

Concerned South Jordan Resident

Recently attended a South Jordan work meeting in which I received an eye opening experience. I was keenly made aware; of how out of step our board and fire chief is; with what I believe are the conservative values which South Jordan residents hold. I wasn't aware that we compare ourselves with cities such as San Diego, Chicago and, casinos that have liberal constituents' and policy makers.

I've lived in South Jordan for 13 years and have never felt I had to watch and attend every city council meeting for my protection until now. Not that AEDs don't have a remarkable use in the community; but since when do we mandate our small business' to have an added expense that the individual should incur if so needed. Also in your mandate if I understood it correctly it could mandate homes with an increased medical need to supply an AED as well. Where does it stop? I'm concerned that we need to understand as a community that everything that is good doesn't need to be mandated.

Please take our communities conservative values as a guide when making policy and mandates now and in the future.

Thank you,
Julie Davis (South Jordan Resident)

From: Mark Seethaler <MSeethaler@sjc.utah.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2012 1:17 PM
To: Chuck Newton
Cc: Scott Osborne; Mark Seethaler
Subject: RE: Condo Development North of The District

Categories: Alarming

We can speak openly ...

- 
1. I 'Replied All' ... if it came to you and cc to others that was not a 'message' I was sending
 2. Brian first responded, effectively stating that she was a winner and not in command of the facts. His response, I believe, did not carry into the same string as this one.
 3. I don't know for certain but I believe this woman (who I don't know) is in Brian's district. It was evident from her response that he (being 'her' representative) was not going to clarify the issue or take the lead.
 4. We actually don't represent individual districts. Under our form of government, once elected (by districts) each of us represent the entire city - a point that could be more effectively managed in practice.
 5. In my initial message I stated that to avoid us handling this 6 different ways, I would appreciate a common response. We did get the two 'official' responses and two personal responses.
 6. We now have something to go on that preserves the city's position while being responsive to a resident ... without taking needless time in a meeting to discuss or assign.
 7. The letter was a week old when I picked it up ... since I saw nothing on it, I decided to initiate a communication that would end in some understandable response - especially since 4 of us were not around when 'the cheapest real estate in the valley' was constructed, right here in South Jordan.
 8. At a personal level (though I did not say so and won't belabor the point) I feel that City leadership was asleep at the wheel when they allowed such a project to move forward. Fast forward 20 years ... that site will be a higher-crime area, etc. What about schools? What about park/open space? Not what we want going forward, so if part of this process is bringing out the 'value' issues, I'm happy for that awareness.
 9. The mayor is plenty busy. If the mayor would like to interject himself in such matters - asking us to hold off until he does so in cases like this where we all get a letter - the mayor can say so himself.
 10. I actually thought I was helping.
- Now - as you stated, no hard feelings. You are always one with whom I can speak openly and for the good of the city I trust this will always be the case.
mark

From: Chuck Newton
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2012 12:51 PM
To: Mark Seethaler
Cc: Scott Osborne
Subject: RE: Condo Development North of The District

Thank you for your comments. I am responding only to you, with a CC just to the mayor because of what I am going to say. I hope you will forgive me for cc'ing the mayor on this. The only reason for doing so, is to use this particular case as a jumping off point for a discussion on how we handle future complaints of this type, and not to cause you any embarrassment or discomfort.

1) The comments of your email tend to indicate that you may have thought I was ridiculing her. And as such, you made the response about the 3 choices which appears to take a swipe at me publicly, in front of the Council and everyone else that was copied. That was made more apparent when you emailed me directly, but copied everyone else.

My intent was not ridicule. I was trying to make the point that even if her position was devoid of fact, which seemed to be the case, we should still respond to her. Then I pointed out that if this was a concern, why did she not deal with it

before - she only dealt with it when her house values went down several years later, which underscores that some situational ethics were involved, which is a reasoned judgement based on experience and the contents of her email.

Separately, this is not the first letter we have received that was addressed to all of us.

I was waiting to see if our City Mgr would volunteer to respond on behalf of the City Council, or suggested a draft from the mayor representing all of us, which is what -- I believe -- should have happened.

2) While you may have responded and forwarded the city staff comments to the lady involved, there are two sub-parts here - A) we each received individual letters, were you responding then on behalf of all of us? B) I am surmising that you don't know this woman personally even though she appears to reside out of your district, nor do you represent the area in question.

As such, while I appreciate your good intentions, this points to a process that we need to put into place to deal with these types of issues.

On a personal note, without any prejudice intended and my personal warm feelings for you, my opinion is that a line was overstepped by your response to her. If the area in question is not in one's district, we should allow the City Council Member to respond to their constituents, or if we have all been contacted which would include the Mayor, then the Mayor and the City Council Member could send a joint response drafted by the City, or the Mayor could respond for all with the appropriate approval of the City Council Member in whose district the complainant resides -- either of which would be appropriate.

Thanks for your concerns, and efforts to see that justice is carried out.

Regards,

Chuck Newton

From: Mark Seethaler

Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2012 12:04 PM

To: Chuck Newton

Cc: George Shaw; MAYOR_CONTACT; CITY_COUNCIL_EMAIL; Leadership Council; Greg Schindler; Ty Montalvo; Ryan Loose

Subject: Re: Condo Development North of The District

As a City, when a resident articulates what, to them, is a legitimate complaint it seems to me that we have three choices ... we can ignore them, we can ridicule them, or we can professionally respond to their complaints while maintaining the integrity of our position.

I am grateful for the professionalism of both George Shaw and Greg Schindler and have received their permission to share the written responses with Mrs. Larson. That's how a professional organization operates; and this is an example of why, as an elected official, it is refreshing to represent South Jordan. My thanks to those who constructively contributed.

mark

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 17, 2012, at 1:49 PM, "Chuck Newton" <CNewton@sjc.utah.gov> wrote:

As a matter of course, despite how painful it might be to discuss the facts with someone who does not seem to be associated with the facts, and would prefer to make unfounded allegations, it would still behoove us to respond despite the cost in time it would require, to respond to these allegations.

Greg has done an excellent job in laying out the case, and some of George's additional comments should be added as well in a response to this individual.

The question I have is, if she is so concerned about 'breaking the trust' why is she waiting 10 years to bring it up? Apparently, it only concerned her when she thought her property values were dropping, otherwise she was okay dokay with it. Gotta love those situational ethics!! (Yes, I know this email is subject to GRAMA).

\Regards, Chuck

From: George Shaw
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2012 5:17 PM
To: MAYOR_CONTACT; CITY_COUNCIL_EMAIL
Cc: Leadership Council; Greg Schindler; Ty Montalvo; Ryan Loose
Subject: Condo Development North of The District

Dear Mayor and Council Members, I am sending this response to you on the assumption that everyone received the Shauna Larson letter. I am also sending it to the Leadership Council and key staff who may have other details to contribute.

As a general response, I would say that we have a lot of residents that are concerned about how the value of their property has dropped significantly over the past few years. While the drop has been across the board, it is of particular angst to those who purchased real estate at the top of the market. This has happened midway thru some projects, where 'latecomers' purchased the same housing product at a much reduced cost. I can understand why those who bought before may be upset. But the real question is: are property values controlled by adjacent land uses or the by the housing market?

Unfortunately, there have been significant changes in the housing market, and these changes are difficult for planning, zoning, and building processes to address. While there are those that are concerned with 'cheaper' housing units being built in the City, there are many others that are asking for more housing diversity and affordability. In reading the Housing Goals and Policies of the General Plan, you can see how we are trying to address those two issues.

As for how adjacent development may or may not affect the value of existing development, the standard paradigm is that 'if you build something different than what I have, it will reduce my property values.' While this is raised as an issue in many zoning hearings, it is very difficult to prove. For example, in the Daybreak area we see multiple neighborhoods which include a variety of housing types that have been built in close proximity without adverse effects on property values.

A better measure of determining property values is the use of 'comparables' that real estate professionals use in determining the value of similar home and lot sizes that have sold in a particular neighborhood. The construction cost per square foot comparison of building structures is another way to assess value. With the current architectural standards that the City has been using, coupled with the higher design standards required in our recently adopted zoning ordinances, I believe that we are doing what we can to 'protect' property values....

As to the specific questions in Shauna Larson's correspondence, I have asked Greg Schindler (because of his history with The District project) to respond to the specific questions

raised. There are other staff in the City that are aware of this project that may also have additional perspective or detail to share.

Best regards, --GGS

From: Greg Schindler
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2012 12:51 PM
To: George Shaw
Subject: RE: Condo Development North of The District

George,

In response to Mrs. Larson's comments:

- (A) "Dishonestly and manipulatively broken 100 year trust" - There are probably others in City Hall that are more familiar with the legalities of the Kunkler Trust than I am. However I would guess that she is writing about the Kunkler Family trust property that included approximately 200 acres north of 11400 South both east and west of Bangerter Highway. As far as I know, what initiated the "breaking of the trust" was the City's filing condemnation procedures on the property west of Bangerter in order to acquire right-of-way to extend 11400 South west to connect to Daybreak Parkway. It is my understanding that the family trust was set up such that the family could not sell the property needed for the right-of-way unless the City started and completed the condemnation process. Since the entire 200 acres, even though divided by Bangerter highway, was one parcel, the family was able to sell all of the property at one time. I understand that the family was not opposed to the sale since the trust's planned piecemeal development requirements were considered burdensome to them. Consequences of the condemnation and purchase of the property include: 1) providing an additional connection to Daybreak (at the time 11800 South and indirect connections through the Country Crossing subdivision were all that were available), 2) the extension of 4000 West south from 10600 South to 11400 South was made possible and ultimately the development of the Oquirrh Mountain Temple, 3) the Jordan Heights subdivision between Bangerter and 4000 W. and 4) the north District area.
- (B) "Zoning for high density condos" - A development agreement was approved by the City Council in February of 2006 approving R-3 and RM-6 zoning west of Bangerter and including the property east of Bangerter into BH-MU zone as part of the District Development. The overall residential density allowed in the BH-MU zone is 8 units per acre and covers the entire area of the development. In the case of the District, there are almost 201 acres. This translates to approximately 1,600 housing units. The development agreement stipulates that the developer will create 1/3 acre or larger lots along the west boundary of the Lucas Dell subdivision. Most of the lots within Lucas Dell are less than 1/3 acre. Each of the townhome subdivisions approved met state and local noticing requirements and meet the requirements of the master development plan for the District. To date, the total number of dwelling units approved over the entire District area is approximately 1,100. Based on the approved master development plan, it is unlikely that number will significantly increase.
- (C) I cannot address "Mayor Money's great concern", if he made a comment in those regards, only he would be able to explain it.

- (D) "Poor-quality build-out" – A matter of taste and opinion. All of the townhomes have been constructed to meet all building and fire code requirements just as Mrs. Larson's home was.
- (E) "Lack of planning with respect to public schools" – The Jordan School District is notified of every development proposal in the City. They plan where and when to build new schools. The State legislature has made it clear that Cities have very little to say about school development. Design, construction and inspection are done through the State.
- (F) "Lack of park placement/green space within the project in violation of City ordinances" – I am not sure which ordinances are being referred to. The BH-MU zone does not require open space/park development. The townhome projects themselves have open space components that are for the use of the townhome owners. This includes swimming pool, club house, play courts and outdoor play equipment.
- (G) "Overall lack of good planning, foresight and consideration of the surrounding neighborhood and concerns of its residents" – Placing higher density developments adjacent to major collector streets (River Heights Drive) and arterial streets (11400 S and Bangerter) is not only common but a best planning practice to address traffic concerns when mass transit is not available in the area. The neighbor's concerns were addressed by only allowing 1/3 acre lots or larger to abut their subdivision and no structure greater than 2 stories in height can be located within 400 ft. of the Lucas Dell neighborhood.
- (H) "\$119,000 vs \$410,000" – Staff has not seen any studies or practices that would substantiate the loss in value in Mrs. Larson's home is due to the construction of townhomes ¼ mile away. Her home was purchased at the peak of the housing boom with prices overly inflated. The boom ended and the value of nearly all homes plummeted from the 2006-07 peak values regardless of original purchase price.

From: George Shaw
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2012 8:20 AM
To: Greg Schindler
Subject: FW: Condo Development North of The District

From: Mark Seethaler
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2012 8:23 PM
To: George Shaw
Cc: John Geilmann; CITY_COUNCIL_EMAIL; Scott Osborne
Subject: Condo Development North of The District

Mr. Shaw -

I picked up my mail at City Hall last night and discovered the attached letter from a SJ resident, Shauna Larson. I called Shauna and she indicated that she sent the same letter to the Mayor and to each Council representative. In order to stay on the same page and have an understanding of past City actions, would you be kind enough to direct this message to the appropriate member of your staff that would share insights into this situation. I know that this would be particularly helpful to the four of us who have not previously dealt with this issue.

Mrs. Larson references the build-out of condominiums just north of The District. Her concerns seem to include -

- The questionable process our city went through to 'break' a 100-year trust in order to transact the land to a commercial developer (The Boyer Company).
- The zoning of high-density condos (\$119,000) adjacent to single-family homes of considerably higher value (\$410,000) within her neighborhood.
- The poor-quality build-out of the condos - and lack of accountability exhibited by City and Council leadership.
- Mayor Money's 'great concern' about this development ...
- Lack of consideration for the many residents who attended many meetings in opposition to the proposed development.
- Crammed-together nature of the condos which are advertised on the Internet as "the cheapest real estate in the valley."
- The inevitable traffic congestion.
- Lack of planning with respect to public schooling accommodation.
- Lack of park placement/green space within the project 'in violation of city ordinances'.
- Overall lack of good planning, foresight, and consideration for the surrounding neighborhood and concerns of its residents.

Now, of course I realize that some of these issues are more within the City's control (i.e. means of property acquisition, and the requirement and placement of a park), and some are subject to the development and planning process which is not always easy to second-guess. But I would say that the resulting build-out and 'cheapest real estate in the valley' may not best reflect South Jordan's community value. So, an objective understanding of this development would be most helpful for all of us.

Thank you for your insights on this particular, significant development as a means to better understand the process and any aspects that we might improve going forward.

Sincerely,
Mark Seethaler

From: Mark Seethaler <MSeethaler@sjc.utah.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 04, 2012 3:30 PM
To: Chuck Newton
Cc: Steve Barnes; Scott Osborne
Subject: Re: Fire department

Categories: Blue Category

Thank you Chuck. Very interesting. I began to enumerate my take-aways, but have over-written them with this: informative, diverse information with the commonality of financial commitments - past and present. Capital expenditures by the city, whether for Chevy pick-up trucks or maintenance bays are the gift that keeps on giving. With no incentives for departments to underspend their allocated budgets and few controls on capital acquisitions, we seem to have a checkbook mentality - if the money is there, spend it. I stand on my recommendation for a governance structure between our Council and city management. Nice causal insights on Mulligans, wetlands, development and park fees.

Thanks.
mark

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 4, 2012, at 2:28 PM, "Chuck Newton" <CNewton@sjc.utah.gov> wrote:

As a followup to last night's closed meeting, I thought I would share with you some additional items.

1) The transport license is for the City of South Jordan for transport from locations of incidents to health facilities and then inter-local which is from a facility within S Jordan to another S Jordan facility or to a facility outside S Jordan. However, the problem that I referenced is that of a firefighter, Coy Barnson, wanting to have a transport business for Jordan Valley Hospital. Our transport license is exclusive to origination from within the City limits. If a South Jordan resident was at Jordan Valley, and wanted transport to even South Jordan, it would be under the arrangements and contractor that Jordan Valley has hired. There seemed to be some confusing positions put forth on the issues as to why a firefighter would be considered to be competing with the city. Bluntly, does not appear to be an accurate position, which takes me back to the point that the Fire Chief appears to have stepped out of bounds, significantly.

2) Mr Butters represented that I had been visiting every building in the City to find problems. Actually, I had not done so, but I appreciate his suggestion. I will consider it.

Let me tell you what I found in my casual tour of Public Utilities. They usually hire 13-17 seasonal employees. The giant 8 bay maintenance facility is mostly used for storage of some vehicles rather than most being used for repairs. We have four ambulance, two not being used. We have a brand new Swat vehicle just two years old. Utilities took the money they saved from snow plowing this year, and used it to build a giant brine type mixing tank which will be used to more efficiently apply the ice melter so it doesn't scatter all over into the gutter and park strips from the device that spreads it dry - I thought it was great initiative and think the employee who came up with it ought to be recognized.

We have a 2nd 4 bay building that's used - 3 bays by police, 1 bay by Public Utilities. Further, we have some 350 vehicles, with approx 40 at the City Hall. My casual questions apparently caused an uproar, and a reporting back to the City Manager of my visits to that that building and Station 62.

Further, last night after everything, I had a conversation with our City Mgr. He brought out that we actually have 2 SWAT vehicles, because one was an armored car which was given to us. Cool. And separately, it would appear that my asking questions about vehicle utilization may have precipitated a review about the fleet. John indicated last night that he has discovered that they have a number of Chevy S10's in the inventory which are fully paid for, and but are not being utilized very much and only getting, as I recall, about 60 miles per year put on them. He thinks we could dispose of them. I would agree.

My visit to the Fire Station discovered we have an Urban Rescue 18 wheeler with a boat with a motor for water rescue, and then a separate boat on the fire engine. I showed up to the fire station, and it was Chris Roper who gave me the tour. He indicated that the fire engine is faster with a faster engine, and they can be on the water rescuing by the time the Urban Rescue vehicle guys are pulling up and starting to suit up for water, but you have to paddle the fire engine boat. Urban Rescue also is stocked with items for building collapse and earthquake building rescue. They also have 3 days of food and water in the compartments on top so they can stay out without coming back to the station. Very impressive. Chris Roper was quite the salesman on the jobs they can handle, and the diversity of equipment which would allow them to handle those jobs. He also showed me some specialized compartments that S Jordan had the fire engine manufacture build that no one else has done which allows equipment retrieval from both sides of the truck on trays that roll out. This saves time in having to reposition the engine once it gets there. The alterations to the engine were such an improvement, I'm wondering if S Jordan didn't miss an opportunity to try to file patents on them.

Some more items of significant interest.

I discovered that Kelly Pfost just resigned as of last night. She was a red hot financial analyst for the city, and was moved to assist our Economic Development. But after a month and a half, was tasked to be the Public Information Officer. As you may recall, she was the one taking photos at City Meetings and Events. She is leaving to a job where she will be a financial analyst for Lewis Young.

Regarding finance, Laurie indicated to me yesterday that the Rec Center appears to not need another transfer of funds for operations. She said she would review this during the budget. I also asked her for some other data which she will be providing that should help us. She also indicated that the indoor sod area is bringing in a lot of money and would appear to be the driving factor of the financial ability of the Rec Center.

Regarding Mulligan's, she said that the info given to me by the former mayor is outdated, the driving range profitability has dropped off. It's the miniature golf course that's driving profits now. That's particularly interesting since our heated driving range was always a big draw particularly also since we had such a moderate winter.

That in mind, I had a discussion with Rob Wall about the potential of developing Mulligan's and the problems with it. He indicated there is about 70 acres, with 50 able to be developed. During our river tour, I discovered there is a conservation easement between the river and the hill to the east. That hill goes up to the back of the businesses on Jordan Gateway. I asked about potential access from Jordan Gateway down to the wetlands and making it a useable park. He knows and has worked with the person that controls the easement.

This becomes crucial for two reasons:

- 1) We can access that conservation easement area that contains wetlands and turn it into a more useable park area within certain limitations. That also become an attractive feature in that we could then have a arching footbridge over the river into the golf course area. then if we develop a portion or large portion of the golf course area leaving a 9-12 hole course for executive golf complementing the new commercial area that for now, I'm calling River Park West.

- 2) As such, that means that a commercial park fee would be appropriate for this area as well in order to move this into a more useable and attractive park feature to complement the area. The development though would be more of a bridge/overlook into the wetlands area.

As such, I think we would be remiss if we did not expend the funds to determine the viability of retaining a max of 10-20% of the commercial park impact fees which could decrease our residential park from instead of 5% to a figure closer to 8-10%. A better reduction in fees would assist in continuing to develop the pockets of South Jordan proper, like Eglunds who we heard last night, instead of the primary development focus being almost exclusively in Daybreak.

Chuck

From: Steve Barnes
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2012 9:48 AM
To: Mark Seethaler; Chuck Newton; Scott Osborne
Subject: FW: Fire department

Below is a response I received from the chief to some of the concerns regarding the fire dept. Thought you might like to see it.

-Steve

From: Chris Evans
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 2:29 PM
To: Steve Barnes
Cc: John Geilmann
Subject: RE: Fire department

Council Member Barnes:

I believe Mrs. Albanese is referring to the interfacility ground ambulance transfer service the South Jordan City Fire Department provides from South Jordan Medical Center to other area hospitals. If I understand her concerns/comments correctly they include: a) the transfers are for "non-emergency" patients and therefore "911" units should not be used; b) the fire department is providing the service with existing 911 staffing and units; c) the department is going to hire additional employees who will be dedicated to provide this service but has now put that on hold; d) we are depleting our 911 services to the point it is jeopardizing residents of South Jordan; and d) waiting a few additional minutes for an automatic aid unit to respond will compromise the health and safety of residents.

The short answer to the above is: a) yes, as of January 3, 2012 the fire department is providing interfacility ground ambulance service for the South Jordan Medical Center; b) the transfers include emergency and non-emergency advanced life support patients; c) for the present, we are providing the service with existing staff and units; d) our plan does include the hiring of additional employees to assist with this service in the future however they will not be dedicated as suggested, it will only be on an as needed basis during peak hours, and initially it will be with one new part-time employee and one existing full-time employee; and e) no, we are not jeopardizing the safety of residents by providing said service.

I will do my best to provide additional background without writing a novel. However, there is a significant amount of information and history related to the system of care we have developed in South Jordan. Please feel free to contact me if you have additional questions as I have spent a great deal of time evaluating our options. The following will provide some background information on the subject:

- South Jordan City provides a two tiered medical response system which includes both Advanced EMT quick response (non-transport) and Paramedic ground ambulance service.

- Ground ambulance and quick response service in Utah is regulated by the Utah Department of Health, Bureau of Emergency Medical Services (EMS). To provide either service one must generally obtain a designation for quick response and/or license for ground ambulance service. Licenses/designations are geographic in nature and designed to avoid unnecessary duplication and provide local government with flexibility to address cost, quality and access to emergency medical services within their community.
- In SJC, the quick response service is provided by our fire suppression units which includes Ladder 61 and Engine 62. In 2007, we upgraded our quick response service from EMT Basic to Advanced EMT (AEMT). An AEMT can provide many of the advanced interventions that a paramedic can provide. This ensures that our quick response units can provide good basic life support as well as many of the common advanced interventions provided by a paramedic such as a 12 lead ECG, IV, certain medications, and advanced airway management.
- In 2008, South Jordan City obtained an exclusive license for all ground ambulance service within the City. Whereas we now hold an exclusive license we are required to provide all ground ambulance and paramedic service within the City. The law does require mutual aid or automatic aid agreements for periods of unusual demand. We have mutual aid and automatic aid agreements in place with more than a dozen other ground ambulance and paramedic providers in the area. Attached you will find a copy of the plan of operations we were required to submit when pursuing the exclusive license. It provides additional information related to the history of our ground ambulance service and rationale for an exclusive license.
- In a two tiered system such as ours, the industry standard for the response time (drive time) for a quick response unit is four minutes and eight minutes for the ground ambulance/paramedic service at least 90 percent of the time. We do meet this standard.
- The South Jordan Health Center opened on January 3, 2012. While they do have a fully functional emergency department, they are not a fully functional hospital. They do not have all of the services that the other area hospitals offer and cannot keep a patient for longer than 24 hours. As such, some patients must be transferred from this facility to another local hospital. Transfers occur when a patient needs to be admitted to a hospital or transferred to a higher level of care because they require additional treatment or testing that cannot be performed at the South Jordan Campus. Some patients may be sent by private vehicle, while most require ground ambulance transfer. Further, many must be accompanied by advanced life support personnel during the transfer (paramedic or AEMT).
- For the present, we have not increased our staffing to provide the service. We staff two ambulances daily and they respond on calls for service as they are dispatched regardless of whether it is a 911 or interfacility call for service. We do not hold or reserve any units for interfacility or 911 – we generally take calls as received. The captain or BC can modify or redirect units as needed.
- We recently hired seven part-time paramedics however, we have not yet deployed these individuals and do not plan on doing so until the call volume (number of calls and/or frequency of multiple calls) warrants a change. When needed, using one existing full-time employee and one part-time employee, we will staff a third ambulance during peak hours (the medical center and fire department peak hours are similar).
- Why do we provide interfacility service and why are we doing it in the manner in which we are?

- We hold the exclusive license for all ground ambulance service within the City.
- When a transfer is required, the facility cannot meet the needs of the patient and as such he/she must be transferred to a higher level of care. They do have an option to send certain patients by private vehicle when appropriate to do so. We the fire department transfers a patient we are doing so because the attending physician feels the patient must be transferred by ambulance and monitored and/or treated during the transfer. The transfers include a wide range of conditions including critical unstable, critical stable, serious stable or unstable, and minor stable patients.
- Regardless of whether the patient is on the street, at home, a local business, or in the South Jordan Medical Center, they are our responsibility and our resident/customer and we have a strong desire to provide service to our residents/customers. I had one individual say to me, if I have to be transferred from that facility, I want to be transferred by “my fire department”.
- Interfacility ground ambulance service is one piece of a larger and more complex system of care in South Jordan City.
- We have additional capacity within our current ambulances and responding with existing resources provides for better utilization of existing resources while reducing the burden on our taxpayer. Among many other factors, I did consider the utilization of both our quick response units and ambulances when developing our response plan for interfacility service. Prior to implementation of the interfacility service, our average call volume and committed time (calls for service only) was as follows:
 - Ladder 61 responded on 4.18 calls and was committed on calls for service about 3 hours 16 minute per 24 hour period.
 - Engine 62 responded on 3.62 calls and was committed about 2 hours 27 minutes per 24 hour period.
 - Ambulance 61 responded on 2.94 calls and was committed about 2 hours 59 minutes per 24 hour period.
 - Ambulance 62 responded on 1.96 calls and was committed just over 2 hours per 24 hour period.
- As mentioned, we operate a two tiered response system that includes a quick response unit. Our quick response units are not generally dispatched to an interfacility call for service and remain available for other calls for service. Even when both ambulances are busy on calls, a quick response unit will respond and provide care until an automatic aid ambulance arrives. Remember, our quick response units are also AEMT and not basic EMT. They are trained and equipped to perform commonly used advanced treatments.
- For periods of unusual demand, we maintain an automatic aid agreement with every other quick response, paramedic, and ground ambulance provider in this county as well as several adjoining counties. The agreements are tested and have proven to be very effective. There is no delay in dispatch and the next closest unit, regardless of jurisdiction, is dispatched anytime we are unable to respond. Most of the units are underutilized and have additional capacity as well. In fact, there are more than 50 ground ambulances staffed in this county daily.

- Due to the distribution of fire stations, paramedics, and ground ambulances in adjoining communities, considering an eight minute drive time during an emergency response, all areas of South Jordan are accessible by automatic aid companies. Anytime we are unable to fill any portion of the dispatch assignment (quick response, paramedic, or ambulance), dispatch will automatically dispatch the next closest unit regardless of jurisdiction. The system has been in place for years and works very well. Today, we provide aid outside of South Jordan more frequently than others provide aid to us.
- We have an automatic “move-up” or back fill system. If all of our units are busy on calls and it appears they may be busy for an extended period of time, dispatch will move a unit from another jurisdiction into a South Jordan fire station. We provide the same service to others when needed.
- Providing all ground ambulance service provides the department, local elected officials, and residents with the greatest flexibility with addressing cost, quality and access issues related to ground ambulance service in the City.
- We are reducing the tax burden to residents by maximizing third party reimbursement for ground ambulance service. The rates for ground ambulance service in Utah are regulated by the Health Department. The customer will pay for the service regardless of who provides the service. In our situation, the revenue remains in the City and offsets the cost to our residents for the many services provided by the fire department.

Since January 3, 2012, we have responded on thirty-eight interfacility transfers from the South Jordan Health Center. With few exceptions, all patients were transferred to the U of U Medical Center Salt Lake Campus. While on several occasions both ambulances have been busy on an interfacility transfer, our quick response units remain available to respond on calls and we always have our automatic aid agreements to fall back to when needed. The automatic aid program is exercised daily in this county and it works exceptionally well. We are will prepared to address periods of unusual demand.

Attached I have included a few documents you might find of interest. The first is the plan of operations we were required to submit when pursuing our exclusive license. It will provide additional information on the history of the ambulance service in South Jordan as well as the rational for an exclusive license. I have also included a map which shows the location of some of our automatic/mutual aid partners. It does not include Gold Cross who has units throughout the Valley or some of our other municipal partners that may be used in the move up program as needed. I have a great deal of additional material and information (i.e., SJFD call volume by time of day and day of week, frequency in which advanced treatments are used by SJ paramedics, response information for automatic aid partners, evidence based information on the value of basic life support vs. advanced life support, etc.) that has been considered when evaluating our staffing and response options and would be happy to share additional information if you desire.

We are monitoring the service closely. When the demand requires, we will add a third ambulance during peak hours and then make further adjustments in the future as needed.

If you have any questions or need additional information please let me know.

Thank you.

Chris

From: John Geilmann
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 6:50 PM
To: Steve Barnes
Cc: Chris Evans
Subject: RE: Fire department

Steve:

By copy of this email, I am forwarding this matter to Chief Chris Evans and am asking him to bring us up to date. Knowing our fire administration like I do, I don't believe the City has or will be left without adequate fire/paramedic personnel.

Chief:

Would you please respond to Council member Barnes on this issue with a cc to me?
Thanks,
John

From: Steve Barnes
Sent: Mon 2/20/2012 2:18 PM
To: Julie Albanese; John Geilmann
Subject: RE: Fire department

Hi Julie, thanks for reaching out to me. I haven't heard about this but am happy to look into it. Would you mind letting me know exactly what it is that you have heard? I am copying our City Manager, John Geilmann in on this email so that he can advise me of the situation or who I would need to speak to to look into this further.

Thank you,
-Steve

From: Julie Albanese [mailto:juliebarnson@comcast.net]
Sent: Fri 2/17/2012 12:32 PM
To: Steve Barnes
Subject: Fire department

I have some concerns about our fire department personnel being used for non emergency transports. This is leaving south Jordan city depleted. I am wondering if you can look into this issue? I was told that they are in the process of hiring to fill the transport position, then told it was on hold. I am concerned since I live in this area. As a former ER and cardia Cath lab nurse I know that minutes count and I want to make sure that if and when I need medical assistance I have it readily available.

Thank you
Julie Albanese

Sent from my iPhone

From: Steve Barnes <SBarnes@sjc.utah.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2012 1:52 AM
To: Mark Seethaler; Scott Osborne
Cc: Chuck Newton
Subject: RE: Checking up

Mayor, I am so happy to see emails like this from you. With so many of the interactions you and I have had, I continually find myself feeling that we really "hired" the right man for the job. I too am concerned with the issues that you outlined in your email and share a lot of the feelings that Mark has expressed. Mark one comment that I would make, and would be interested in your thoughts on deal with part of your 2nd recommendation. I personally feel that Mayor Money exercised some power that wasn't really his to exercise unilaterally and I wouldn't want to see that pattern continue. An example of that would be when we were informed that the reason that the speed limit on 114th was kept at 35 mph "because Mayor Money wanted it at 35 and put pressure on UDOT to make it 35". Maybe I'm wrong but I don't think that the mayor in our form of government has the authority to do that. I would rather see that "any decision that is not explicitly included in the current operating plan (i.e. budget to the line item) over \$5,000" come before the full council for open discussion. I have a lot of faith and confidence in Mayor Osborn but while I like Mayor Money as a good man, I wouldn't have wanted him making those decisions as I'm not sure that I would've agreed with him, in addition to the fact that I don't think that the legal authority exists to make those decisions unilaterally.

I would like to comment more but it is insanely late and I need to get to bed. In short though, I agree with just about all that has been expressed by both of you and agree that these are serious issues worth our attention. Part of me thinks that we should let this \$75,000 issue slide right now and attack it going forward. In good conscience, I don't think that is the right thing to do. If it isn't too late to do something about it I think that we should look into doing something about it right now. If we don't, not only are we letting what might be the "wrong thing" happen now, we are setting (or maybe continuing to perpetuate) a bad precedent going forward. I plan on calling John and/or Rob to discuss this tomorrow.

Thank you, all three of you for all that you do!
-Steve

From: Mark Seethaler
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 8:37 PM
To: Scott Osborne
Cc: Steve Barnes; Chuck Newton
Subject: Re: Checking up

Mayor -

Great issues. As I mentioned briefly on my phone message, we obviously lack an effective governance structure. In any effective 'partnership' there exists open communication, mutual competency and contributions, and an increasing level of trust. Unilateral actions, even when legally permitted, that preclude appropriate stakeholders (particularly a pattern of such) trigger not only uncertainty, but foster an environment of distrust. When trust is lacking at the highest level of organizational governance, the entire organization is compromised. Neither you, nor our governing council, will be effective at governing a house divided, and our residents lose. That's not what I signed up for.

So, my recommendations -

1. Understanding our structure. We need to understand the ordinance underlying our 'manager by ordinance'. How is this written; what are the ambiguities; and what liberties might have been taken, even during our short term? It seems that we might appropriately solicit the expertise of our city attorney.

2. Improving our structure. While there are specific elements of 'controls' that could be implemented (like your suggestion of maximum spending authority, etc.) we run the risk of disenfranchising our key management, and establishing an environment of abdication ("if the Council wants us to do something they'll tell us") ... that would be a destructive outcome. So, I suggest that you as a mayor have a 1:1 discussion with our City Manager wherein you state that due to being blindsided, you request that he inform you of any decision that is not explicitly included in the current operating plan (i.e. budget to the line item) over \$5,000, as you have suggested. Then, at your sole discretion, you can either concur or ask that the decision be referred to the full Council for open discussion. More fundamentally, as our 'visioning' process continues, let's determine more effective governance mechanisms. Some of which are identified below.

3. Reporting and contracting authority. In the best corporate environments (which I continue to maintain have applicability to our city) Boards of Directors have certain explicit authorities ... some of which are governed by federal law such as Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX). These include audit oversight, executive compensation oversight, and retention of certain strategic decisions, capital commitments, and contracting for certain professional services. It seems odd to me that our city personnel contract with the auditor who, in turn, audits the books of our city personnel. As a 'vision' issue, our Council needs to establish direct authority over both professional auditing and financial advisory services. By contract, these service providers should report to our Council, possibly with you, mayor, designating a lead or a sub-group of the Council (and possibly a member of our senior staff) to oversee the selection criteria and recommendation to our entire Council.

4. The Cabinet. Just when I thought our city titles (seems that anyone that is not at least an associate director is mowing the lawns ... and even then they might best be seasonal or contract employees) could not be more inflated, the most recently distributed directory includes a section of Cabinet Members. It's the CM and ACs. Didn't know we needed a Cabinet. As I mentioned in my email earlier this afternoon, our Council needs to be (or form as a subset) the Compensation Committee. All issues as identified in my earlier email (cash compensation, benefits, comparables, titles, pay grades, qualifications, etc. should be reasonably documented. All hiring and any action to alter compensation, pay severances, etc. must then be approved by this oversight committee. And yes, total employment must be reviewed. In comparison, our employee count is alarming and efficiencies, expectations, and better use of contract/seasonal/part-time labor must be worked to resolution.

5. Direct reports. Technically the City Manager is the only direct report to the Council. This only works in the best of times (or in ignorance). As these are not the best of times re: City efficiency and transparency, it is proven to not work today. You, mayor, and Chuck, in particular, are spending WAY more than the normal time in your positions. Wish I could do more with my direct involvement, but I have a very good thing called an employer to keep reasonably satisfied. We all need help. We need an executive assistant to the Council (likely drawing from current staff) who can be effectively tasked and empowered to investigate, report and recommend. This, in addition to the direct reporting of select contracted professionals.

6. The vision. Much effort and expense has gone into establishing positioning statements for the City. No doubt, they are doing some good, but often are thrown back at us from residents who quote from our website to support their complaint or position regarding city practices. My true feeling is that once we get reshuffled with the right people in the right seats on the bus (as much as practical) that we need and honest-to-goodness of all city mission, vision, and enabling principles. They are good but they are not great ... as clearly evidenced by the discord we have right now between an active Council that is eager to learn and contribute in our elected offices, and ongoing city management than needs to demonstrate much greater flexibility, adaptation, and proactive working relationships. So, what is missing in the published creeds, mottos, and slogans of our fair city that allows this disfunction? Once we're initially realigned with personnel, we need some professional help to guide our focus toward a true vision, true and effective supporting tenants and an environment where we practice what we preach. That's the vision we need - one that benefits the residents of South Jordan; one that makes a tangible difference in our daily behavior; one that drives our good city towards greatness. I'm very serious about this being done professionally, but affordably. We can't afford not to do this right and begin to immediately reap the rewards of clarity in purpose and consistency in action towards our destiny.

Lesser men would do less.
Mark Seethaler

Sent from my iPad

On Mar 27, 2012, at 3:20 PM, "Scott Osborne" <SOsborne@sjc.utah.gov> wrote:

Mark/Steve/Chuck

Thanks to each of you in being in attendance to the ribbon cutting and the B.H.S. recognition program, your support to each of these events made a difference.

As I am not getting a better grasp on how things are working in the city I have found a few things a bit troubling. As I review some of these items I would like your input and suggestions as to what you feel as well.

It appears that in the past staff and the city manager have informed the council about decisions they have either made, or contracts that have been previously awarded. Couple of case in points:

- Decision to sign a contract with UDOT to take over maintenance and purchase a new street sweeper. Their decision to add an additional employee for the street sweeper
- Awarding a contract to a consulting firm for the community block grant. Asking for FRP from several parties, determining beforehand who was going to get it and then letting the contract to a firm that was \$8,000 more than the lowest bid. I am not suggesting that the lowest bid must always be taken, however we were not appraised of the RFP, range of bids, and justification of who was selected.

It has recently come to my attention that with the announcement of Don Bruey there was a special financial allocation given him. This is in addition to the extension of leave and vacation pay. It is my understanding that an additional bonus of \$75,000 was offered and accepted.

The purpose of this letter is not to second guess the staff and management, but to get you take on the process. Are you comfortable with having staff make these kinds of financial decisions prior to meeting with and gaining council approval?

Do you feel that you would like to be more proactive and engaged in decisions of higher expense, and the exceptional financial commitment to employees?

Would you like to see, for example a guideline employed for expenses in excess of \$5,000 not specifically directed by the budget approved prior to any commitment?

At what level do you see the council's involvement in overseeing financial oversight?

Do you feel that it would be beneficial to develop a vision program for each department, that states what we hope to accomplish this year, next year and for the next four years. So that staff is not just focusing in on the daily tasks but actually trying to accomplish short and long term goals for their department. This would include developing a cost savings strategies, efficiencies and service levels.

I am going to stop now.... But I could go on and on. As you are preparing for the Visioning meeting in April, now that we have all moved past the initial stage of getting to know each other, I would like to see us address some very specific objectives. I believe that we did a good job describing some concepts in the first meeting, however I believe that we need to be much more specific. Develop an actionable plan. Address some very difficult situations, such as why do we have 11 department heads? Why do we

have 3 ACM's ? Why do we have 418 employees with 54,000 citizens and Taylorsville with 56,000 has 104 employees? Sorry I said I was going to stop. Now I am.

Let me know your feelings and desires on this front. I am asking each of you that are newly elected to address this, and I have not included Brian and Larry, but will engage them after I have your thoughts. I am not trying to create a rift between us, just feel that your perspective may be different at this point in time and experience.

Let me know your thoughts either by email or give me a call on my cell 801 949 8043.

I look forward to your ideas and suggestions.

Scott

From: Mark Seethaler <MSeethaler@sjc.utah.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2012 8:22 PM
To: Chuck Newton
Subject: Re: Checking up

Categories: Alarming

Thanks for reading and commenting. Often the mayor does not respond to me via email - even on issues he initiates ... know he's busy. I told Kristen about your publication in the WSJ and she was impressed!

Thanks again.

mark

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 5, 2012, at 1:51 PM, "Chuck Newton" <CNewton@sjc.utah.gov> wrote:

I think we need to adopt this as an item to be added to our visioning at our Apr 21 meeting.

When I say item - I mean as a category, with the separate breakout points you have listed below. I suspect that it will take us longer than the remainder of this year to get it to where we have a comfort level with it.

Chuck

From: Mark Seethaler
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 8:37 PM
To: Scott Osborne
Cc: Steve Barnes; Chuck Newton
Subject: Re: Checking up

Mayor -

Great issues. As I mentioned briefly on my phone message, we obviously lack an effective governance structure. In any effective 'partnership' there exists open communication, mutual competency and contributions, and an increasing level of trust. Unilateral actions, even when legally permitted, that preclude appropriate stakeholders (particularly a pattern of such) trigger not only uncertainty, but foster an environment of distrust. When trust is lacking at the highest level of organizational governance, the entire organization is compromised. Neither you, nor our governing council, will be effective at governing a house divided, and our residents lose. That's not what I signed up for.

So, my recommendations -

1. Understanding our structure. We need to understand the ordinance underlying our 'manager by ordinance'. How is this written; what are the ambiguities; and what liberties might have been taken, even during our short term? It seems that we might appropriately solicit the expertise of our city attorney.

2. Improving our structure. While there are specific elements of 'controls' that could be implemented (like your suggestion of maximum spending authority, etc.) we run the risk of disenfranchising our key management, and establishing an environment of abdication ("if the Council wants us to do something they'll tell us") ... that would be a destructive outcome. So, I suggest that you as a mayor have a 1:1

discussion with our City Manager wherein you state that due to being blindsided, you request that he inform you of any decision that is not explicitly included in the current operating plan (i.e. budget to the line item) over \$5,000, as you have suggested. Then, at your sole discretion, you can either concur or ask that the decision be referred to the full Council for open discussion. More fundamentally, as our 'visioning' process continues, let's determine more effective governance mechanisms. Some of which are identified below.

3. **Reporting and contracting authority.** In the best corporate environments (which I continue to maintain have applicability to our city) Boards of Directors have certain explicit authorities ... some of which are governed by federal law such as Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX). These include audit oversight, executive compensation oversight, and retention of certain strategic decisions, capital commitments, and contracting for certain professional services. It seems odd to me that our city personnel contract with the auditor who, in turn, audits the books of our city personnel. As a 'vision' issue, our Council needs to establish direct authority over both professional auditing and financial advisory services. By contract, these service providers should report to our Council, possibly with you, mayor, designating a lead or a sub-group of the Council (and possibly a member of our senior staff) to oversee the selection criteria and recommendation to our entire Council.

4. **The Cabinet.** Just when I thought our city titles (seems that anyone that is not at least an associate director is mowing the lawns ... and even then they might best be seasonal or contract employees) could not be more inflated, the most recently distributed directory includes a section of Cabinet Members. It's the CM and ACMs. Didn't know we needed a Cabinet. As I mentioned in my email earlier this afternoon, our Council needs to be (or form as a subset) the Compensation Committee. All issues as identified in my earlier email (cash compensation, benefits, comparables, titles, pay grades, qualifications, etc. should be reasonably documented. All hiring and any action to alter compensation, pay severances, etc. must then be approved by this oversight committee. And yes, total employment must be reviewed. In comparison, our employee count is alarming and efficiencies, expectations, and better use of contract/seasonal/part-time labor must be worked to resolution.

5. **Direct reports.** Technically the City Manager is the only direct report to the Council. This only works in the best of times (or in ignorance). As these are not the best of times re: City efficiency and transparency, it is proven to not work today. You, mayor, and Chuck, in particular, are spending WAY more than the normal time in your positions. Wish I could do more with my direct involvement, but I have a very good thing called an employer to keep reasonably satisfied. We all need help. We need an executive assistant to the Council (likely drawing from current staff) who can be effectively tasked and empowered to investigate, report and recommend. This, in addition to the direct reporting of select contracted professionals.

6. **The vision.** Much effort and expense has gone into establishing positioning statements for the City. No doubt, they are doing some good, but often are thrown back at us from residents who quote from our website to support their complaint or position regarding city practices. My true feeling is that once we get reshuffled with the right people in the right seats on the bus (as much as practical) that we need and honest-to-goodness of all city mission, vision, and enabling principles. They are good but they are not great ... as clearly evidenced by the discord we have right now between an active Council that is eager to learn and contribute in our elected offices, and ongoing city management than needs to demonstrate much greater flexibility, adaptation, and proactive working relationships. So, what is missing in the published creeds, mottos, and slogans of our fair city that allows this disfunction? Once we're initially realigned with personnel, we need some professional help to guide our focus toward a true vision, true and effective supporting tenants and an environment where we practice what we preach. That's the vision we need - one that benefits the residents of South Jordan; one that makes a tangible difference in our daily behavior; one that drives our good city towards greatness. I'm very serious about this being done professionally, but affordably. We can't afford not to do this right and

begin to immediately reap the rewards of clarity in purpose and consistency in action towards our destiny.

Lesser men would do less.
Mark Seethaler

Sent from my iPad

On Mar 27, 2012, at 3:20 PM, "Scott Osborne" <SOsborne@sjc.utah.gov> wrote:

Mark/Steve/Chuck

Thanks to each of you in being in attendance to the ribbon cutting and the B.H.S. recognition program, your support to each of these events made a difference.

As I am not getting a better grasp on how things are working in the city I have found a few things a bit troubling. As I review some of these items I would like your input and suggestions as to what you feel as well.

It appears that in the past staff and the city manager have informed the council about decisions they have either made, or contacts that have been previously awarded. Couple of case in points:

- Decision to sign a contract with UDOT to take over maintenance and purchase a new street sweeper. Their decision to add an additional employee for the street sweeper
- Awarding a contract to a consulting firm for the community block grant. Asking for FRP from several parties, determining beforehand who was going to get it and then letting the contract to a firm that was \$8,000 more than the lowest bid. I am not suggesting that the lowest bid must always be taken, however we were not appraised of the RFP, range of bids, and justification of who was selected.

It has recently come to my attention that with the announcement of Don Bruey there was a special financial allocation given him. This is in addition to the extension of leave and vacation pay. It is my understanding that an additional bonus of \$75,000 was offered and accepted.

The purpose of this letter is not to second guess the staff and management, but to get you take on the process. Are you comfortable with having staff make these kinds of financial decisions prior to meeting with and gaining council approval?

Do you feel that you would like to be more proactive and engaged in decisions of higher expense, and the exceptional financial commitment to employees?

Would you like to see, for example a guideline employed for expenses in excess of \$5,000 not specifically directed by the budget approved prior to any commitment?

At what level do you see the council's involvement in overseeing financial oversight?

Do you feel that it would be beneficial to develop a vision program for each department, that states what we hope to accomplish this year, next year and for the next four years. So that staff is not just focusing in on the daily tasks but actually trying to

accomplish short and long term goals for their department. This would include developing a cost savings strategies, efficiencies and service levels.

I am going to stop now.... But I could go on and on. As you are preparing for the Visioning meeting in April, now that we have all moved past the initial stage of getting to know each other, I would like to see us address some very specific objectives. I believe that we did a good job describing some concepts in the first meeting, however I believe that we need to be much more specific. Develop an actionable plan. Address some very difficult situations, such as why do we have 11 department heads? Why do we have 3 ACM's ? Why do we have 418 employees with 54,000 citizens and Taylorsville with 56,000 has 104 employees? Sorry I said I was going to stop. Now I am.

Let me know your feelings and desires on this front. I am asking each of you that are newly elected to address this, and I have not included Brian and Larry, but will engage them after I have your thoughts. I am not trying to create a rift between us, just feel that your perspective may be different at this point in time and experience.

Let me know your thoughts either by email or give me a call on my cell 801 949 8043.

I look forward to your ideas and suggestions.

Scott

From: Scott Osborne <SOsborne@sjc.utah.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 3:20 PM
To: Mark Seethaler; Steve Barnes; Chuck Newton
Subject: Checkiing up

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Alarming

Mark/Steve/Chuck

Thanks to each of you in being in attendance to the ribbon cutting and the B.H.S. recognition program, your support to each of these events made a difference.

As I am not getting a better grasp on how things are working in the city I have found a few things a bit troubling. As I review some of these items I would like your input and suggestions as to what you feel as well.

It appears that in the past staff and the city manager have informed the council about decisions they have either made, or contracts that have been previously awarded. Couple of case in points:

- Decision to sign a contract with UDOT to take over maintenance and purchase a new street sweeper. Their decision to add an additional employee for the street sweeper
- Awarding a contract to a consulting firm for the community block grant. Asking for FRP from several parties, determining beforehand who was going to get it and then letting the contract to a firm that was \$8,000 more than the lowest big. I am not suggesting that the lowest bid must always be taken, however we were not appraised of the RFP, range of bids, and justification of who was selected.

It has recently come to my attention that with the announcement of Don Bruey there was a special financial allocation given him. This is in addition to the extension of leave and vacation pay. It is my understanding that an additional bonus of \$75,000 was offered and accepted.

The purpose of this letter is not to second guess the staff and management, but to get you take on the process. Are you comfortable with having staff make these kinds of financial decisions prior to meeting with and gaining council approval?

Do you feel that you would like to be more proactive and engaged in decisions of higher expense, and the exceptional financial commitment to employees?

Would you like to see, for example a guideline employed for expenses in excess of \$5,000 not specifically directed by the budget approved prior to any commitment?

At what level do you see the council's involvement in overseeing financial oversight?

Do you feel that it would be beneficial to develop a vision program for each department, that states what we hope to accomplish this year, next year and for the next four years. So that staff is not just focusing in on the daily tasks but actually trying to accomplish short and long term goals for their department. This would include developing a cost savings strategies, efficiencies and service levels.

I am going to stop now.... But I could go on and on. As you are preparing for the Visioning meeting in April, now that we have all moved past the initial stage of getting to know each other, I would like to see us address some very specific objectives. I believe that we did a good job describing some concepts in the first meeting, however I believe that we need to be much more specific. Develop an actionable plan. Address some very difficult situations, such as why do we have 11 department heads? Why do we have 3 ACM's ? Why do we have 418 employees with 54,000 citizens and Taylorsville with 56,000 has 104 employees? Sorry I said I was going to stop. Now I am.

Let me know your feelings and desires on this front. I am asking each of you that are newly elected to address this, and I have not included Brian and Larry, but will engage them after I have your thoughts. I am not trying to create a rift between us, just feel that your perspective may be different at this point in time and experience.

Let me know your thoughts either by email or give me a call on my cell 801 949 8043.

I look forward to your ideas and suggestions.

Scott

DARN TOOTIN - VOTE CHUCK NEWTON

Wise Words

On Nov 8th

DARN TOOTIN" --

VOTE CHUCK NEWTON



IT'S YOUR MONEY!

We can't keep going further into debt, it's now up to \$88.4 Million! Care to guess who's going to pay the bill?

Last News

South Jordan is a great place to live, work, shop and relax! But it's also become the 7th most expensive city in Utah, and our population has dropped to approx. 50,000 (2010 census), shifting future taxes onto the remaining residents.

The Council needs someone to say no to spending, waste and tax increases!

In the last two months, I fought to get the City Council to refinance some of our City Debt. City Staff said nothing was wrong, but I got the Mayor to take another look, and guess what – the resulting refinance and early payoff is saving South Jordan residents over \$600,000 in interest payments on the debt and I haven't even been elected yet!

Plus, I'll fight to stop the secret city council pay raises (another this summer), and the secret city council retirement program the city residents are paying for.

We need to focus on the nuts and bolts of city government, and an approach to economic development and the jobs it brings to our community! Economic Development happening now is just limited expansion. A number of businesses have closed their doors (Verizon, Sports Clips, etc) and either leaving or electing not to come here at all to South Jordan (IHC, Goldman Sachs, Costco, etc).

My opponent has voted against some development like Rosemon University (the state's first dental program), and Rio Tinto. Now, my opponent has a new brochure calling for a citizen's committee for economic development.

We already have three (3) -- they're called a Chamber of Commerce, a City Council, and City employees -- WHAT WE DON'T HAVE IS A PLAN, nor a staff actively recruiting businesses! What we also have -- a large city bureaucracy for a small city -- with 3 Assistant City Managers, 11 Division Heads, and a large city staff overseen by a City Manager making far more than the Governor of the State of Utah.

Oct 15th -- my opponent was knocking on my neighbors' doors telling them we have to invest more in South

From: Steve Barnes <sbarnes@sjc.utah.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2012 11:22 PM
To: Chuck Newton
Subject: RE: Out of Office Contacts

Categories: Yellow Category

Yeah, per our discussion earlier this evening it concerns me as well. I'd be interesting the rationale behind this.

-Steve

From: Chuck Newton
Sent: Wed 1/25/2012 10:32 AM
To: Steve Barnes
Subject: FW: Out of Office Contacts

I have concerns about this type of attitude.

The attitude to which I am referring is the cost and expense of traveling all the way to Logan, for not only today, but Thurs and Fri as well at City taxpayer expense.

Do they not realize that the election was about expenses, taxes and debt about the City?

Did they not get the message when we canceled the breakfast with the Leadership Council to save money, had our meeting at the Gale Museum to save money, and the Mayor told the City Manager no more gifts next time to save money?

I believe we need to discuss this, come up with a plan of action, and I think some type of punitive administrative action towards the City Manager may be warranted.

Further, I think this makes us look foolish as a City Council.

What are your feelings about this?

Best Regards,

Chuck Newton
South Jordan City Council, District 2

-----Original Message-----

From: John Geilmann
Sent: Tue 1/24/2012 12:00 PM
To: CITY_COUNCIL_EMAIL; Leadership Council
Cc: Ryan Loose; Kelly Pfof; Ambra Katwyk; Lori Day
Subject: Out of Office Contacts

Good morning Mayor and Council:

FYI - Starting this afternoon (Tuesday, January 24, 2012) the Leadership Council (City Manager, ACMs, Department Heads, and

Melanie Edwards) will be out of the office. We will be in Logan City for our annual Strategic Planning Conference. The LC will be back in the City Offices on Monday, January 30, however, we are all available by email or cell phone if needed.

In the absence of the LC, if you need assistance, please contact the Information Center, and they will direct your call to Ryan Loose, Kelly Pfof, or Ambra Katwyk.

Have a GREAT day and we will see you all next week.

John

- Budget Issues
 - Audit Process
 - City Council reimbursement plan
 - Miles
 - Per extra meeting, day pay – out of town mtgs, day long mtgs
 - Planning Commission bump up
 - Car, Mayor
 - Staff
 - Increase health premium co-pay
 - Vehicle utilization

Attachment F
4-2-13 C.C. Mtg.

2012 CDBG Funding All Utah Entitlements

Utah Entitlements	Funds Received	15% Pub. Serv.	20% Admin
State	\$4,088,940	\$613,341	\$817,788
Salt Lake City	\$3,205,086	\$480,763	\$641,017
Salt Lake County	\$2,130,316	\$319,547	\$426,063
Provo	\$1,533,248	\$229,987	\$306,650
Utah County	\$1,264,185	\$189,628	\$252,837
West Valley	\$935,859	\$140,379	\$187,172
Ogden	\$916,952	\$137,543	\$183,390
Davis County	\$742,218	\$111,333	\$148,444
Orem	\$592,702	\$88,905	\$118,540
Logan	\$488,989	\$73,348	\$97,798
St George	\$456,626	\$68,494	\$91,325
West Jordan	\$443,523	\$66,528	\$88,705
Sandy City	\$358,178	\$53,727	\$71,636
Taylorsville	\$340,378	\$51,057	\$68,076
Layton	\$281,072	\$42,161	\$56,214
Clearfield	\$217,184	\$32,578	\$43,437
South Jordan	\$146,606	\$21,991	\$29,321

2013 APPLICANTS

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Request</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
The Road Home <i>Homeless shelter and transitional assistance</i>	\$3,500	\$3,500
South Valley Sanctuary <i>Domestic violence shelter and support</i>	\$10,000	\$3,500
Family Support Center <i>Family crisis support, emergency nursery</i>	N/A	\$2,500
Legal Aid Society <i>Legal support and services</i>	\$11,760	\$2,500
Big Brother/Big Sister <i>At-risk youth mentoring</i>	\$3,000	\$2,500
ASSIST <i>Emergency home repair and accessibility design</i>	\$10,000	\$4,990
Valley Services <i>Preventative home maintenance and critical minor repairs</i>	\$10,000	\$2,500
TOTAL	\$48,260	\$21,990

PY2013 CDBG Public Service Criteria

APPLICANTS	Criteria						Total
	Previously Funded	Application Submitted	Residents Served	ConPlan Goals	Involvement w/City	Misc	
Legal Aid							
Valley Services							
ASSIST							
South Valley Sanctuary							
Big Brother/Big Sister							
The Road Home							
SJC Bus Lease							
Family Crisis Center							
TOTAL							
AVERAGE							

Note: All applicants are eligible, timely submitted applications, and have previously been funded locally by other municipalities.

City CDBG Plans

5-Year Strategic Plan

2012-2016 Consolidated Plan

Specific Goals:

- Maintain existing housing stock
- Increase affordable housing
- Homeless prevention, shelter, and services support
- Victims of domestic violence services support
- Improve public facilities used by seniors
- Provide transportation services for senior
- Address accessibility deficiencies in public facilities
- Address the needs of abused and neglected children and special needs populations

1st Year Action Plan

2012 Annual Action Plan

Projects:

Public Services	\$21,990
<i>The Road Home</i>	\$3,333
<i>South Valley Sanctuary</i>	\$3,333
<i>Family Support Center</i>	\$3,334
<i>Senior Bus Lease</i>	\$11,990
Senior Center Improvements	\$85,764
City Hall Accessibility	\$9,529
Program Administration	\$29,321
TOTAL	\$146,606

2nd Year Action Plan

2013 Annual Action Plan

Projects:

Public Services	\$21,990
<i>The Road Home</i>	\$3,500
<i>South Valley Sanctuary</i>	\$3,500
<i>Family Support Center</i>	\$2,500
<i>Legal Aid Society</i>	\$2,500
<i>Big Brother/Big Sister</i>	\$2,500
<i>ASSIST</i>	\$4,990
<i>Valley Services</i>	\$2,500
Senior Center Improvements	\$67,695
City Hall Accessibility	\$27,600
Program Administration	\$29,321
TOTAL	\$146,606

John Geilmann

From: Linda Auger <linda.auger@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 02, 2013 12:42 PM
To: John Geilmann
Subject: City Council meeting tonight

Good Afternoon Mr. Geilman,

I am writing this email with great concern after ready the agenda for tonight's City Council meeting. My concern is with Legislative Action Items, item C.

The appointed Mayor and City Council plan to give themselves a raise. Are they serious? In these hard economical times this is not appropriate to vote themselves a 20+% raise. Maybe smaller raises over a period of time but not this huge chunk of increase. This reminds me so much of the current White House Administration where they are asking all Americans to tighten their belts and to learn to go without while they take extravagant vacations. I, as a citizen of South Jordan, am asking for cooler heads to prevail. This whole thing stinks to the high heavens but this and the following item are two that jump right out at me.

The second part of concern is on page 2 of that item under Section 1, Amending: item D. where they are to receive milage reimbursements and per diem payments for training, travel and other city business as "approved by them as the governing body". Please, say they are kidding. That's like letting the fox guard the hen house. There must be some oversight on this, some checks and balances, some protocol to establish what is and is not acceptable.

This is a part-time Mayor and City Council, I don't believe it was intended for the citizens to support these men who are there to "serve". If they are having a hard time serving either time wise or money-wise then let them step down so others who truly desire to serve can do so without placing the burden on the backs of South Jordan residents.

I am not sure I will be able to attend this meeting, I know they are lengthy and drawn out. Sometimes the things discussed and the manner they are discussed is child-like and inappropriate so I am sending my concerns to you in hopes that this items does not pass. Thank you

Linda Auger
10862 Pine Shadow Rd.
South Jordan, Utah 84095
801-254-8734