

**MINUTES OF THE
SOUTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, October 7, 2014 – 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers, City Hall**

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Mayor James F. Minster, Council Members Sallee Orr, Wayne Smith, Bryan Benard, Brent Strate and Russ Porter

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

City Manager Matt Dixon, City Attorney Ken Bradshaw, Parks and Public Works Director Jon Andersen, Chief of Police Darin Parke and Recorder Leesa Kapetanov

CITIZENS PRESENT

Jim Pearce, Austin Miller, Jerry Cottrell, Melanie Wilhelmsen, Stephanie Christianson, Matt & Alison Thorsted, Nicole McGarry, Hailey Toyn, Paige Vanden Bosch, Emily Stanger, Jason Allen

I. OPENING CEREMONY

A. Call to Order

Mayor James F. Minster called the meeting to order at 6:04 pm and called for a motion to convene.

Council Member Smith moved to convene as the South Ogden City Council, with a second from Council Member Porter. In a voice vote Council Members Strate, Orr, Benard, Porter and Smith all voted aye.

B. Prayer/Moment of Silence

The mayor led those present in a moment of silence.

C. Pledge of Allegiance

Council Member Porter then directed everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The mayor indicated it was time for public comments; no action would be taken on comments and those speaking should limit their comments to three minutes.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Nicole McGarry, 4560 Jefferson - Ms. McGarry had come to the meeting to express the need for sidewalks in her neighborhood, especially for children walking to school; currently, children were walking in the street or on the grass. There were no sidewalks on Jefferson Avenue from 4500 S. to 4300 S. She asked that the city council look at putting sidewalks in the area. She knew the process might take a while, so she suggested in the meantime the city put in bike lanes or change the road to one way.

Alison Thorsted, 4468 Orchard Ave. – said she and her children walk to school and pre-school on 4500 South. She added she was also the Health and Safety Advisor at Mar-Lon Hills Elementary School. She said there was not only a safety concern about children walking to school, but also a concern about how fast cars were traveling on the streets. She said there were no sidewalks on Orchard Avenue or 4500 South when walking to the school. More and more children were moving into the neighborhood and the problem was becoming larger. She suggested painting the streets indicating there was a school zone nearby, or even putting speed bumps in the streets to make people slow down.

Emily Stanger, 4520 Orchard Ave. – stated there were many children on her street that walked to school and there were more and more children moving into the area. She said there was an especially dangerous area at the corner of 4500 South and Orchard because the road curved and drivers could not see pedestrians on the road. She realized that it took a while to put sidewalks in, and so she would like to see the school zone extended on 4500 South down to Jefferson or even further. She also suggested adding more signs indicating there were children present. Ms. Stanger also commented about a problem house at 666 E 4500 S. There had been more than one death at the home as well as numerous other problems. She felt the property was not safe because of the activities happening there and wanted to voice her concerns.

Melanie Wilhelmson, 651 Lavina Dr. – pointed out her children did have sidewalks to get to school, but she was here in support of her neighbors and friends who didn't have sidewalks.

Jerry Cottrell, 5765 S 1075 E – said he did not have children that attended Mar-Lon Hills, but had confidence the council would help the children in the area.

Mr. Cottrell then went on to comment, saying the city lied about when STEPS Recovery put their application in; there had also been questions as to when a moratorium went into effect. The city couldn't seem to get their story straight and that was why many people in his neighborhood didn't trust what they were told by city officials. He said someone had lied to the residents and to the city council and asked the mayor and City Manager Dixon to determine who lied and deal with the situation appropriately. He then addressed the city council, telling them that if they did not mean to put an exemption in the moratorium, they should find out who inserted the exemption and why. He also wondered why the exemption was not mentioned in the motion.

Mr. Cottrell then finished by stating the city's handling of the moratorium was disgraceful and said the problem seemed to lie with city staff leadership (Mr. Cottrell submitted a written copy of his comments for the record. See Attachment A).

Sean Wilcoxon, 4525 Orchard Ave. – Mr. Wilcoxon felt 4500 South was high risk because of the speeding on the street. He would like to see sidewalks put in on Orchard to the school as well as 4400 South and Porter. He had done some research, indicating sidewalks cost about \$10 per foot and would like to see some put in.

III. RECOGNITION OF SCOUTS/STUDENTS PRESENT

There were no scouts or students present, however Council Member Strate presented South Ogden pins to the young children in the audience.

IV. PRESENTATION

A. Reed Richards - Chairman of RAMP 2014 Committee

Mr. Richards was not present but Stephanie Christiansen was there to represent the RAMP 2014 Committee. She gave the council a handout (see Attachment B). She explained to the audience what the RAMP tax was and that it was up for renewal on this year's ballot. South Ogden City alone had received \$692,031 from RAMP Grants during the 9 years it had been in effect. Ms. Christiansen showed a presentation (see Attachment C) to the council. The RAMP tax cost the average household between \$10 to \$12 per year and generated over \$53,000,000 to help with recreation, arts, museums and

parks in the county. She asked for support from everyone present in renewing the tax by voting in favor of it in this year's election.
Ms. Christiansen answered some questions from staff and the council and then concluded her presentation.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approval of September 2, 2014 and September 16, 2014 Council Minutes
- B. Approval of September Warrants Register
- C. Approval of Tuscan Ridge Townhomes PRUD Phase 5

Mayor Minster read through the consent agenda and asked if there were any questions. There were no questions or comments, so the mayor called for a motion.

Council Member Porter moved to approve the consent agenda, items A, B, and C as listed. The motion was seconded by Council Member Benard. There was no further discussion on the motion. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

The consent agenda was approved.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

- A. To Receive and Consider Comments on the Proposed Amendments to the FY2015 Budget

City Manager Dixon explained it was necessary from time to time to amend the budget. He invited Finance Director Steve Liebersbach to come forward and give an overview of the amendments being made.

Mr. Liebersbach explained there were some carry-over items from the previous budget that needed to be addressed, some new monies that had been received as well as some unforeseen expenditures that all required amendments to the budget. He then mentioned that that evening's discussion would not be as long as anticipated, as there would not be any discussion on capital outlay.

Mayor Minster called for a motion to leave the public meeting and enter a public hearing to receive comments on amendments to the FY2015 budget.

Council Member Porter moved to open the public hearing to receive comments on the budget, followed by a second from Council Member Benard. All present voted aye.

The mayor invited anyone who wished to come forward and comment. No one came forward. Mayor Minster then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Council Member Orr moved to leave the public hearing and return to the council meeting. Council Member Porter seconded the motion. All present voted aye.

VII. DISCUSSION / ACTION ITEMS

- A. Consideration of Ordinance 14-13- Amending the FY2015 Budget

Finance Director Liebersbach came forward and reviewed the amendments, going over each line item and explaining what it was. He made special note of the last line item, explaining that this amendment allocated money for legal fees in connection with the monastery property. The total cost for the fees was not known, but because of the fees and the possible landscaping of the island that would be created in the Harrison Blvd./Hwy. 89 project, staff had taken all capital one-time projects out of the budget.

The council asked some questions about the budget which Mr. Liebersbach answered. Mayor Minster then called for a motion.

Council Member Smith moved to adopt Ordinance 14-13, amending the 2015 budget, followed by a second from Council Member Porter. Seeing no further discussion, the mayor called the vote:

Council Member Smith-	Yes
Council Member Porter-	Yes
Council Member Orr-	Yes
Council Member Benard-	Yes
Council Member Strate-	Yes

Ordinance 14-13 was adopted.

B. Discussion and Consideration of Previously Tabled Ordinance 14-11- Amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule

City Manager Dixon pointed out the amendments to the fee schedule were housekeeping items. Council Member Orr asked if our fees were what were allowed by the state. City Attorney Ken Bradshaw referred her to the GRAMA fees which cited state code as what would be allowed. Council Member Benard reminded everyone he had previously held this ordinance up as the last page showing the appeal petition fee had been missing. It was now present and he saw no issues with the ordinance.

Council Member Strate said the term hearing officer was used in many different ways throughout the city ordinance. He wondered if the fee specified in the schedule applied to all appeals in the city. Mr. Bradshaw explained appeals that were heard by the hearing officer would be charged the fee.

The mayor then called for a motion.

Council Member Porter moved to adopt Ordinance 14-11, followed by a second from Council Member Benard. The mayor asked if there were further discussion. Council Member Strate clarified what fees the state mandated. Mr. Bradshaw explained some of the wording in the state code, saying there was not a dollar amount set, but rather a reference was given to how much could be charged according to who was able to supply the information. Mr. Strate asked if there was any intent to recover the costs or if it was just a formality. Mr. Bradshaw said for a GRAMA request, costs were often not recovered. For appeals concerning business licenses, someone could appeal to the city manager and there would not be a charge for the appeal. If they wanted to appeal the city manager's decision, it would go to the hearing officer, at which time the fee would be charged. Council Member Strate suggested the wording for appeals in the code be looked at and made clearer. **There was no further discussion. The mayor made a roll call vote:**

Council Member Porter-	Yes
Council Member Benard-	Yes
Council Member Orr-	Yes
Council Member Strate-	Yes
Council Member Smith-	Yes

Ordinance 14-11 was adopted.

C. Discussion on Landscaping of Island at Highway 89/Harrison Boulevard Interchange

City Manager Dixon referred the council to the map of the project in their packets. He said the re-alignment project at Harrison and Highway 89 would create an island that was very large, as well as a smaller one to the southeast. UDOT had allotted a certain percentage

for the landscaping of the islands, but would give the city the option of enhancing the landscaping if they would fund it. Staff from PEC, the landscaping company working with UDOT, was present and looking for some direction from the council as to how to move forward.

Jason Allen and Lars Anderson from PEC came to the podium to answer questions. Council Member Smith said he would like a digital sign on the island that could be changed to warn drivers of upcoming road hazards. Mr. Allen said UDOT did limit digital signs to text only (no images) and did not allow any commercial advertising. There was more discussion and questions concerning landscaping for the island. They then discussed the number of lanes and where they were going. The consensus of the council was they would like to see two lanes coming off of westbound Highway 89 onto northbound Harrison Boulevard instead of just one. There seemed to be plenty of room to do it, and they felt it would alleviate traffic backup. Mr. Allen said they would request that UDOT add the lane, but if UDOT's traffic count and study did not show the lane was needed, it would be difficult to get them to add it.

The council discussed the current "Welcome to South Ogden" sign, stating that it should remain in place even if another welcome sign was put on the island, but it and the landscaping around it should be updated to match what was done on the islands. Council Members Benard and Orr stated they were against any type of digital text sign in the island; the sign should be a monument sign. The council then discussed the landscaping for the islands and what the maintenance would be.

City Manager Dixon was also concerned with the area by the existing welcome sign that would be used as a detention basin; it had the potential to become an eyesore and not be maintained since it was UDOT property. He asked Mr. Larsen if he could do a low maintenance landscape for it that the city might maintain. The council discussed what low maintenance would entail; did it mean all rocks or grass? They asked Parks and Public Works Director Jon Andersen to comment. Mr. Andersen said rocks were not low maintenance because weeds tended to grow up between them; he preferred grass. However, he was worried about the safety of his crews who would have to mow the grass in the island; there was also the issue of debris being shot out from mowers and trimmers that might damage passing cars. The council determined that grass was probably not desirable in the island; xeriscaping would be better. The detention basin should be grass with some shrubs and elements to tie it in with the island. Mr. Andersen suggested the water feature of the current "Welcome to South Ogden" sign be enhanced. Council Member Smith suggested putting a stamped concrete apron around the island to allow cars to pull off onto it if they broke down. Mr. Allen and Mr. Anderson said they would look at the suggestion and see if it would work with the water run-off and drain system.

The consensus of the council was the landscaping of the island should be as low maintenance but as attractive as possible and incorporate a "Welcome to South Ogden" monument sign.

VIII. DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS

A. Parks and Public Works Director Jon Andersen – Project Updates

Mr. Andersen gave updates on projects throughout the city:

Chambers Road Project – this project was very close to being completed.

1075 East Road Project – the street should be mostly dug out by tomorrow. There had been some poor soil issues that would drive the cost for the project up significantly. They hoped to be laying asphalt by next week, weather permitting.

Overlay Projects – Glasmann, 850 East and Burch Creek had all been completed, and the striping would include bike lanes as designated by the bike plan. The 5700 South overlay had run into issues where the water line was; part of the road would have to be excavated and new dirt brought in before it could be overlaid. This was a common issue with all

roads in the city, and part of the reason many roads were crumbling.

Willow Wood Road Project – because of the issues on the other roads and imminent bad weather, they had determined to simply clean this road up from the water line project and not work on it until next spring.

40th Street Storm Sewer Project – this project was 50% complete.

Crack Seal – this project was complete.

Road Striping – should be completed by the end of the week.

Mr. Andersen then talked to the council about signs for the Nature Park, as discussed in a previous meeting. He had brought some signs to the meeting to give the council members an understanding of what the different sizes would look like. He wanted some direction as to what the signs should say as well as how large they should be. The council indicated the signs should say dogs had to be on leashes and no ATV's were allowed. Council Member Smith said a sign by the amphitheater should prohibit skateboarding as well. Mr. Andersen also showed the council some options for barricades at entrance points that would not allow ATV's to go through, but allowed foot traffic. He then informed them that a 20"x30" one color sign would cost approximately \$75-\$80.

The consensus of the council was the signs should be large (20"x30"). The sign for dogs should say "Attention Dog Owners" and then have pictures indicating the dogs needed to be on a leash and cleaned up after. Mr. Andersen said he would put the larger ones at the entrances and smaller ones throughout the park as reminders. He hoped to have the signs designed and an example for the council to approve by the next meeting.

Council Member Smith then asked Mr. Andersen about the new street lights. It seemed to Mr. Smith they were burning out more often than the old streetlights. Mr. Andersen said that was probably not the case, but it was more noticeable because the lights were brighter. He also said the contract to replace the bulbs was for ten years.

B. Chief West – Open House Information

The chief informed the council it was Fire Prevention Week and the fire department was holding an open house tomorrow from five to eight pm.

Chief West also offered to help any members of the council with their NIMS training.

Council Member Smith commented that NIMS compliancy was mandated by the federal government and related to being able to receive certain grant money.

Mayor Minster asked Chief Parke if he had anything to report. The chief came forward and said the ASPCA had given the city a \$5,000 grant. There had also been a very positive article in the Salt Lake Tribune concerning the city's animal shelter, which had resulted in a private donation of \$100.

IX. REPORTS

A. Mayor – in the interest of time, the mayor had nothing to report.

B. City Council Members

Council Member Smith – nothing to report

Council Member Strate – nothing to report

Council Member Benard – nothing to report

Council Member Orr – said she planned on going to Mar Lon Hills in the morning from 8:00 to 8:20 am to see what the situation was.

She reported about a Mosquito Abatement Conference she had attended; she had visited a class on Ethics and GRAMA and based on what she had learned, she asked if a limited reply from the council could be added to the public comments section of the agenda, or the council have a discussion about whether they wanted to add it or not.

She also had received another complaint on the sign on Highway 89; it was too bright. She concluded by reminding everyone about Open Mic Night on Thursday and SOBA meeting Wednesday at noon at the old city hall building.

Council Member Porter – thanked staff for their part in applying for RAMP funds and encouraged everyone to vote for it. He also thanked staff for working with the residents on 43rd Street, helping them to get their driveways smoothed out.

C. **City Manager** – nothing to report

D. **City Attorney Ken Bradshaw** – nothing to report

X. RECESS INTO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND RENEWAL AGENCY BOARD MEETING

Mayor Minster then indicated it was time to recess into a Community Development and Renewal Agency Board meeting and entertained a motion to do so.

Council Member Benard moved to recess into a Community Development and Renewal Agency Board meeting, followed by a second from Council Member Porter. All present voted aye.

See separate minutes.

XI. RECONVENE CITY COUNCIL MEETING, ADJOURN AND CONVENE INTO A WORK SESSION

A. Discussion on Land Use Ordinances

(Motion from CDRA Board Meeting)

The CDRA Board returned to the council room at 9:03 pm. Board Chairman Minster called for a motion to close the executive session, reconvene the CDRA Board meeting, adjourn, and reconvene as the South Ogden City Council, adjourn council meeting and convene into a council work session.

Board Member Smith so moved, with a second from Board Member Benard. All present voted aye. (Note: Board Member Orr was not present for the vote).

The council moved to the EOC Room for the work session. Council Member Orr was present for the work session, as well as the other members of the council. Staff present for all or part of the work session were : City Manager Matt Dixon, City Attorney Ken Bradshaw, Parks and Public Works Director Jon Andersen, Police Chief Darin Parke, City Recorder Leesa Kapetanov and Attorney Neil Lindberg, Land Use Attorney retained by the city. Jerry Cottrell, a resident of the city, was also present.

After a short break, the work session began at 9:17 pm. The mayor turned the time to City Manager Dixon to lead the discussion.

Mr. Dixon said that due to many questions being raised by the council about land use, they had decided to hold the work session. He had tried to structure the work session to answer the questions the council had, beginning with: 1)How is land use authority defined in state and city code, and 2)What are the differences between legislative, administrative, and quasi-judicial decisions and how do they affect the processes the city deals with. Mr. Dixon introduced Neil Lindberg, the attorney who had advised the planning commission through the recent conditional use application. Mr. Lindberg was there to help answer some of the questions the council had.

City Manager Dixon turned the time to Neil Lindberg to go over some educational points on land use. Mr. Lindberg went over some important points of LUDMA (Land Use, Development, and Management Act), explaining to the council every city must have at least one land use authority and at least one appeal authority. The city's zoning ordinance set out the procedures for approving applications. The applications could be divided into two classifications: administrative/quasi-judicial and legislative. The planning commission had two major functions: making recommendations to the council on legislative things, and to making decisions on applications as they may be empowered to do so through the zoning ordinance. Mr. Lindberg referred to a chart which had been included in the packet concerning the differences between types of proceedings. He reviewed the different types and explained the differences between legislative, administrative/quasi-judicial and ministerial, and the important points to consider for each one.

City Attorney Ken Bradshaw said the council needed to make a philosophical decision of what roles they wanted to be involved in; they were already involved in legislative proceedings and needed to determine if they wanted to be involved in some of the administrative/quasi-judicial proceedings as well. However, they would also need to look at the time commitment entailed in doing so as well as consider other ramifications. Mr. Lindberg cautioned against getting involved in administrative/quasi-judicial proceedings, as it was easy to get the standards of review mixed up. They may be involved in an administrative review but unwittingly use a legislative standard, or vice versa. It would leave the city very open to litigation.

City Manager Dixon referred the council to the Land Use Appeals Authority Chart included in their packet, which outlined the process of different land use actions. He recognized the current code needed updating; it needed to be clearer and more easily understood. The question that now needed answering was, did the council want to look at how land use authority was delegated and decide if they wanted to change it.

Council Member Porter said the current system had been working for decades, and had only come into question because of the recent hard decision. He agreed some points of the code needed to be fixed, but the system did not need a total overhaul. Council Member Smith agreed. Council Member Benard said the council should review the Land Use Appeals Authority Chart and determine how it should be set out. The council discussed some parts of the ordinance pointed out by Council Member Strate. Mr. Strate felt the process for conditional use permits should go back to how it was prior to May 21, 2013, but keep the appeal officer rather than a Board of Adjustments.

Mr. Lindberg said the council needed to consider what level of complexity was appropriate in a process. The goal was to get the applicant "to home plate". He suggested that the conditional uses be studied to determine where they should be allowed and under what conditions. Council Member Strate pointed out some cities did not have conditional uses at all in their codes. Mr. Lindberg said the reason for conditional uses was to allow flexibility within the code, however, he advocated having

very few of them and being very specific as to what standards would have to be met to allow them.

City Manager Dixon informed the council the planning commission was looking at the various uses in residential zones to see if changes should be made; they would then make a recommendation to the council. They would also be assigned to make updates to sections of the zoning ordinance so it complied with the Fair Housing Act.

Mr. Dixon said if the council was ready to make the decision to stay out of all administrative/quasi-judicial processes and concern itself with only legislative processes, staff could set up the code to reflect that decision. Council Member Benard said he would like to review the Land Use Appeals Authority Chart and would like some information as to why they were set up the way they were. He also wanted a complete chart, as the current one was only 95% complete. He was not ready to commit to only being involved in legislative processes until he had more information. The rest of the council concurred.

There was no more discussion. Mayor Minster called for a motion to adjourn.

Council Member Strate moved to adjourn, followed by a second from Council Member Porter. The vote was unanimous to adjourn. The meeting ended at 11:05 pm.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of the South Ogden City Council Meeting held Tuesday, October 7, 2014.


Leesa Kapetanov, City Recorder

Date Approved by the City Council October 21, 2014

Attachment A

Written Comments from Jerry Cottrell

As many of you know, I look at things happening in the City and they sometimes remind me of movies. I am withholding judgment for now as to whether or not it is still Groundhog Day. I am hopeful that we can finally move on. But I am thinking of another movie; it came out in 1971... a movie called "The Gang That Couldn't Shoot Straight". I thought of that movie because it occurred to me that if a movie were made about South Ogden City government, it might be titled, "The Gang That Can't Get It's Story Straight."

The City's Version 1 of the moratorium story was that Mr. Jorgensen got his application in the day before the moratorium took effect. We now know that story was a lie.

The City's Version 2 of the story has it that the moratorium went into effect June 12th. Now that might have been problematic since we found irrefutable evidence that Mr. Jorgensen's application was not submitted until June 13th. Ah, but not to worry! It seems the City Council specifically exempted STEPS from the moratorium.

But then on the night of the appeal hearing, along came the City's legal eagle, Mr. Neil Lindberg, who dazzled us all with Version 3 of that story. For the benefit of those not present at the hearing, I will just let you know that Mr. Lindberg opined that because of the way the ordinance was drawn up, the moratorium actually went into effect on June 17th.

So, out of one moratorium the City has presented three different stories. I wonder if that fact could possibly be related to the fact that many of my neighbors don't trust what they are told by City officials. And why should they? After all, these moratorium stories are mutually exclusive. They can't all be true! But the most disturbing thing to me is that I recognize that it is entirely possible that none of them is true. There may be a Version 4 just over the horizon.


Mr. Mayor and Mr. Dixon, I don't think it is unreasonable of me to expect that neither of you would endorse lying to the citizens but clearly, someone did lie to us. In fact, if I am not mistaken, they also lied to the City Council. I expect the two of you to determine who lied and to deal with the situation appropriately.

To the City Council, if you did not intend an exemption to the moratorium, I hope you will take the time and trouble to determine who inserted that exemption... and why. But if you intended to exempt STEPS, it might be helpful to reflect upon why the exemption was not mentioned in the motion. After all, during the Planning Commission discussion of the expansion of educational facilities in R1 zones, Mr. Bradshaw assured us all that it matters how an ordinance is motioned. Well, at least it matters when the City wants it to matter... other times, not so much.

Some might think this topic unimportant because the moratorium has expired. But the City's handling of this moratorium is symptomatic of larger issues... issues that are as relevant today as they were back in June when the City first started weaving its fantasy Version 1 of the moratorium story. We can't change the past but I would appreciate it if the City would just tell the truth from now on. The City's handling of this moratorium is

nothing short of disgraceful. And just to be clear, I am directing these last remarks not at the City Council but at the City staff and possibly its leadership. That seems to be where the problem exists. But I am asking the City Council to help fix the problem. Thank you.


Attachment B
RAMP Handout



South Ogden City

2006:	South Ogden Nature Park	\$163,000
	Municipality	\$14,377
2007:	Municipality	\$15,195
	South Ogden Days	\$ 2,000
2008:	South Ogden Nature Park	\$200,000
	Municipality	\$15,615
	South Ogden Days	\$ 1,000
2009:	Municipality	\$15,615
	South Ogden Days	\$18,000
2010:	Municipality	\$15,891
	Community Concert	\$ 4,600
2011:	Amphitheater	\$70,000
	Your Art on Canvas	\$20,000
	Municipality	\$16,118
	South Ogden Days	\$10,000
	1936 Experience Exhibit	\$ 3,500
2012:	Municipality	\$16,532
	South Ogden Days	\$ 5,000
2013:	Friendship Park Tennis Courts	\$43,843
	Splash Pad Upgrade	\$20,500
	Municipality	\$16,532
	South Ogden Days	\$ 5,000
Total		\$692,031

Attachment C
RAMP Presentation



Renew RAMP on NOV 4

Your Quality of Life

In 2004, you authorized Weber County RAMP to fund enhancements for Recreation, Arts, Museums and Parks in your community



Your vote created a better quality of life and greater economic vitality for Weber County Citizens



Your Penny at Work



RAMP is funded by a sales tax of 1/10 of 1% or one penny for every \$10



The average Weber County family invested \$12 per year in RAMP

Your \$12 generated \$2.5 million per year for community projects

Your Investment Has Funded...

Trails and hiking bridges, sports fields and courts
The Weber County Ice sheet expansion
Park amenities, water features and playgrounds



Music, dance and theatre performances
Festivals and film series
Community amphitheaters and museum exhibitions



RAMP in Your Community

RAMP has funded \$26,515,267 in grants for 91 nonprofit organizations and municipalities



Your Support




RAMP's Summer Saturday Programs have made recreational, arts, museum and park programs available to thousands of children and families at no cost

RAMP's Impact



Your investment was more than doubled through matching funds, land donations, in-kind resources and volunteer services

RAMP Supports What You Love



Affordable access to performances, festivals, concerts and exhibitions

RAMP Gives You Access

Convenient and safe access to mountains, trails and waterways

Local access to first class recreational complexes



RAMP has helped build trails, tunnels, bridges and boardwalks connecting 450 miles of trails in Weber County

Your trail system is used more than 1.2 million times each year



RAMP Economics

RAMP has had a direct economic impact on your community and the businesses that serve Weber County



RAMP Bridges the Gap

A \$2 million RAMP grant for the ice sheet expansion generated an additional \$7.2 million to create the Weber County Sports Complex



RAMP Enriches

RAMP provides hands-on access to unique educational experiences and free access to Summer Saturday activities for families



RAMP Builds

RAMP builds and enhances needed facilities



RAMP Works

Weber County has built a national reputation for quality of life based on amenities that RAMP has helped fund



RAMP Raises Us All

RAMP expands our horizons and enhances our world

What better use for your penny?



Make It Last

Support what you love for another ten years



The RAMP logo features a stylized green mountain range above the lowercase text 'r.a.m.p.'. To the right of the text is a horizontal strip containing four categories: 'RECREATION', 'ARTS', 'MUSEUMS', and 'PARKS', each accompanied by a small square image illustrating the respective activity.



Vote to Renew RAMP
on November 4



The logo consists of a green mountain range icon above the text 'r.a.m.p.' in lowercase. Below this, the word 'WORKS' is written in large, bold, orange uppercase letters. At the bottom, the phrase 'FOR YOU' is written in smaller, orange uppercase letters, with a brushstroke-like effect behind the text.

