

★ CLERK COPY

12/16/2025

Mayor and Council Members,

My name is **Kevin Blomquist**. I'm speaking tonight to provide context regarding the **SITLA property acquisition**, the process my wife **Kresta** and I participated in over several years, and to respectfully ask that the City consider reopening dialogue in the future. My purpose is not to debate past decisions, but to explain our reliance on the process we were guided through and to express our sincere interest in working constructively with the City going forward.

To be clear, this was not a sudden or speculative interest in the subject property. **For more than fifteen years**, my wife Kresta and I had inquired with **SITLA** about the possibility of purchasing this property. For most of that time, SITLA was not willing to sell. **Approximately five years ago**, when we approached them again, they indicated they were finally willing to move forward, and that is when this process formally began.

Before the City purchased the property, I worked directly with **SITLA for nearly two months** to meet their requirements. That work included determining compliant lot sizes, identifying which specific lots we were interested in, and ensuring the proposal met SITLA's rules and restrictions for auction. This was detailed, hands-on work done directly with SITLA staff.

When the property ultimately went to auction, I was asked to **step aside to avoid a bidding war** by **Joe Decker, then serving as City Manager, and Jeff Yates, then serving as a City Council member**, both acting in their official capacities. The understanding conveyed to me was that the City would proceed as the purchaser and would then work with us to help secure the portion of the property that would not be needed for a retention pond. In reliance on that understanding, I worked exclusively with Mr. Decker and Mr. Yates prior to the auction and did not participate in bidding. While discussions continued for a period of time, the process did not ultimately move forward before both individuals left their positions. My understanding of that arrangement was later summarized in a letter authored by Mr. Yates, which I have previously shared with the City.

Over the next five years, we continued to work with Kanab City in good faith. We followed every step we were asked to follow, provided information, paid for a formal appraisal, and remained engaged throughout the process under the belief that the City remained open to a solution. That created real expectations. When the process ended abruptly, it was difficult for both of us—we both had hopes and plans of building our forever home on this property.

I want to be clear about our intentions tonight. We are not here to make demands or to reopen past disagreements. We are here because we value Kanab, we value our relationships, and we genuinely want to find a positive path forward.

If the City is open to it in the future, we would welcome the opportunity to **work collectively again**. One possible option could be revisiting a **property trade**, including land we own that the City is currently using without a formal easement, along with additional funds from us to account for any difference in value. I raise this only as an example of our willingness to be flexible, reasonable, and solution-oriented—not as a request for action tonight.

We understand this matter is not on the agenda, and we respect that. My purpose in speaking is simply to ask that the door not be permanently closed, and that when the time is right, the City consider re-engaging with us in a fair and transparent way.

Kresta and I love this community, and we hope this can ultimately be resolved in a way that reflects well on everyone involved.

Thank you for your time and for allowing me to speak.