

**MINUTES**  
**WEBER COUNTY COMMISSION**  
Tuesday, January 7, 2020 - 10:00 a.m.  
2380 Washington Blvd., Ogden, Utah

*In accordance with the requirements of Utah Code Annotated Section 52-4-203, the County Clerk records in the minutes the names of all persons who appear and speak at a County Commission meeting and the substance "in brief" of their comments. Such statements may include opinion or purported facts. The County does not verify the accuracy or truth of any statement but includes it as part of the record pursuant to State law.*

**WEBER COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:** Gage Froerer, James "Jim" H. Harvey, and Scott K. Jenkins.

**OTHER STAFF PRESENT:** Lynn Taylor, of the County Clerk/Auditor's Office; Bryan Baron, Deputy County Attorney; Courtlan Erickson, Deputy County Attorney; and Fátima Fernelius, of the Clerk/Auditor's Office, who took minutes.

- A. **WELCOME** - Chair Jenkins
- B. **INVOCATION** - Bryan Baron
- C. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** - Sean Wilkinson
- D. **THOUGHT OF THE DAY** - Commissioner Harvey
- E. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None.

**F. PRESENTATION - MUNICIPAL BUILDING AUTHORITY OF WEBER COUNTY, UTAH, LEASE REVENUE BONDS SERIES 1994. (OGDEN ECCLES CONFERENCE CENTER AND WEBER CENTER FUNDING).**

John Bond, County Treasurer, gave some history stating that a main goal of the commissioners in 1992-1994 was to consider the county and what was happening in downtown Ogden. County offices at that time were spread out in many different buildings which made it difficult for the public. In 1979-1980 the Ogden City Mall opened and was a boon to the downtown's economic impact. The Newgate Mall opened in 1981, and with its renovation in 1993-1994, the Ogden City Mall started experiencing business challenges. There was much discussion to shore up those challenges. The commissioners and Ogden City officials discussed economic growth. The county decided to consolidate as many services into one building as possible. The Eccles Conference Center was also constructed and the Egyptian Theater was brought back to life. The commissioners went out for a \$28 million bond rather than the planned \$21 million for the Weber Center and the Conference Center. In 1995 another \$4.79 million in bonds was issued and in 1997 this was consolidated into a \$35 million bond. Weber State University (WSU) took charge of maintaining/operating the Conference Center and continues to contribute about \$250,000/year, the city purchased all the property for the Weber Center and gave it to the county to develop, and the city's donations have changed overtime. There were discussions with the city and WSU on how to cooperate together and there was a lot of effort to make this work. The George S. and Dolores Eccles Foundation donated \$2 million to this effort. The county looks for opportunities to reduce costs and as interest rates decreased, the county refinanced bonds in 2005, 2007 and 2009. The projected interest for the original \$28M was \$39M and with the refinancing, the savings was almost \$4M. Mr. Bond said that the conference center and the Weber Center have helped stabilize downtown Ogden, that it has been an economic driver, and he feels that overall the gains outweighed the losses because downtown Ogden continues to thrive.

**G. CONSENT ITEMS:**

1. Ratify warrants #2282-2313 & #445876-446070 for \$1,883,331.77 dated December 20, 2019 and #446071 for \$7,000.00, #2314-2328 and #446072-446261 for \$371,835.23 dated December 27, 2019.
2. Warrants #2329 -2343 and #446262-446374 for \$2,345,285.75.
3. Purchase orders FY2019 for \$80,903.69 and FY2020 for \$675,921.22.
4. Minutes for the meeting held on December 17, 2019.
5. New beer licenses.
6. Surplus an FD410 credit card processor from the Golden Spike Event Center/Ice Sheet.
7. Amendment to the Little Mountain Solar Development Agreement.
8. Ratify contract with the Egyptian Theatre Foundation regarding use of grant fund.

Commissioner Froerer moved to approve the consent items; Commissioner Harvey seconded.  
Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Froerer – aye; Chair Jenkins – aye

**H. ACTION ITEMS:**

1. **APPOINTING A CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR THE WEBER COUNTY COMMISSION.**

Commissioner Jenkins noted that traditionally the Commission chair is rotated.

Commissioner Jenkins moved to appoint Commissioner Froerer as Chair for the Weber County Commission; Commissioner Harvey seconded. Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye.  
Commissioner Jenkins moved to appoint Commissioner Harvey as Vice Chair; Commissioner Froerer seconded.  
Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye;

2. **CONTRACT WITH AMERICAN CHARIOT RACING INC., FOR THE 2019-2020 SEASON CHARIOT RACES AT GOLDEN SPIKE EVENT CENTER (GSEC).**

Duncan Olsen, GSEC General Manager, presented this contract.

Commissioner Jenkins moved to approve the contract with American Chariot Racing, Inc., to hold the 2019-2020 season chariot races at the Golden Spike Event Center; Commissioner Harvey seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

3. **RESOLUTION APPOINTING MEMBERS TO THE WEBER COUNTY TOURISM TAX ADVISORY BOARD – RESOLUTION 1-2020.**

Stacy Skeen, of the Commission Office, stated that two current members' terms expired in December and the board recommends their reappointment.

Commissioner Jenkins moved to adopt Resolution 1-2020 reappointing Steve Ballard and Lisa Fuller to the Weber County Tourism Tax Advisory Board through 12/31/2022; Commissioner Harvey seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

4. **CONTRACT WITH KELLY MADSEN FOR AN INDIGENT DEFENSE INVESTIGATOR.**

Bryan Baron, Deputy County Attorney, noted the county's obligation to provide indigent defense counsel and resources. In the past, there was a single investigator working for a flat fee and now there will be two working at \$60/hour. This will resolve some issues with conflicts between co-defendants, appellate counsel and trial counsel.

Commissioner Harvey moved to approve the contract with Kelly Madsen for an indigent defense investigator; Commissioner Jenkins seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

5. **CONTRACT WITH EMILY ADAMS, CHERISE BACALSKI & FREYJA JOHNSON FOR INDIGENT DEFENSE ATTORNEYS APPEALS.**

Bryan Baron, Deputy County Attorney, said that these were the most qualified through the procurement process.

Commissioner Harvey moved to approve the contract with Emily Adams, Cherise Bacalski and Freyja Johnson for indigent defense attorneys appeals; Commissioner Jenkins seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

6. **CONTRACTS WITH THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS FOR INDIGENT DEFENSE ATTORNEY'S IN JUVENILE COURT:**

Richard T. Williams	Rebecca Voymas
Jennifer Clark	Mary Anne Ellis
Jonathan Pace	Andrew Heyward
Ammon Nelson	

Bryan Baron, Deputy County Attorney, noted that these were the most qualified applicants and these are renewals.

Commissioner Jenkins moved to approve the above seven contracts for indigent defense attorneys in Juvenile Court; Commissioner Harvey seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

7. **CONTRACTS WITH THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS FOR INDIGENT DEFENSE ATTORNEYS IN DISTRICT COURT:**

Martin Gravis	Jason R. Widdison
James Retallick	Shawn Condie
Randall Marshall	Michael D. Bouwhuis

Bryan Baron, Deputy County Attorney, stated that these have worked for the county previously and scored significantly higher than other applicants. These are 5-year contracts.

Chair Jenkins moved to approve the above six contracts for indigent defense attorneys in District Court; Commissioner Harvey seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

8. **INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH FARR WEST CITY FOR ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICES.**

County Sheriff Chief Brandon Roundy, stated that this 5-year renewal agreement has no changes.

Commissioner Harvey moved to approve the Interlocal Agreement with Farr West City for animal control services; Commissioner Jenkins seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Froerer – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

9. **INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH PLAIN CITY FOR ANIMAL CONTROL SERVICES.**

Chad Averett, County Animal Shelter Director, noted that the only difference from the contract with Farr West is the termination written notice term.

Commissioner Jenkins moved to approve the Interlocal Agreement with Plain City for animal control services; Commissioner Harvey seconded.  
Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

**10. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH U.S. FOREST SERVICE ALLOWING BOTH ENTITIES TO CONTINUE WORKING TOGETHER TO PROVIDE ENHANCED COMMUNICATION, COMMUNITY SUPPORT, NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT & PROTECTION, PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT & SAFETY & SUSTAIN HEALTH, DIVERSITY & PRODUCTIVITY OF OUR LOCAL COUNTY & NATIONAL FOREST.**

Sean Wilkinson, County Community Development Director, said that this MOU allows the county to work with the Forest Service and it is the baseline for future specific agreements on projects. The Forest Service has similar agreements with other counties/entities. Sean Harwood, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest District Ranger, noted that this is what the Forest Service uses to document the work with other agencies. No money is involved.

Commissioner Jenkins moved to approve the Memorandum of Understanding with the U.S. Forest Service allowing both entities to continue working together to provide enhanced communication, community support, natural resource management and protection, public involvement and safety, and sustain the health, diversity and productivity of our local County and National Forest; Commissioner Harvey seconded.  
Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

**11. CONTRACT WITH THE UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR STATEWIDE UTILITY LICENSE AGREEMENT.**

Gary Myers, County Engineer, stated that this contract allows the county's facilities to reside anywhere that they may exist within State right-of-ways.

Commissioner Harvey moved to approve the contract with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) for a statewide utility license agreement; Commissioner Jenkins seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Froerer – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

**12. CONTRACT WITH MARRIOTT CONSTRUCTION FOR 1800 SOUTH STORM DRAIN.**

Gary Myers, County Engineer, stated that this item went to bid and Marriott Construction was the low bidder. During area development, it was discovered that the county's storm drain infrastructure on 1800 S. needed repair.

Commissioner Jenkins moved to approve the contract with Marriott Construction for the 1800 South storm drain; Commissioner Harvey seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Froerer – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

**I. PUBLIC HEARING:**

**1.**

Commissioner Jenkins moved to adjourn the public meeting and convene the public hearing; Commissioner Harvey seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Froerer – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

**2. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER/TAKE ACTION ON REQUEST TO AMEND COUNTY ZONE MAP TO REZONE APPROX. 4.59 ACRES FROM RE-15 ZONE TO R-1-10 AT APPROX. 6224 S. 2225 E., OGDEN-ZMA 2019-05.**

Steve Burton, of the County Planning Division, stated that the Western Weber County Planning Commission heard this item on 12/10/2019 and by unanimous vote recommended that the County Commission deny the requested rezone based on the following finding: The area surrounding the proposed rezone was not developed in accordance with the General Plan and that the development pattern of the surrounding area is RE-15, which is for very low density, per the General Plan, and although the proposal is consistent with the wording of the General Plan, the proposal is not consistent with the surrounding area.

The RE-15 zone is intended for very low density residential and agricultural uses, with a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet. The R-1-10 zone is intended for residential lots with a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. There is a difference in the zones of about 20 feet in width requirements along the street and the setbacks are different as well. The R-1-10 zone does not allow most of the farm animal land uses that the RE-15 does nor some of the agricultural uses (e.g., livestock, horses) of the RE-15. Uses permitted in both zones: agriculture, cluster subdivisions, home occupations, household pets, residential facilities for elderly persons, single-family dwellings, cemeteries, etc. The General Plan says that this area should be low density, which is 8 units/acre. The proposal is for 4 units/acre. Planning staff's findings is that it is consistent with the General Plan and compatible with the surrounding area, and recommend approval. Rick Grover, County Planning Division Director, said that the Planning Commission had looked at the area, the majority of which has been built out as currently zoned. They felt the proposal was not consistent with the small existing parcels and what has been built out in the area.

Randy Moore, applicant, showed area maps and the proposed layout, and said that in researching what would be appropriate for this property, he read staff reports and minutes relating to approval of surrounding zones. He found properties zoned R-1-10, some R-2 and the majority of the area zoned RE-15. The Eastwood Drive property, rezoned about a year ago, was rezoned from RE-15 to R-1-10. He indicated that the related minutes said that the southeast area master plan recommends use of the R-1-10 density. He felt that the proposed rezone would promote health and general welfare by offering more affordable lot sizes than the surrounding zone, and that there was no conflict with the proposed zone and new uses were anticipated to fit harmoniously in the area. He felt that the Eastwood property and his proposal (two blocks apart, one year later) were viewed differently, and was surprised at the Planning Commission meeting by all of the concerns raised by the residents about his proposal. He said that if the property stays in the RE-15 there would be 10 lots and if rezoned to the R-1-10 zone there would be 12-13 lots, a miniscule difference, but residents may have perceived the classification as a significant change. All of the lots would accommodate a 3-car garage, the front/rear yards would be very large, and the conceptual home plans that he showed ranged from 1,500-2,100 sq. ft. The homes could be larger by going deeper and would be in the \$550,000-700,000 price range and the lots averaged 13,000 sq. ft. The lots in the middle would be narrower and those in the cul de sac and front would be wider. He does not feel this proposal would affect existing homes but could now see the residents' strong emotions relating to the current use of the land as a park, which has been part of the neighborhood for many years. He feels sorry for the loss of the park but they would do their best to build a nice development to further add to the quality of the neighborhood.

3. Public comments (the public was asked not to repeat what their neighbors had already said):

--Jean R. Babilis has lived in the area for 40 years and feels it is a mistake to put \$600,000 homes where one would be staring right at his neighbors on .3 acres, that the person who donated this property to the LDS Church expected it for a park. The planning commissioners recommended denial; it is not in the spirit of the area and it needs to stay with the area zoning. The Commission represents the residents who live there and requested denial.

--James Beck, lives ½ block from the current park/subject property, and quoted from Mr. Burton's staff report to the Planning Commission, "Even though the proposed rezone creates an island in one zone surrounded by another this is not considered spot zoning because the General Plan requests this type of zoning density in the area, thus this request is anticipated and recommended for not just the subject property but for adjacent properties." Mr. Beck refuted Mr. Burton's statements on the report to the Planning Commission stating that regardless of what the General Plan anticipated, the higher density zoning is not what actually occurred, the adjacent property owners had spoken loudly and clearly at the Planning Commission, and that the RE-15 and R-1-10 zones have caused significant concerns for the very homeowners who will be impacted as heard at the Planning Commission. He quoted again from Mr. Burton's report that "overtime the General Plan anticipates that future decisions will change surrounding RE-15 to R-1-10 or similar zoning" stating that this would create a precedent that residents do not want, and "that overtime the adjacent properties will be changed to allow for more homes to be built on what is now their property," but he cannot see how that can ever happen. Mr. Beck said that the R-1-10 property located approximately 1,300 feet to the north of the subject property mentioned by the developer is very much different, it is an isolated piece of property, an exception to the general zoning of Uintah Highlands—it has a major thoroughfare running through it and is not surrounded by other residents on all sides. He asked that if the difference between the proposal and the current zone is as insignificant as stated by the developer, then why is he wanting to change the zoning.

--Sara Wichern, of Uintah Highlands, stated that the main difference in this community and the Eastwood properties is going from 100 feet of street frontage to 80 feet. Parking tends to be a problem in cul de sacs and she does not see that there is sufficient parking in the proposed layout for those visiting those homes. She stated that rezoning does not commit the developer to this layout but allows him to do anything within the new zoning (e.g., in Magna a developer put 28 homes on 5.1 acres), which is a concern. She is the community council president for Uintah Elementary and already overcrowding at the school is a huge issue and they have been unable to get the community onboard to raise taxes to get the money needed for the schools.

--Angela Stander-Ito, said that the residents lost their attempt to keep the park (a huge loss), that they came together strongly and she asked the Commission not to let them lose on the rezone, that they won't survive the continued overdevelopment in their community, and that the commissioners hear them that they do not want this. They are surrounded by South Ogden City and that large amounts of townhomes and apartments came in, and the community has shouldered the need for high density housing, that they feel they have been taken advantage of in recent developments and she spoke of the need for balance.

--Michael Healy said that three of the proposed homes would be along his back fence, that when the General Plan was written there were 47 residents in the Uintah Highlands area and planners envisioned a new Jr. High, a new park, open space, etc., but they have none of those, and it feels like part of the General Plan is being cherry picked for what works for the developer. More recent General Plans for the Ogden Valley and the other portion of unincorporated county does not use the term "low density" regarding houses/acre. He does not

believe that many people were notified of the Planning Commission meeting and said that there were over 30 people today. This proposed subdivision is part of his subdivision, the Highlands Bluff Estate Phase 1, which has CC&Rs and which this proposal would violate. Currently, there are 16 homeowners in his subdivision and a super majority oppose this rezone.

--Julia B. Stephens, is third generation in this area. She referred to the staff report to the Planning Commission, which stated that the area surrounding the proposed rezone was not developed in accordance with the General Plan and that the development pattern of the surrounding area is RE-15, very low density. This is why the residents were here today, because it does not conform to the whole area. There numerous new homes would change the look of the land and also creates problems with ingress/egress.

--Larry Matson, area resident, referred to the packet he dropped off at the Commission from Bruce Nilson and from him. The renderings presented by Mr. Moore do not conform to what is in the area and he asked that the Commission take into consideration the continuity of the area, which the residents want to maintain.

--Jan Healy resides in the cul de sac where proposed lot 1 would go in and expressed concerns. She watched the snowplow recently the difficult task as the snowplow took two hours trying to remove snow between the driveways in her small cul de sac, and it was not even the biggest snowfall. She said that looking at the map there is not as much space between those homes as there is between the existing ones and there is no way a snow removal truck would be able to shove the snow out into her cul de sac because there is no room for it. Occasionally trains coming down Weber County touch off fires below them which come straight up the hillside through the dry grass and from recent fires they know there are only minutes to get out of the neighborhood. If the 39 more cars are allowed between her and her neighborhood's outlet she would not be able to get out. At the intersection of Skyline and Wasatch where there are 500 new units during rush hour it is extremely congested and scary.

--John Reeve, of South Weber, former developer of all that area and an engineer, has concerns as lot sizes are shrinking—where people will put their boats, trailers, extra cars, etc., which most people now have. This area gets a lot of snow and he is concerned with the width of the road and where the snow will be put. In other areas, they put them out on the street and asked how the county would maintain the road in the neighborhood.

--Merle Lindly said that three homes would border his home and one of those would be his front yard, that he and surrounding homeowners were confident that the proposed buyers understood the property zoning at the time of purchase. He asked if the difference is as miniscule as the developer said, why are they trying to change the zone. The current homeowners unanimously oppose the rezone due to traffic congestion, that the secondary water pressure is already very weak and they received a culinary water rate increase and limitations in the last two years, sewer, fire danger, noise level, overcrowded schools, and higher activity of roaming pets/cats. The homeowners do not see that the rezoning would compliment or enhance the community or restrict the buyers' objective to construct homes.

--Cassie McDaniel, resides just behind proposed lots 10-12, having purchased their home three years ago after much search for something with a view and a bit more room as they have 3 children under six and the park was part of the reason they purchased it. With the proposal she would see backyards instead of one or two. She referred to last year's incident where a 4-year old's hand was bitten off through the fence.

--Jannette Borklund, area resident and Planning Commissioner, said that the planning commissioners had discussed the Eastwood development and the rezoning, that there had been one opposition, and that it created a boundary where higher density could occur. The Planning Commission's feeling was that even though the proposed rezoning of the subject property was consistent with the wording of the General Plan, that plan is almost 50 years old and at that time the area was 40% vacant and 40% agricultural. Their finding was that good planning practices indicate that zoning should reflect the overall character of the area, that neighborhoods should not be isolated, and that higher zoning should be on arterial or collector streets. This area is surrounded by RE-15 on all four sides. They would like the egress not to come to the stop sign because it would cause traffic congestion.

--Tina Manning said that her property (almost an acre), where she's resided for 51 years, would back the two proposed far lots. They have chickens and asked if that would be an issue if her new neighbors who would have paid \$600,00+ did not like the chickens. The proposed lots are narrow and would push them back to her lot.

--Dian Cantrell, a 90-year old who lives on the subject cul de sac, said that there are about 20-25 young neighborhood children, who go through the stop sign at the end of the road every single day, that there are now 1-3 cars in every garage that go through that stop sign, and to add 13 more homes all of which would use that stop sign would add even more children and cars. She asked that in consideration of the children, that the Commission consider a park which is what the area needs. She pointed out that there had not been a single person from the area to agree that the rezoning should occur.

In Mr. Moore's closing statement he said that the proposed homes would be custom on each lot, hence there were no plans available, but he had submitted copies of some plans to the Commission, that the proposed would exceed the area homes in quality/type of home. He noted that many who spoke live adjacent to his proposed

subdivision, and said that the RE-15 zone requires a 30-ft. front setback and the R-1-10 20 ft. If he left it in the existing zone, the homes would be 10 ft. closer to the existing homes. Due to the dimensions of the subject property, the lots are about .3 acres and the existing average about .36 acres, his lots average about 90 ft. wide and the majority would probably have 3-car garages, and in the R-1-10 zone the side yards would still be 12 ft. on each side, and he did not see parking as an issue. He sees this as what buyers today are looking for.

4.

Commissioner Harvey moved to adjourn the public hearing and reconvene the public meeting; Commissioner Jenkins seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

5. **ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING:**

**I.2.-REQUEST TO AMEND THE WEBER COUNTY ZONE MAP TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 4.59 ACRES FROM RE-15 ZONE TO R-1-10 AT APPROXIMATELY 6224 S. 2225 E., OGDEN, (ZMA 2019-05).**

Mr. Burton addressed Chair Jenkins' question stating that the side setbacks are the same in the proposal and for the existing zone. He addressed Chair Froerer's question stating that the Planning Commission's recommendation was unanimous with seven commissioners voting to deny the request. Commissioner Harvey lived in the area for nearly 50 years and said that when the Eastwood property came for rezoning he received many calls from area residents asking for its approval. He hopes Mr. Moore is successful in the area. He noted that living in the upper Uintah area in a cul de sac with three driveways, and with the amount of snowfall, they have a very difficult time stacking snow and according to these preliminary drawings, they show five driveways in the R-1-10. He cannot support this.

Commissioner Jenkins moved to approve the rezone; Chair Froerer seconded. Commissioner Jenkins supports private property rights and said that a similar subdivision was approved up the street recently, with the side setbacks being the same he does not see that it is more difficult here than in any other subdivision, and lot sizes are shrinking. In response to Commissioner Harvey's question, Courtlan Erickson, Deputy County Attorney, read from the Weber County Code, 102-1-5, that discusses legislative amendments that include rezones that come to the County Commission after Planning Commission consideration, "The unanimous vote of the full body of the County Commission is required to overturn the recommendation of the Planning Commission if there was a unanimous vote of the Planning Commission in favor or denial of the petition." Chair Froerer supports private property rights, and said that growth is a major issue in our county, that it is time to deal with it, that we no longer can go down the path of large lots. He received a number of emails and a few accused the County Commission of not providing a park to the residents and he said that the commissioners worked long in trying to make the park a reality but it did not work out, however, he feels it is not the county's responsibility to provide parks. Commissioner Harvey – nay; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – nay. The rezone was denied.

**J. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:** Commissioner Jenkins said that when he was mayor in 1992 they were trying to make the decision on the Eccles Conference Center, that it was a weighty decision, but it had worked out and we have a wonderful facility. He is anxious that the county remains frugal and tries to pay cash. Commissioner Harvey has a profound respect for the other two commissioners, who are great men of character. Chair Froerer is excited about 2020, stating that a lot was accomplished in 2019, and concurred that the commissioners can disagree without being disagreeable.

**K. CLOSED MEETING - a motion for a closed meeting.**

Commissioner Jenkins moved to convene a closed meeting relating to pending or reasonably imminent litigation; Commissioner Harvey seconded.

Commissioner Harvey – aye; Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

Commissioner Jenkins moved to adjourn the closed meeting and reconvene the public meeting; Chair Froerer seconded.

Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

There was no action taken on the closed meeting.

**L. ADJOURN**

Commissioner Jenkins moved to adjourn at 12:48 p.m.; Chair Froerer seconded.

Commissioner Jenkins – aye; Chair Froerer – aye

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott K. Jenkins, Chair  
Weber County Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ricky D. Hatch, CPA  
Weber County Clerk/Auditor