with the application because approximately one year after buying his property, the adjacent land was purchased by a business; he was concerned about the possibility of a commercial gravel pit across the street from his home. Mr. Turner discovered at that time that there was no recourse for his family to prevent the creation of the gravel pit. While there are currently no plans for the commercial operation, Mr. Turner was inspired by the event - it became apparent that the local community needs to establish a shared vision for West Mountain.

Clark Turner is in favor of local control. He pointed out that West Mountain is a different place than it was thirty years ago, and will continue to change for thirty more years. Mr. Turner expressed that the people who live here are the ones who should make the decisions about how growth occurs in the area; they are the ones directly affected. He agreed with the comments from Monte Phelps concerning Genola, which has been a city since 1935 but has not succumbed to high-density housing or other city-related problems - they continue to maintain the rural atmosphere appreciated by many West Mountain residents. Mr. Turner acknowledged that the petitioning group made a mistake in not involving more people in the application process from the beginning, but noted that communication has opened and they can all move forward together.

Someone in the audience asked whether individuals could remove their properties from the proposed Incorporation of West Mountain City, and Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore noted that is not an option. When another person in the audience implied that local residents were not notified of these proceedings, Mr. Moore clarified that notices were provided as legally required in several locations: through the Utah State Public Notice Website (<http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>), publications in the newspaper, and directly to persons owning one percent or more of physical property located in the affected areas. The subject was also brought up during several public meetings of the Utah County Board of Commissioners, held each Tuesday morning in downtown Provo. One of the petitioners added that 300 fliers were printed and hand-delivered to neighbors, apologizing for missing anyone but indicating that reasonable measures were taken to inform everyone.

Tim Ewell came forward and encouraged the attendants to remember that they are all neighbors, acquiescing that there had been no calculated efforts to exclude anyone from the process. Mr. Ewell mentioned that his family has been in West Mountain for forty years. He reflected that everyone present would like West Mountain to remain the same, but there have already been many changes since his childhood. Mr. Ewell reiterated that whether the neighbors agree or disagree on incorporation, it should be made clear that the petitioners were not trying to gain anything personally.

Tina Waters declared that her husband and his family moved to West Mountain to get away from the cities. If incorporated into a city, growth and change will both happen, and there will be nothing anyone can do about it.

Grant Schaerrer replied that change can be good. Mr. Schaerrer explained that he was against dividing agricultural use parcels into five-acre lots; he was outvoted years ago, but is now grateful for the many neighbors that have been a result of the smaller lots. Mr. Schaerrer urged the community to unite in finding the best solution, repeating the comments from Tina Waters that change is coming and cannot be stopped. It is up to the residents to decide how the area will develop.

UTAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WEST MOUNTAIN INCORPORATION
MINUTES - December 17, 2013
Page 4

Grant Schaerrer referred to Herriman, Utah as an example of what could happen in the region. He spoke about the astronomical growth in the areas surrounding Herriman: Riverton, West Jordan, and Draper. Mr. Schaerrer noted that the same thing will happen in West Mountain; there will be pressure from other locations, and population will naturally increase between expanding families, out-of-state residents moving in, Brigham Young University students permanently locating, and the opportunities brought through new businesses and upgrades to the Provo Airport. While Herriman was mostly agricultural use thirty years ago, they now have five-acre lots, ten-acre lots, and one-acre lots in between. Mr. Schaerrer pointed out the wiseness of zoning agricultural, residential, and commercial all together. He repeated that while nothing can be done to stop growth, the options can be greatly improved by planning ahead.

Someone in the audience asked Grant Schaerrer about "being outvoted" as he mentioned in his comments, and Mr. Schaerrer clarified that it was a Utah County decision.

Tamara Atkin expressed her opinion that the confusion in the community over the purpose of the Feasibility Study was no accident. She stated it was presented in a certain way to collect signatures. Ms. Atkin mentioned a neighbor that compared the figures presented by the financial consultants to her own research and found discrepancies in the results. She acknowledged that people keep talking about not wanting to change; it is easy to not change by simply not becoming a city.

Michael Smith joked that while he had commented during the first Public Hearing on December 3, 2013, it had been so cold that evening that most of the communication had been lost or forgotten. Mr. Smith reflected that progress has been made; the Feasibility Study has gathered relative information for the issue at hand. He pointed out that it is not constructive to compare the problems of large cities on the West Coast to the proposed incorporation of West Mountain City because California State is huge, regulated, heavily taxed, and extremely democratic. Mr. Smith added that the comparison of Draper, Utah is also irrelevant to this discussion, and even Woodland Hills is very different. West Mountain is unique and the facts presented through the Feasibility Study are accurate.

Michael Smith construed that the incorporation of West Mountain City is about less government, and local government. Becoming a city does not automatically mean high-density housing, heavy traffic roads, and other nuisances for the residents. Mr. Smith added that areas that fall prey to those issues accept federal monies and provide resources to cities that are otherwise unavailable. He is astounded that the residents are choosing to assume the worst. Mr. Smith noted the direct relation between larger, unlocalized government, and inefficiency as well as lack of response to the people. He returned to the subject of Genola - they are not a corrupt bureaucracy, and they have not been repeatedly sued. Incorporation is about remaining the same. Mr. Smith chooses to be represented by people who live here. He does not want to be the mayor, but he certainly wants a mayor or City Councilmember from West Mountain.

A woman responded (later identified as Debi Brozovich) to Michael Smith's statements. She acknowledged that Genola continues to be referenced, but questioned whether they would make the same choice again in hindsight after all of the hard work. She also questioned what the people of West Mountain would gain through incorporation.

Chad Campbell is concerned about the division occurring in the community over this matter. He has been working in Genola and has observed them grow over the years. Mr. Campbell mentioned recently seeing signs in Genola that identify agricultural areas, in order to notify others of potential odors and other farm-related operations. Mr. Campbell does not want to see those types of signs in West Mountain - he moved here from Payson with his wife in order to raise their family in a farming environment and does not agree with people from the city attempting to dictate their way of life.

Chad Campbell admitted that growth is inevitable. He indicated that West Mountain could eventually be annexed into Payson City, but not for some time. Mr. Campbell has heard complaints against mink farms in the area, and calls it "city talk." While escaped mink can cause some damage to livestock, the problems are equivalent to hunting dogs, cows, sheep, etc. getting away from their owners. If there is a problem with a mink farmer, the solution is a phone call away.

UTAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WEST MOUNTAIN INCORPORATION
MINUTES - December 17, 2013
Page 5

Mr. Campbell encouraged the residents to work together and remain friends.

Jacob Atkin came forward to speak about three main points: the dangers of self-government, Payson City, and West Mountain's activity with Utah County. Mr. Atkin reflected that any combination of Mayor/City Council for West Mountain would have control over decisions that affect the residents daily. He construed that a bond would still be a burden even after the elected officials have been voted out of office. Mr. Atkin mentioned that his father works for Orem City Water Division, and has estimated that it would cost \$3,000,000 for a water tank for West Mountain City - a cost that would be paid by 300 households. Mr. Atkin admitted that the county sometimes operates from a more distanced view from the residents, but the decisions made are for the entire county; taxes would never be tripled by one action because the burden is shared by all.

Jacob Atkin addressed the possibility of annexation into Payson City. If an option, it will not be a concern for at least ten or twenty years as demonstrated by the fact that they did not annex the land surrounding the temple for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints currently under construction. Mr. Atkin expressed that West Mountain residents need to approach Utah County with one voice; the Board of Commissioners and other officials are elected as caretakers on their behalf, and need to be made aware of their needs.

Matt Kalmar was born and raised in the area of Riverton, Utah, and watched the surrounding neighborhoods grow and eventually creep in to his family's forty acres of land. Mr. Kalmar suggested that the incorporation of West Mountain would be similar to rolling down a hill, an action that cannot be stopped past a certain point. He noted the desire of the petitioning group to have local control, and the controversy surrounding whether or not mink farms are true agricultural use. Mr. Kalmar proclaimed he would prefer looking outside and seeing five mink farms in a row, over subdivision lots. Mr. Kalmar revealed skepticism about residents being able to actually change the government, and Commissioner Anderson replied that the County Commissioners want to do what the people want them to do. Mr. Kalmar's closing comments were against holding grudges against neighbors and friends.

Amy Ewell directed a question to the Board: Will the commissioners do whatever they can to help the people as long as it is in their financial interest? Commissioner Anderson resolutely replied "Absolutely not." He explained that the Board is there for the entire county, and has actually lost money in the past to do what is best for the residents. Commissioner Anderson reiterated that the Board is an unbiased party, neither in favor or against incorporation.

Someone else in the audience asked about Utah County's long-term view on minimum acreage requirements, and Commissioner Anderson explained that if a company or group of people desires a zoning change in an area, an application is submitted to the Utah County Planning Commission (an advisory board to the Utah County Board of Commissioners, consisting of seven members). The Planning Commission reviews legal requirements, receives comments from the public, and makes a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. The commissioners then also receive public comment before making a decision. Commissioner Anderson admitted that there is no way to satisfy everyone because opinions will always differ, but the Board makes the best legal decision possible.

Another audience member mentioned continuously feeling "out of the loop" on community matters, mentioning a motorcycle racing track planned for West Mountain several years ago that did not materialize. She asked for information on how to become more involved, and Commissioner Witney referred her to the Utah County Website (<http://www.utahcounty.gov>), public meetings of the Utah County Board of Commissioners and Utah County Planning Commission, and the minutes of said meetings.

Shauna Phelps said she had heard that a developer can come into West Mountain, purchase a large amount of property, and plot quarter-acre lots with separate sewer and water facilities. Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore clarified that zoning would determine the possibility, as well as legal water issues. Ms. Phelps and Commissioner Ellertson discussed a water system for Lincoln Beach.

UTAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WEST MOUNTAIN INCORPORATION
MINUTES - December 17, 2013
Page 6

Commissioner Witney brought attention to the fact that contrary to some opinions expressed, the Board of Commissioners is there to listen to the residents. He repeated that they represent the unincorporated areas.

Shauna Phelps commented on neighbors and friendships in the community. She shared that her husband, along with others, have experienced attacks on their character due to disagreements on the incorporation of West Mountain City. Ms. Phelps mentioned specifically a sign posted in the neighborhood by someone who one week prior was given a ride home from school for their son. She adamantly advised the residents to stop attacking each other, and especially against turning children into enemies. Ms. Phelps noted that it is the responsibility of the residents to be involved with their community.

Jan Barker asked about the "MAG" projection referred to during the presentation by Cecily Buell and Susan Becker. Commissioner Anderson clarified that MAG, or the Mountainland Association of Governments, is comprised of several counties; they provide information regarding growth and roads in Utah along the Wasatch Front, and Summit and Utah Counties. Ms. Barker agreed that there has been division amongst the people over incorporation, and pointed out that it is fruitless to continually repeat that certain people did not know about the matter. It is in the past - the residents all know now, and should take it upon themselves to keep each other knowledgeable.

Jan Barker added her support to earlier statements from Clark Turner and Grant Schaerrer; a unified goal must be reached for the good of the community. Ms. Barker recalled fearing for her family when first moving to West Mountain, only to discover that everyone present moved for the same reasons: a rural way of life. She does not agree with the concerns over what a City Council might force upon the residents. Ms. Barker expressed that they are all neighbors, and all worthy of trust.

Lorin Jensen explained that he initially refused to sign the petition when first approached, but consented upon being told that the Feasibility Study is only to determine the possibility of incorporation. Mr. Jensen voiced concern that the names on the petition could be used on the application to incorporate, and Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore clarified that the signatures would not be used in that manner. Mr. Moore explained that the application could only use those same names from the petition for the application if the original request included specific language identifying that purpose. Mr. Jensen also voiced concern over the estimates provided within the Feasibility Study, and misinformation. He acknowledged that change is inevitable, but stated he "doesn't think it's our time yet." Mr. Jensen is against any increase in taxes.

Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore further detailed Utah Code Section 10-2-109, reiterating that there was no language on the request for the Feasibility Study that made it clear the signatures could also be used on an application for incorporation; therefore, new signatures would need to be collected for the process to move forward. Michael Smith asked if people signing the petition are signing in favor of the incorporation, and Mr. Moore replied 'no;' the signatures would only determine whether the issue will be included on a ballot for election.

Tamara Atkin asked whether West Mountain City would be held financially responsible for the Feasibility Study and the election upon incorporation. Robert J. Moore quoted Utah Code Section 10-2-123 to clarify that any city expenses would have to be incurred after the actual incorporation; Utah County will not request reimbursement of the study costs.

Jacob Miller purchased property in West Mountain in 2002 to build a house on his "own little piece of the planet." There were no houses for 200 yards in any direction at that time; now there is one within half that distance, and a couple across the street. Mr. Miller spoke of a friend's struggle to sell property in American Fork for the last decade, and the revelation that the city is planning an overpass near the land which effectively renders it unable-to-sell for the next forty years. Mr. Miller speculated that the same problems can become a reality in West Mountain if left to the control of a City Council. He noted the decrease of farmers and greater profit of selling property in smaller parcels, ending his comments by quoting Matt Kalmar's earlier sentiment: he would prefer mink farms over hundreds of houses in the rural environment.

UTAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WEST MOUNTAIN INCORPORATION
MINUTES - December 17, 2013
Page 7

Paul Meredith noted the fallacy in the repeated statement of “local control” from those in favor of incorporation, reasoning that it is not local because no one asked his opinion when drawing up the plans. He asked whether the law allows for an amended feasibility study, and Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore stated it is possible under Utah Code Section 10-2-107 if the results do not meet the revenue-over-expense requirements established earlier, and it is requested by the sponsors. When Mr. Meredith asked whether the sponsors could re-submit a petition with new boundaries to exclude certain individuals, Mr. Moore explained why that is not really an option. Mr. Meredith asked the audience to consider why they would want to raise taxes to have the same services currently provided by the county. He expressed that West Mountain is heaven the way it is; move to a city if you want to live in a city.

Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore provided some more details on the pending Payson City Red Bridge annexation application in relation to the Feasibility Study for the Incorporation of West Mountain City. If the annexation is not approved within ninety days following the Feasibility Study, the petition sponsors could request a modified study to include that property in the analysis.

JoDee Atkin felt a sense of panic when she initially found out that West Mountain was being considered for incorporation. Ms. Atkin mentioned that neighbors should have been involved in the process from the beginning; she called the county directly for more details. When an audience member interrupted to state that everyone has been invited to the meetings, Ms. Atkin responded that she had only heard about one session, and it was after the fact from one of her children. Ms. Atkin pointed out that the County Commissioners and Deputy Attorneys have made themselves very accessible, and added that Payson City is not in a rush to annex West Mountain. She shared her opinion that Payson City only interfered where the dump is concerned out of anticipation for this incorporation. Ms. Atkin suggested changes for Utah County Government, noting there are other solutions than becoming a city.

Carl Parker thanked the Henderson family for serving as hosts for this meeting and treating all present as guests, noting their quality of character. Mr. Parker reminded the audience that annexation is a request from citizens to join a city. Payson City does not approach property and attempt to claim it as their own. Mr. Parker commented on the outdated practices of the Utah County Commission, pointing out that they represent 12,000 people throughout the entire county. He urged the residents to take responsibility for not participating in their local government, and encouraged them to become more engaged.

Dee Henderson commended Susan Becker and Cecily Buell from Zion’s Bank for their thorough work for the Feasibility Study. He also thanked the County Commissioners for facilitating the study. Mr. Henderson identified himself as one of the requesting petitioners, along with Michael Smith, Clark Turner, Julie Blaney, and Monte and Shauna Phelps. He emphasized that the idea for incorporation was not a hunt against mink farmers or anyone else; only an attempt to keep West Mountain a great place for the future. Mr. Henderson spoke of the many meetings and research conducted, and the bell curve learning process. He suggested that the residents lay aside doubts and instead focus on teamwork and positive possibilities. Someone in the audience suggested an email list for future communications, and Mr. Henderson addressed legal requirements: it is not accurate to assume that a water system or septic systems will become mandatory upon incorporation, since that would be decided by the residents and elected officials. Mr. Henderson repeated that the purpose of the study is to determine what is feasible. The group plans to use the next year for further discussions, and hopes everyone will participate as a community.

Brent Thurman asked for clarification regarding the questions to be posed on the ballot, and Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore explained. The initial votes will be used to determine three things: Will West Mountain become a city? If so, what form of government shall run the city? i.e. 5-member Council, 6-member Council, Mayor/5-member Council, etc. The final question would be if the councilmembers are selected by the city. Other issues related to zoning and parcel divisions would be dealt with through a separate process. Mr. Thurman expressed concern about the unknown factors on the other side of the vote.

UTAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WEST MOUNTAIN INCORPORATION
MINUTES - December 17, 2013
Page 8

Mark Belk asked about the filing process; is the group to submit the application for incorporation the same as the group that petitioned for the Feasibility Study? Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore confirmed. Mr. Belk summarized that following the hearing tonight, the group has one year to file the application for incorporation. He also acknowledged the general consensus that the members of the community would like West Mountain to remain as much as possible in its current status - the disagreement occurs in the separate ideas to maintain that environment. Mr. Belk expressed hope that the neighbors will be able to work through discussions together to fully understand the ramifications of any decisions. He encouraged clear communication, rejecting the "sound bites" of easily-repeated catchphrases used thus far in arguments. Mr. Belk pointed out that they do not want to become politicians who only talk with no following actions. He reminded the group that West Mountain is a unique situation, reiterating the point that buzz words should not interfere with actual information.

Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore clarified his response to Mark Belk regarding the filing of the application to incorporate; anyone can submit the paperwork, not necessarily just the group that originally petitioned for the study.

Vic Petersen mentioned a local resident serving on the Utah County Board of Adjustment. Commissioner Witney confirmed, adding that the resident is also a member of the Utah County Planning Commission. Mr. Petersen asked if it is true that a city cannot annex land, and Utah County Deputy Attorney Robert J. Moore explained that there are two approaches to annexation. In short, however, someone must petition to be annexed.

Vic Petersen shared the quote, "Five and a quarter acres is the best defense against development." He mentioned a home for sexual offenders that had been presented to the community, which banded together and won against the construction of it in West Mountain. Mr. Petersen noted that he moved from Sandy, Utah to Mapleton, Utah for space, comparing Mapleton to California. He voiced that the rights of citizens are limited - what can and cannot factually be achieved by becoming a city should be clarified, since local government does not always provide absolute protection.

Melvin Meredith mentioned that he is a full-time farmer. He commented on seeing all of his neighbors move in to the area since the year 1987. Mr. Meredith added that the changes happened gradually, and there is no reason to change. He is in favor of keeping the area for agricultural use, stating that West Mountain is great as is; let's keep it that way.

Paul Rindlisbacher declared that history repeats itself only when the people do not listen. The first settlers of West Mountain came in the 1850's and lived in relative peace and tranquility for more than a century. Mr. Rindlisbacher was born here. He asked the residents to answer themselves, "Why did you come to West Mountain?" Mr. Rindlisbacher joked that none of them would state it is because West Mountain is a beautiful and wonderful city. They all moved for their own individual reasons. Mr. Rindlisbacher referred to the "old-timers," noting that they operated with the motto 'live and let live.' They worked with their hands, simple machinery, and tools, and raised their families to understand that things that are not broken do not need to be fixed. Mr. Rindlisbacher pointed out that change will happen, just as it has since 1860 and will again by the year 2060, but one large overhaul is not the method to achieve those changes.

Paul Rindlisbacher's closing comments were against contention between friends and family. He mentioned speaking to the Utah County Clerk/Auditor's Office and receiving information that the Feasibility Study is borderline; without a tax base, people cannot afford to pay more money and still earn their livelihood. Mr. Rindlisbacher encouraged the residents to be patient for a successful transition, rather than demanding change on their own terms.

UTAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WEST MOUNTAIN INCORPORATION
MINUTES - December 17, 2013
Page 9

The Board thanked the audience for their attendance and input, and Commissioner Witney adjourned the meeting. The minutes of the December 17, 2013 Public Hearing: West Mountain Incorporation Feasibility Study meeting were approved on February 11, 2014.

DOUG WITNEY, Commission Chair

ATTEST:

BRYAN E. THOMPSON
Utah County Clerk/Auditor