

29 May, 2020

Dear Mayor,

I am writing to you to express a couple of ideas/suggestions I have for our town. As you know, I always have an opinion about everything. That said, I will give you my opinions about two items I think are important.

The first is of immediate concern. I know you are in process of doing next year's budget. With the pandemic, I know the sales tax income will be much lower and I expect other incomes will also be impacted. It could possibly even lower home assessment values for property tax evaluation. Therefore, I propose that the city council make a one year tax adjustment to raise our property tax rate to cover the loss of expected income. At the same time, I would ask that the "nice-to-have" items (trails, parks, and other non-essential budget items) be reduced to a bare minimum to allow the budget to remain within an acceptable level. I think it would also be acceptable to begin to build a "rainy day" fund even as we are being deluged. These are not easy tasks but I believe are needed to maintain our community in the nice manner we currently have.

The second item is of a less immediate nature. I don't believe the 30 year plan for South Weber growth is of such a priority that it needs to be decided at this time. I recommend putting the effort on hold until after the pandemic when we all can review and discuss it in an open forum and not be limited to a virtual review. As you know, I have thoughts on the future growth of this community even though I will not be here in 30 years. Some areas off issue I have no ideas/input to so will not address. There are two issues I definitely think are important.

First is the plan to have a river walk the entire length of the Weber River through South Weber. It is of vital importance to preserve this environment while we have the chance. I would propose a 50 foot easement back from each river bank. This would allow trails, fishing, and riverine environment that would enhance the community. If we lost that it would never be able to be regained.

The second concern is the gravel pits. Basically, the value of the land/property has already been extracted. What is left is in reality a liability. It should not have anywhere near the value of surrounding real estate but instead should be required to undergo a reclamation effort by the current business and not left as an eyesore for the city. The hole on the east of Highway 89, south of the Weber river, could possibly be used as a giant recreation area, to include such things as ball fields, bike or skateboard parks and such if some reclamation occurred. The only other realistic value would be for a salvage yard or land fill, which I don't think the city would want.

The hole on the west side of Highway 89 is another problem. The idea of high density housing is really a nonstarter. Any break in the river would immediately put the entire internal

community in immediate danger. In addition, placing housing there would require the ongoing cost of maintaining pumping stations to get the sewage into the system with a perpetual burden of raising sewer rates for the whole community. Any pumping failure would involve the city in lawsuits to repair/replace ruined items caused by sewer backups. This would also be true of any storm drainage system. Just the cost of maintaining these systems would be an unfair constant drain on the utility resources. This said, any commercial endeavors would have to be limited to the drainage fields required to provide septic lines for each business so as not to have to tie into the sewer system, and a separate private pumping system for runoff water..

I believe a reasonable solution would be to work with a utility system to have the entire pit turned into a renewable energy source. This could include both solar and wind farms. South Weber may even be able to get a deal wherein it receives a royalty from the energy production. The viable options for this pit are few.

The other pit, the one north of the river, is not in South Weber but will probably be a constant reminder/monument of how not to use our environment.

This letter is intended to provide some ideas and input into our city's needs and future. It is intended to replace the normal input that would be given in open council meetings if they were available. Inasmuch as the only meeting format at this time is on-line, I am submitting them to you, and if appropriate ask they be read into the city council meeting minutes.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ned McCracken', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ned McCracken
2252 Deer Run Drive
South Weber, Utah

From: [TYRON GAGNON](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Landfill growth.
Date: Monday, June 8, 2020 7:36:07 PM

Landfill managers are now adding another layer above the the man made earth berm located above Cedar Bench drive. The windstorms that occurred this past week blew large amounts of trash into south Weber along with a pretty consistent smell of garbage. Video can be provided upon request.

Questions:

Can the City formally request the landfill be cleared by South Weber City before expanding upward along the earth berm?

What can the city do to prevent landfill debris or smell from entering the city?

Can the city provide a status of the complaints logged in the General Plan being built I.e number of complaints the city has received, trends by month.

Can the city inquire and provide to its residents Landfill planning documents for awareness?

Please let me know if you have any comments or questions.

Tyron "Ty" Gagnon
(801) 389-6747

CC 2020-06-09 CI #3 Sturm

Presentation to the South Weber City - City Council - 09Jun20
Comments and Questions on the Meeting Packet Content
by Paul A. Sturm

- 1) I realize that, with the issues surrounding the COVID19 pandemic, the City has attempted to keep citizens informed and able to participate in SWC government, and I applaud these efforts. But, I would like to bring an issue to the City Council that occurred surrounding the Planning Commission (Try #2) meeting on 3Jun20 concerning the car wash. After following the instructions provided by the City for participating in the on-line Zoom meeting, and after having provided Public Comments to the City's Public Comment website, I made my presentation. My presentation was based on the fact that I had submitted my written comments hours earlier, that my verbal comments were summary, and that the Planning Commission would have seen my 3-page series of inputs (background information followed by comments/questions). Few, if any, of the Planning Commission received my documentation, and as such, had no idea regarding the specifics I addressed during my Zoom presentation. After the meeting I talked with some of the Planning Commissioners and they relayed they were confused. When I told them that I had sent a document to Public Comments, I was informed that they did not receive the document, and in fact received nothing for that meeting and had to get it for themselves. I was asked that, in the future, if I would send my input directly to them because the City was not getting them the needed information. There appears to be a disconnect in providing Commissioners/Council members with the public information all of the time. Is there a way to have a backup plan?
- 2) Comment: Regarding this meeting's agenda - There were several Agenda Items listed on the agenda page that were not shown as titles in the remainder of the packet. In some cases it was difficult to determine where the transition between Agenda Items was occurring. In five (5) out of the 14 Agenda Items the Agenda Item number was not shown with the associated packet documentation.
- 3) Agenda Item 6 - Comments on 2020-2021 Tentative Budget Package. (Please note: These are being provided, not be critical, but to enhance the City's product.)
 - a) General Comment - Typically in official documents when a blank page occurs, the statement "This Page Intentionally Left Blank" is put on that page so that the reader knows that there really was no information on that page.
 - b) Page 35 (Packet Page 66): First paragraph - "South Weber City is contracted." It should read "South Weber City contracts for public safety services through..." We do not perform the actual services.

c) Page 45 (Packet Page 76): First paragraph - The South Weber City Streets Department does not finance the City's maintenance, the South Weber City Streets Department Fund does.

d) Pages: Page 73 (Packet Page 104), Page 79 (Packet page 110), and Page 83 (Packet Page 114) need to have the word Fund capitalized to be consistent with the other fund-area discussions in this package.

4) Questions on Agenda Items 9, 10, 11 regarding approvals for the RV Park. Since these Agenda Item numbers are not shown in the packet, I will address my comments/concerns by using the packet page number for reference.

a) Packet page 150: The drawing shows a 2360 sf office, and as per other areas of the documentation (on-site staff not limited to length-of-stay restrictions), this office structure could be assumed to be the residence of that on-site staff member. If that is the case, should not this building constructed in accordance with SWC residential building code, not just as an office?

b) Packet pages 168-171: Reference: South Weber City Planning Commission Meeting 23 May 2019 minutes. Have all of these concerns been addressed? Especially those shown on Packet Page 171 as follows:

Commissioner Grubb moved to recommend to the City Council the Final Approval for Riverside RV Park Conditional Use: At approx. 852 E Cottonwood Ln. (11.85 acres) parcel 13-018-0021 & 07-109-0017 by FM Winkel Family LLC subject to the following:

- 1. City Engineer, Brandon Jones, letter of 16 May 2019.**
- 2. City Planner, Barry Burtons, letter of 16 May 2019.**
- 3. 24 hour on site management.**
- 4. Removal of dead trees and shrubs as approved by Wildlife Resource hired Arborist Consultant.**
- 5. No open fires in individual camp sites.**
- 6. Quiet hours 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.**
- 7. Lighting is to follow quiet hour rule and protect dark sky.**
- 8. A 15' easement for a 10' path minimum be provided to Weber Pathways prior to occupancy and improved for use prior to occupancy thru this property and along the frontage of 6600 South and Cottonwood Drive.**
- 9. RV Park rules must be posted on-site and given to all patrons.**
- 10. Developer provide the elevation certificates for two permanent structures.**
- 11. Provide easement as installed for the culinary water line.**

5) Agenda Item 13 - Legal Services Contract (Packet Page 181): Since three firms responded, why was a comparison table for rates, experience, etc. not shown as has been done for nearly every other competitive proposal received by the City?

cc 2020-0609 CI #4 Johnson

Corinne Johnson

8020 S 2500 E

Overall Budget
is 603,000

I would like to address the Fire Budget for the 2020-2021 Fiscal Year. As I have watched city council meetings over the last year it has become apparent that we spend a lot of money on our Fire Department. I do not oppose investing in our fire department but on several occasions "cheaper" options have been presented that are disregarded, or a lot of time is spent justifying extravagant purchases. This concerns me. It seems like when it comes to the Fire Department South Weber City has money to burn.

We should be spending the appropriate amount of money based on the size of our city and the amount of revenue we collect. I did some research on these numbers and was alarmed to find that we spend a very disproportionate amount of our City's Tax Revenue on the Fire Department. The chart below lays out what I found. We are already over-spending on our fire department and we need to be realistic on how much money we can truly afford to spend on our Fire Department.

City	Fire Department 2020	Tax Revenue 2020	% Spent on Fire
South Weber	\$643,000	\$1.8	35%
Riverdale	\$1.7	\$7.4	22%
South Ogden	\$2	\$9	22%
Syracuse Fire	\$2	\$9	22%
Roy City	\$4	\$18	22%
Brigham City Fire	\$1.4	\$8	17%
Farmington Fire	\$1.3	\$9	14%
Price	\$512,00	\$5	10%
Layton	\$5	\$30	7%

I'd like to focus for a minute on Price. Price is a small town like ours but with double our population. This is the description of their fire department "The Price City Fire Department is a full service fire department which provides structure and wildland fire suppression, emergency medical services, vehicle extrication and crash rescue, confined space rescue, high angle rescue, hazardous materials response and airport firefighting and rescue, fire and arson investigation as well as business fire prevention inspections. We are a National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) combination department which employs a combination of 25 full time and paid on call personnel."

They manage to do all this on a budget 100,000 less than ours. They also have 5 times the tax revenue we do and they still manage to keep their fire department expenses low with just 10% of their revenues spent on the fire department.

Let me remind you we spend 35% of our revenues on fire. I do recognize our budget is dropping by 41,000 for 2021 but that is still way too much of our revenue. To get us to 25% (which is still higher than the average) our budget would need to be around \$450,000.

I am grateful as a South Weber Citizen that we have a full-service fire department and I understand it costs money but there is a huge imbalance here.

South Weber Citizens are asking for additional resources to be spend on our parks and rec programs, trails, street lights, crucial capital facilities infrastructure projects etc. It would be a disservice to South Weber Citizens if you as a City Council do not take a closer look at the Fire Department- their employment structure, equipment purchases, and question the need of expanded EMS services.

I have also heard on numerous occasions that our Fire Department spends the majority of it's time and resources answering calls OUTSIDE our community. Is that what the citizens of South Weber are paying for? I am asking the Public Safety Committee to immediately launch an inquiry into the use of South Weber Tax Payer Dollars in regards to the number of calls, the number of employees and the use of equipment outside our city.

I am very proud of our South Weber City Fire Department and the sterling reputation they have amongst fire departments and the work Chief Tolman has done to earn that reputation. We must make sure, however, that South Weber Citizens do not disproportionately pay too much for services we don't need or are used to serve other communities more than they serve our own.

Julie Losee

2541 E. 8200 S.

CC 2020-06-09 CI #5 Losee

Why are we making all of these major, community impacting, decisions when we can't even meet in person, in a public session, with the ability to comment and share our concerns, likes, dislikes, ask questions and even be heard by others in the community, as well as the council, like we used to?

YouTube videos and emailed comments are not cutting it.

Schools, work, sports, marriages, funerals, our very lives, have all had to be put on hold while the state and the world deals with everything that is currently going on, but our cities business and the need to approve development plans and rezone requests for developers seems to be moving full steam ahead. This frustrates me to no end, especially the more I think on it.

Why are we letting developers plans move forward, when our lives are on hold and our voices can not truly be heard?

The lack of and the limited amount of public opinion and insight might actually be a disservice in the consideration of what is best for the South Weber Community as a whole, especially on items where once approval is given the city will be hard pressed to "take it back"

Please think on this for a moment tonight and before making any decisions that we as a community will "just have to live with"

Thank you for listening, stay safe and I hope we can all get back to LIVING soon!

Julie