From: South Weber City
To: Lisa Smith

Subject: New Entry: Public Comment for City Council Date: Friday, September 13, 2024 3:47:48 PM

Name

Kevin Polson

Email

Dropdown

City Council


Subject

Fire Department Side by Side

Comment or Message


There's something a bit gross about reading the City Council meeting minutes and watching almost every council member support a higher property tax rate, and in another meeting also saying we need to buy a Side by Side with city tax dollars. Is South Weber City really so rugged that there's that many areas inaccessible to most full sized vehicles already owned by the City? I understand a side by side might make it a bit more convenient at times to get to small areas, but the number mentioned in one of the meetings was something like \$64,000. I assume that's to outfit the side by side with whatever we think is a necessary accessory for the fire department, but that feels like a perfect example of government spending that we've all (I guess not all) grown to despise.

I greatly appreciate the fire department and I also appreciate the City Council for their work here in South Weber, so I am not fond of sending in comments that give an impression that I don't appreciate them. However, just because we may have budgeted to waste money doesn't mean we're beholden to that. We can rethink our options and make better choices. I would love an ATV at my house to push snow in the winter time, but I don't



Comments to South Weber City Council for 10(now 24)Sep24 Meeting by Paul A. Sturm RDA Packet Item #2 - Page 12 of 20 Resubmitted-Please Note different Green color on Page 2 of Packet

RDA Resolution 24-01: Initiating the Process of Adopting One or More Community Reinvestment Project Area Plans by Designating a Survey Area



Comments/Questions:

Appears to be

As stated above, these parcels total the 23.401 acres indicated. There is a difference in acreage between the Study Area and the Survey Area of 1.661 acres. Please Explain.

 The Agency hereby tentatively designates the initial Proposed Project Area as the <u>Old Fort</u> <u>Community Reinvestment Project Area</u>, the proposed boundaries of which will be within the Survey Area;

Packet Excerpt Shows:



Davis County Property Search Shows Parcel 130070033, but it is not in the survey area?:





Page 2 (Replacement)