GRAND COUNTY
CHANGE IN FORM OF GOVERNMENT
STUDY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Grand County Council Chambers
125 East Center Street, Moab, Utah

AGENDA
Friday, May 10, 2019

12:00 p.m.

☐ Call to Order (Chairperson Stocks)
☐ Pledge of Allegiance
☐ Approval of Minutes (Secretary Till)
  A. April 19, 2019 (Study Committee Regular Meeting)

☐ General Reports
  B. Availability of additional potential trainers and target date(s) for informational sessions for Committee Members and the public on the four forms of government and on House Bill 224 (2018), continued from March 15, 2019 (Committee Member Greenberg)
  C. Report on fee information from a secondary source for possible future engagement of outside counsel, continued from April 12, 2019 (Chairperson Stocks on behalf of Committee Member Day)
  D. Report on Morgan County's study strategy (County Attorney Sloan)
  E. Report on communications with Tooele County Study Committee Member(s) regarding their plan for voluntarily changing their form of government (Committee Member Till)

☐ Community Outreach and possible action
  F. Approving final modifications to the formally accepted flyer as an informational handout for engaging voters, continued from April 19, 2019 (Committee Member Till)
  G. Approving initial newspaper editorial regarding the public engagement process (Chairperson Stocks)
  H. Report on possibility of regular public service announcements and/or an ad at both local radio stations, continued from April 19, 2019 (Committee Member Till)
  I. Approving proposed public relations/advertising schedule and budget, continued from April 19, 2019 (Committee Member Till)
  J. Review of Study Committee Member lists for creating a master distribution list, continued from April 19, 2019 (Chairperson Stocks)
  K. Approving proposed overall plan for public engagement (Chairperson Stocks and any Committee Member)

☐ Citizens to Be Heard
☐ Presentations
☐ General Business- Action Items- Discussion and Consideration of:
  L. Approving proposed timeline for bringing Study Committee responsibilities to fruition (County Attorney Sloan)

☐ Consent Agenda- Action Items (none)
☐ Discussion Items
  M. Review of State Code Title 17, Chapter 52a, Part 5 Adoption and Implementation of Optional Plan (le.utah.gov) (County Attorney Sloan)
Discussion and possible action on study strategy  
N. Report on results from interviews of all current Grand County Department Heads and Elected Officials, including all current and a few past County Council Members, on their views of the pros & cons of current, past and potential forms of government for Grand County (Committee Members Carmichael and Greenberg)

O. Approving proposed survey (Committee Members Carmichael, Green and Till)

Public Hearings- Possible Action Items (none)

Future Considerations

P. Review of available salary information of County Administrators for Commissions and Councils, County Manager(s), and Elected Executive(s) with veto power in Utah (County Council Administrator Dillon)

Closed Session(s) (if necessary)

Adjournment

NOTICE OF SPECIAL ACCOMMODATION DURING PUBLIC MEETINGS. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals with special needs requests wishing to attend Change of Form of Government Study Committee meetings are encouraged to contact the County two (2) business days in advance of these events. Specific accommodations necessary to allow participation of disabled persons will be provided to the maximum extent possible. T.D.D. (Telecommunication Device for the Deaf) calls can be answered at: (435) 259-1346. Individuals with speech and/or hearing impairments may also call the Relay Utah by dialing 711. Spanish Relay Utah: 1 (888) 346-3162

It is hereby the policy of Grand County that elected and appointed representatives, staff and members of Grand County Council may participate in meetings through electronic means. Any form of telecommunication may be used, as long as it allows for real time interaction in the way of discussions, questions and answers, and voting.

At the Change of Form of Government Study Committee meetings/hearings any citizen, property owner, or public official may be heard on any agenda subject. The number of persons heard and the time allowed for each individual may be limited at the sole discretion of the Chair. On matters set for public hearings there is a three-minute time limit per person to allow maximum public participation. Upon being recognized by the Chair, please advance to the microphone, state your full name and address, whom you represent, and the subject matter. No person shall interrupt legislative proceedings.

Requests for inclusion on an agenda and supporting documentation must be received forty-eight (48) hours prior to a regular or special Change of Form of Government Study Committee Meeting, subject to the Chair's authorization. Information relative to these meetings/hearings may be obtained at the Grand County Council's Office, 125 East Center Street, Moab, Utah and at www.grandcountyutah.net; (435) 259-1346.

A Change of Form of Government Study Committee agenda packet is available at the local Library, 257 East Center St., Moab, Utah, (435) 259-1111 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.
GRAND COUNTY CHANGE OF FORM OF GOVERNMENT
STUDY COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING

Grand County Council Chambers
125 East Center Street, Moab, Utah

MINUTES
April 19, 2019

In the absence of the Chairperson and with a quorum present, Committee Member Jeramy suggested that a Committee Member act as Chair Pro tem for today’s meeting until the Chair arrives. MOTION: Committee Member Day nominated Committee Member Greenberg to act as Chair Pro tem, seconded by Committee Member Green, carried 6-0 at approximately 12:07 p.m. on the above date.

Call to Order
The Grand County Change in Form of Government Study Committee (“Study Committee”) met in Regular Session on the above date in the County Council Chambers. Following the nomination, the meeting was called to order by Chair Pro tem Bob Greenberg at 12:07 p.m. with a quorum present. In attendance at the call to order were Study Committee Members Judy Carmichael, Walt Dabney, Jeramy Day, Cricket Green, Bob Greenberg, and Marcy Till. Also in attendance was Ruth Dillon (County Council Administrator) to take minutes. Absent at the call to order was Committee Member Stephen Stocks.

Pledge of Allegiance
The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Walt.

Approval of Minutes
A. April 12, 2019
   MOTION: Motion by Marcy to approve the minutes of April 12, 2019, seconded by Judy carried 6-0.

General Reports

Community Outreach and possible action
B. Review of Study Committee Member lists for creating a master distribution list, postponed from April 12, 2019
   Chair Pro tem Greenberg tabled this agenda item until after Chairperson Stocks arrives.
C. Review of draft flyer as an informational handout for engaging voters
   Chair Pro tem Greenberg asked for review of the draft flyer for potential edits before next meeting.
   MOTION: Motion by Judy to accept the draft flyer as presented, pending edits to be reviewed at the next meeting, seconded by Cricket. Marcy discussed her desire for the public to get at the “meat” of the issues and to have a place to go to get accurate information. Cricket suggested making the website information more prominent on the flyer. Motion carried 6-0.
D. Possibility of regular public service announcements and/or an ad at both local radio stations
   Marcy reported that KZMU will air public service announcements (PSAs) routinely. She reported that she had emailed KCYN and will follow up. She recommended including money for radio advertising.

Citizens to Be Heard
Eve Tallman spoke about her experience working as a professional employee for both a County Council form and a Commission form of government, each of which had appointed managers. She expressed that she feels strongly about having professional managers and is not in favor of having commissioners supervising or coordinating departments.
Judy Powers stated that the form of government needs a professional manager to take care of administration, someone who is not a politician.

Chair Protem Greenberg and Judy reported that they had called Gavin Anderson, Salt Lake County Deputy District Attorney this morning to more fully understand the difference between a commission and a council. They reported having learned that if the Study Committee’s recommendation is for a commission form, that a recommendation could also include hiring an administrator as part of the option and that this would be making new ground because no such mandate exists in Utah state law currently; there would be legal ambiguity. Chair Protem Greenberg further stated that if the Study Committee were to recommend a commission form with an administrator, the commissioners would still retain executive authority and could override the administrator. It was suggested to add to the flyer that an administrator could be hired under the first two commission options.

Presentations- none

General Business- Action Items- Discussion and Consideration of:

E. Budgeting the cost of advertising
   Jeramy agreed to work with Marcy on developing a draft advertising budget for next meeting.

F. Proposed policy for speaking publicly on behalf of the Study Committee
   Chair Protem Greenberg suggested having a rule instead of a policy: To state that a Study Committee Member is only speaking for oneself unless the rest of the committee has taken the position or directed the Study Committee Member otherwise.

   MOTION: Motion by Judy to have a Committee rule to speak for oneself unless the rest of the committee has taken the position or directed the Study Committee Member otherwise, seconded by Jeramy carried 6-0.

Consent Agenda- Action Items (none)

Discussion Items- none

Discussion and possible action on study strategy

G. Progress report on input from County Department Heads and Elected Officials regarding their views on pros & cons of the current, past and potential future forms of government
   Chair Protem Greenberg reported having interviewed 10 of the 12 Department Heads and have observed three trends thus far: 1. No Department Head wants a three-person body. 2. It is fairly unanimous to not want an elected administrator with veto power; and 3. Diversity is important to them on whatever form of government body is voted in. Judy reported that most are contented, and that some are nearing retirement age.

   Stephen arrived at 12:27 p.m. Chair Protem Greenberg handed the gavel over to Chairperson Stocks.

   Bob and Judy continued reporting, stating their opinion of having an amazing group of interviewees who were quickly responsive, cooperative, on time, and open. They reported that they asked questions confidentially about their personal experiences with the commission form and with a council form in terms of strengths and weakness. They also sought opinions and words of wisdom while giving them assurances that the Study Committee would try not to make a recommendation that would not make their jobs harder for them.

   Marcy expressed that the Study Committee will need to take all information into consideration in order to make the best recommendation as a reflection of all the information gathered. Bob reported that they have already started scheduling elected officials, including Council Members, for the first week of May.

H. Progress report on development of a survey
Chairperson Stocks requested a report. Judy reported that the subcommittee is coming up with questions and will have survey ideas at the next meeting. Judy and Marcy stated that questions are needed from Study Committee Members as to what is relevant for the survey.

Marcy reported on philosophical differences in study committee questions that she and Judy are having and reached out to the Study Committee for input. Following discussion, Study Committee Members indicated interest in having closed session questions as well as prioritization questions.

Jeramy stated that survey questions need to consider what would make government more effective, thus the survey has to be as effective as possible with direct questions pertaining to the duties of the Study Committee.

Bob stated that Study Committee Members will be surveying employees.

Judy suggested having an open house where those who participate, county employees and the public, will fill out the survey and have Study Committee Members available in groups of two to expound on their survey responses.

Chairperson Stocks expressed that it is important to be honest in a survey and to make it something people want to respond to.

Bob suggested that someone outside should review the survey to make sure it is unbiased.

Walt suggested that contact information should be provided on the survey for further contact.

Jeramy suggested that it is important that respondents are Grand County residents.

Cricket suggested sending one postcard to the tax roll and registered voters and let citizens know that a second mailer is coming which is a survey.

Stephen suggested contacting Moab Valley Multicultural Center for translation of the survey into Spanish.

Walt stated that the survey should be signed as a Grand County resident for validity purposes.

Jeramy suggested the need for having a physical deadline as to when the survey should be accomplished.

Committee Members agreed that the draft survey will be on the next agenda for adoption. Committee Members’ suggested questions are to be sent to studycommittee@grandcountyutah.net by Tuesday, May 7, 2019. Ruth stated that she manages this email address and will forward suggested questions and any other emails to all Study Committee Members.

By acclamation, Item B was brought back to the table.

B. Review of Study Committee Member lists for creating a master distribution list

Chairperson Stocks stated that a master distribution list would be helpful for reaching out to groups such as the Moab Valley Multicultural Center and to church groups so as to spread the message as far as possible. Marcy stated that the Interfaith Coalition includes every church group and meet monthly. Judy suggested sending a letter to all the different groups. Marcy reported that the schools Community Coordinator now has an extensive database of key leaders in the community including law enforcement, judicial individuals, nonprofits, etc. Marcy agreed to ask the Community Coordinator for the list so that Marcy can then forward it to Chairperson Stocks. Bob stated that when the flyer is finalized, the list can be used.

Walt inquired about how the public will interact with the Study Committee so that citizens will have more time than three minutes when speaking about their experience with different forms of government. He expressed that they should be able to speak to whether the new form should have elected officials from districts or at large or a combination and why.

Judy suggested setting up an evening event that is convenient and comfortable to talk to the Study Committee Members, as opposed to a formal public hearing. It was determined to have an action item for consideration of a plan for public engagement for the next agenda.

Jeramy suggested a venue of the Grand Center for a roundtable setting that is more intimate, or possibly Star Hall depending upon the structure of the meeting.

Cricket suggested having the first hour an open mic setting at 4 minutes each prior to the roundtables.
Walt expressed that he would want to encourage individuals to put their thoughts in writing, whether they choose to speak or not, and to ask them to give their write-up to the Study Committee. He expressed the need to make it clear so that individuals will know what is available to them and have had opportunities to be part of a legitimate process.

Public Hearings- Possible Action Items - none

Future Considerations

Jeramy brought up the need to get laser focused with the timeline.

Marcy suggested having someone from the Study Committee start working backwards in the timeline for the work that has to be done in order to determine if it is physically possible to be ready in time for November 2019 election. Jeramy stated that if the Study Committee is unable to get a recommendation onto the November 2019 ballot, a special election will need to be held in the spring or fall of 2020. Ruth reminded Study Committee Members that county elections are held on even-numbered years. It was stated that the law requires that the new form of government must be established by 12/31/2021. The Clerk/Auditor is requesting 90 days’ notice, per an email provided for the meeting, allowing time for legal review. Jeramy stated that the County Council’s requirement to hold four public hearings would come after the Study Committee recommendation. Jeramy agreed to meet with Marcy to develop a timeline for next meeting.

Jeramy suggested the following general schedule:

May - feedback
June - workshops
July - recommendations
August - put forth a recommendation

Bob suggested that, as of now, the County Attorney would draft the plan for government ordinance. Bob and Judy indicated their intention to interview all elected officials by the next meeting.

Marcy inquired as to whether Study Committee Members want to hear from Tooele County who went through a voluntary change of form of government. Marcy expressed interest in reaching out to visit with someone from Tooele County. Chairperson Stocks suggested that Tooele’s draft of a plan could be important to Grand County by providing a basis for comparison.

Walt suggested that the County Attorney may not need a lot of time to draft the plan. Jeramy suggested that if Study Committee Members agree to have outside legal counsel draft the plan, then an attorney would need to be hired. Ruth reported that the County Attorney had expressed that reaching out to Clyde Snow for a quotation should be done by a Committee Member for apples-to-apples comparison with the quotation provided by Snell & Wilmer. Jeramy agreed to reach out to Clyde Snow law firm for cost estimates.

Bob stated that the proposed ordinance and implementation plan is part of the charge. Ruth reminded Study Committee Members that there is an agenda item next meeting for the County Attorney to review state code as to the implementation plan.

Ruth announced the Open and Public Meetings Act training to be held May 23, 2019 at the Grand Center at noon with pizza. She encouraged Committee Members to attend or to take the training online via the State Auditor link previously provided.

Ruth announced her approaching retirement for March of 2020 after a tentative plan that she and her husband have had for several years. She stated that she is announcing this definitive plan early because of this change of form of government process. She stated that she waited until after the recent individual Department Head interviews before informing them. Study Committee Members expressed their congratulations.
There was an announcement that the local newspaper has space on the editorial page each week. Judy expressed that editorials from the group will be a good idea to help dispel fears. Chairperson Stocks agreed to draft something for the next meeting as the first editorial regarding the process so as to get people involved.

The next regular Study Committee meeting will be held Friday, May 10, 2019, at noon in the County Council Chambers.

Closed Session(s) (if necessary)- none

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 1:11 p.m. by acclamation.

______________________________
Stephen Stocks
Chairperson

______________________________
Marcy Till
Secretary
From: Jeramy Day  
Sent: Wednesday, May 8, 2019 9:17 AM  
To: Stephen Stocks; Marcy Till; Walt Dabney; Cricket Green; Bob Greenberg; Judy Carmichael; Ruth Dillon

Fellow Study Members and Ruth;

I will not be able to make the meeting this week (May 10th) as I will be out of town. Thank you for your understanding. As an update I have reached out to two other law firms and have meetings scheduled with them on the following Monday and Tuesday. Thank you.

Jeramy Day
The Change in Form of Government Study Committee

Grand County must change its current form of government in response to House Bill 224 which became law in 2018. The Change in Form of Government Study Committee is tasked with analyzing the 4 forms of government* and providing Grand County registered voters—with a recommendation on only one of the forms.

We want your input on where to place legislative & executive power in government — with only the elected officials ... or shared with a manager?

Know this: If the Study Committee’s recommended form of government is something other than the 3-person Commission form, and if the voters vote against that recommended form, then the new form automatically becomes a 3-person Commission.

*The 4 options for a new form of government:

- **County Commission** — 3 elected commissioners, exercising both legislative & executive powers.
- **Expanded County Commission** — 5 or 7 elected commissioners, exercising both legislative & executive powers.**
- **Elected Executive & Council** — an elected executive or county mayor exercising all executive powers including veto power. Plus an elected county council, composed of 3, 5, 7, or 9 members, exercising all legislative powers.
- **Council & Manager** — a county manager, appointed by the council, exercising all executive branch powers. Plus an elected county council, composed of 3, 5, 7, or 9 members, exercising all legislative powers.**

** Grand County’s current form is a blend of Expanded County Commission (7) with an appointed Council Administrator (and limited executive authority).

Please get involved and stay informed!

contact us: studycommittee@grandcountyutah.net
follow us: www.grandcountyutah.net/change

Study Committee Members:
Stephen Stocks, Chair  •  Marcy Till, Secretary
Judy Carmichael • Walt Dabney • Jeramy Day
Cricket Green • Bob Greenberg

Legislative power is making the law: Enacting laws, setting tax levels, and adopting a budget, etc.

Executive power is carrying out the law: The administration and management of county activities

Study Committee open meetings:
March 8 & 15
March 21 (informational session)
April 12 & 19
May 10 & 17
June 14 & 21
July 19 & 26
August 2 & 9
County Council Chambers @ noon
Grand County must change its current form of government and we need your input now! We must provide one single recommendation of an optional form—and plan—for our county government at the ballot box.

Here's the thing: The elected county commission or elected county council will continue to have all legislative (law-making) powers.

The question is: Where do you want to place executive (law-executing) powers?

Know this: By law, the new form of government will automatically become a 3-person County Commission if the electorate votes against any other Study Committee recommendation.

The 4 options for a new form of government:

- **County Commission form** – 3 elected commissioners, exercising both legislative & executive powers.
- **Expanded County Commission form** – 5 or 7 elected commissioners, exercising both legislative & executive powers.
- **County Executive-Council form** – an elected county council, composed of 3, 5, 7, or 9 members, exercising all legislative powers. Plus an elected county executive or county mayor as Chief Executive Officer exercising all executive powers including veto power.
- **Council-Manager form** – an elected county council, composed of 3, 5, 7, or 9 members, exercising all legislative powers. Plus a county manager, appointed by the council, as administrative head of county government exercising all executive branch powers except veto power.

Grand County’s current form does not fit one of the above forms. It is 7 Council Members holding both legislative & executive powers specifically without extensive day-to-day administrative oversight. Since 1994 the Council has voluntarily appointed an Administrator for day-to-day oversight and with limited, delegated executive power to hire, fire and supervise Department Heads—and to also ensure that all Council directives are carried out. A new Commission form could voluntarily appoint such an Administrator, yet any future Commission could do away with the position.

Legislative power is making the law: Enacting laws by adopting ordinances & resolutions, budgets, plans & policies, and setting tax levels

Executive power is carrying out (executing) the governing body’s adopted laws and policies: The administration and management of county affairs

Study Committee open meetings
March 8 & 15
March 21 (informational session)
April 12 & 19
May 10 & 17
June 14 & 21
July 19 & 26
August 2 & 9
County Council Chambers, noon

Watch for Open Houses!
Grand County must change its current form of government and we need your input now! We must provide one single recommendation of a new form—and plan—for our county government for the voters to vote up or down at the ballot box.

We need to know what you think works well with our current system of government and what needs improving.

Know this: By law, the new form of government will automatically become a 3-person County Commission if the electorate votes against any other Study Committee recommendation.

Grand County’s current form is no longer allowed. It is 7 Council Members holding both legislative & executive powers but specifically without extensive day-to-day administrative oversight. Since 1994 the Council has voluntarily appointed an Administrator for day-to-day oversight and with limited, delegated executive power to hire, fire and supervise Department Heads—and to also ensure that all Council directives are carried out.

follow us:
www.grandcountyutah.net/change

contact us:
studycommittee@grandcountyutah.net

Study Committee Members:
Stephen Stocks, Chair • Marcy Till, Secretary
Judy Carmichael • Walt Dabney • Jeramy Day
Cricket Green • Bob Greenberg

Legislative power is making the law: Enacting laws by adopting ordinances & resolutions, budgets, plans & policies, and setting tax levels

Executive power is carrying out (executing) the governing body’s adopted laws and policies: The administration and management of county affairs

Watch for Committee Open Houses!

Study Committee open meetings
March 8 & 15
March 21 (informational session)
April 12 & 19
May 10 & 17
June 14 & 21
July 19 & 26
August 2 & 9
County Council Chambers, noon
As a result of H.B.224 passed by the State Legislature in 2018, Grand County must change its current form of government and we need your input now! We must provide one single recommendation of a new form—and plan—for our county government for the voters to vote up or down at the ballot box.

We need to know what you think works well with our current system of government and what needs improving.

We would greatly appreciate your input.

Grand County’s current form is no longer allowed. We must adopt one of the 4 forms of government that is consistent with state law:

- County Commission
- Expanded County Commission
- County Executive-Council
- Council-Manager

For more information or our stories:

follow us:
www.grandcountyutah.net/change

contact us:
studycommittee@grandcountyutah.net

Study Committee Members:
Stephen Stocks, Chair • Marcy Till, Secretary
Judy Carmichael • Walt Dabney • Jeremy Day
Cricket Green • Bob Greenberg

Legislative power is making the law:
Enacting laws by adopting ordinances & resolutions, budgets, plans & policies, and setting tax levels

Executive power is carrying out (executing) the governing body’s adopted laws and policies:
The administration and management of county affairs

Watch for Open Houses!

Study Committee open meetings
March 8 & 15
March 21 (informational session)
April 12 & 19
May 10 & 17
June 14 & 21
July 19 & 26
August 2 & 9
County Council Chambers, noon
As a result of H.B.224 passed by the State Legislature in 2018, Grand County must change its current form of government and we need your input now! We must provide one single recommendation of a new form—and plan—for our county government for the voters to vote up or down at the ballot box.

We need to know what you think works well with our current system of government and what needs improving. We would greatly appreciate your input.

Grand County’s current form is no longer allowed. We must adopt one of the 4 forms of government that is consistent with state law:

- County Commission
- Expanded County Commission
- County Executive-Council
- Council-Manager

For more information on our options

follow us:
www.grandcountyutah.net/change

contact us:
studycommittee@grandcountyutah.net

Study Committee Members:
Stephen Stocks, Chair • Marcy Till, Secretary
Judy Carmichael • Walt Dabney • Jeramy Day
Cricket Green • Bob Greenberg

Legislative power is making the law:
Enacting laws by adopting ordinances & resolutions, budgets, plans & policies, and setting tax levels

Executive power is carrying out (executing) the governing body’s adopted laws and policies:
The administration and management of county affairs

Watch for Open Houses!
Salutations!

The Grand County Change of Form of Government Study Committee sends it greetings. We are diligently collaborating to choose our suggested form of government. Meanwhile, we encourage you to get involved, give insight, and follow us!

Who is the Grand County Change of Form of Government Study Committee? We are the group to review alternatives to our current form of government and recommend one to you. Our current form has been deemed incompetent by the state legislature.

You can be involved through multiple mediums. You are welcome to read about us in the newspapers, watch us on YouTube (live or recorded), or attend our meetings in person. It helps us if you send letters to the editors of the local papers, email us, or talk to us during or after our meetings. However, we understand if you’re out playing in the sun.

Next year, you will have the opportunity to vote on our recommendation. Staying informed will allow you to be involved and make an educated vote in the future. We thank you in advance for your help deciding the future of Grand County’s form of government.

Be well.

Stephen J. Stocks
Chair of the Grand County Change of Form of Government Study Committee
As per the Committee’s discussion of April 12, we interviewed all county department heads, elected officials, county council members, plus three former council members and a former county clerk auditor, 29 people in all (Appendix A). We reached out to Gavin Anderson for advice concerning whether or not the ordinance to adopt a new form of government could require a commission to employ a professional administrator and specify the administrator’s scope of authority.1

30-minute interviews were scheduled on April 16, 17 and 19 and May 2, 3 and 9. Interviewees were assured that their responses would be confidential.

General Summary
The interviews served to bring into focus the salient issues involved in choosing a form of government for the Study Committee to recommend to the voters. All those interviewed provided thoughtful, considered responses. Both the council-manager and commission forms are perceived as having strengths and weaknesses. A commission is perceived, especially by elected officials, as providing a more engaged governing body and giving the voters more control. A council-manager is seen by department heads as providing more stability and continuity and a helpful buffer between those conducting the county’s day-to-day business and elected/political officials. Department heads were largely satisfied with how the current system works although the Council Administrator’s span-of-control and fuzzy authority were cited as problems. In general, the challenges would be to provide professional administration in the commission form and council member engagement in the council form.

- Department heads came to the interviews well prepared having read Gavin Anderson’s hand-out on forms of government.
- Virtually all those interviewed strongly believe that a 3-person commission or council (governing body) would be a bad idea. Reasons cited included a belief that a 3-person body was too easy to sway in one direction or another, lack of diversity and possible vulnerability to corruption.
- Almost all of those interviewed thought that more than 7-members on the governing body would be a bad idea as it would make decision-making more difficult and raise expenses.
- Most of those interviewed thought that a 5-member governing body would be the best compromise between efficiency and diversity.

---

1 Mr. Anderson advised that such an attempt would be uncharted legal territory. He advised that in a commission form of government the governing body would retain executive authority and could not be required to delegate to or even hire an administrator.
• County department heads were unanimous in the belief that an appointed professional administrator providing direct, day-to-day supervision of county departments was very important to the efficient functioning of the county. The administrator was seen as a buffer between county departments and elected officials who may change every 4 years, whose decisions may be swayed by political/re-election concerns and may have no special expertise in the department’s field of operation.

• Most elected officials and council members past and present think that a commission would better serve the county’s needs as it is likely to produce more engagement and ownership on the part of commission members than would a council-manager form of government.

• There was not agreement among elected officials on whether part-time or full-time commissioners would be best.

• No respondents thought that an elected county manager was a good idea.

• There were mixed views of the value of electing some or all of the governing body’s members by district. A number of respondents saw no value in districts and some thought that due to the difficulty experienced in recruiting candidates, that districts encouraged candidates with low commitment to serving. We were told by several respondents that they would like to be able to vote for at least a majority of the governing body (i.e., 3 members of a 5-person body). A number of respondents said that districts helped insure diversity: that the interests of all county residents were attended to, especially those who live in the more rural parts of the county. Several respondents told us that they thought that 2 at-large and 3-district members might be a good compromise.

• There was concern expressed that in the county’s complex and rapidly changing environment the workload for governing body members was already too high for part-timers.

• Many of the department heads reported that while the current form of government works well for them, the council administrator’s span of control was too great.

• There was general agreement that the council’s current pay was appropriate for half-time members and would allow and encourage more people to run for office. The several respondents who believed that full-time commissioners would be the best form of government see $60,000/year as the bottom of a realistic salary range.

• Most respondents who addressed the issue of budgeting thought that the (new) current system is working well.
Appendix A-List of those interviewed and years with the county

April 16
Judd Hill-Airport Manager (8 years with the county)

April 17
Bill Jackson-Roads (29 years)
Jeff Whitney-Building Department (30 years)
Verleen Striblen-Grand Center (27 years)
Fran Townsend-former Clerk Auditor
Matt Ceniceros-IT (9 years)
Shawn Fugit-Maintenance (4 months)
Andrea Brand-Sand Flats (21 years)

April 19
Tim Higgs-Weeds (29 years)
Carrie Valdes-Library (19 years)
Steve Swift-Arena (9 years)

May 2
Curtis Wells-Council
Jaylynn Hawks-Council
Rory Paxman-Council
Debbie Swasey-Assessor
Steve White-Sheriff
Ruth Dillon-Council Administrator
John Cortes-Recorder
Elaine Gizler-Travel Council
Terry Morse-Council

May 3
Evan Clapper-Council
Greg Halliday-Council
Christopher Kauffman-Treasurer
Christina Sloan-County Attorney
Zacharia Levine-Planning

May 9
Joette Langianese-former Council member
Mary McGann-Council
Gene Cairus-former Council member
Rex Tanner-former Council member
Survey Questions----- (Include with this survey Gavin’s 4 types of approved county government for Utah, time line for return of survey. Include drop location at Treasurer Office. Space for additional comments)

#1 Which of the 4 forms of Utah government would be the option best for Grand County. Rank in order of preference 1 being best, 4 is worst.

_____ Commission, 3 people

_____ Expanded Commission 5, 7 or 9

_____ Council with elected administrator 5, 7 or 9

_____ Council with hired administrator 5, 7 or 9

#2 Circle the ideal number of elected officials on commission/council.

_____ 3-------- 5------- 7--------- 9 circle only one.

#3 Are you in favor of elected officials being full time, part time or a mixture of both. Circle you preference.

Full time

Part time

Mixture of both

#4 Prioritize how you would prefer to vote for county elected officials. Rank in order of preference 1 being best and 3 worst.

_____ All by “districts” only

_____ All by “at-large” only

_____ All a combination of “districts” and “at large”
June opening of the budget – if we have other budget items

Marcy - reach out to KZMU

Top 5 survey questions from everyone!

1. How effective do you perceive our current form of city government to be?
   1 2 3 4 5

2. What would make our current form of government more effective?

3. How efficient, fiscally responsible do you perceive elected officials to be?

4. How could the council be more accountable to the citizens?

5. Do you think the County Administrator is a necessary position in our city government?

What are the most important jobs/roles CC must fill/day?

Rank most to least

List roles
Survey Questions

Which of the 4 forms of government would work best for Grand County? Rank order by preference.

1. Commission 3 people with secretary and or clerk
2. Expanded Commission 5, 7 or 9 people with or without hired administrator
3. Council with elected executive (administrador) 5, 7 or 9
4. Council 5, 7 or 9 with hired administrator

Do you want full time or part time commissioner/councilmen?

Do you think this change will work better for the future of county government?

Is it important to have a contact person for county business?

How many Council people or Commision?

3, 5, 7, 9

Are you in favor of full time elected officials being full-time, part-time or a mixture of both? Circle your preference

Prioritize

Would you prefer to vote for all county elected officials or by districts and at-large?

Prioritize

By district only

By at-large

By a combination of both district and at-large candidates

If you have additional ideas/comments please
Questions for Survey

Stephen Stocks [stephenjaystocks@gmail.com]

To:
Judy Carmichael

Judy,

My questions would be as follows:

1. Do you believe the number of Representatives would improve accessibility to the government?

2. Would you prefer to vote for all of the Representatives or only for ones that are in your district?

Bests,

SJS
Survey Questions

Which of the 4 forms of government would work best for you.

Commission 3 people with secretary and or clerk

Expanded Commission 5, 7 or 9 people with or without hired administrator

Council with elected executive (administrator) 5, 7 or 9

Council 5, 7 or 9 with hired administrator

Do you want full time or part time commissioner/councilmen?

Do you think this change will work better for the future of county government?

Is it important to have a contact person for county business?

Survey by May 10th

Voter roles

deadline for participation
To:
Ruth Dillon; Bob Greenberg; Stephen Stocks [stephenjaystocks@gmail.com]; Walt Dabney
Cc:
Judy Carmichael

Question #1

Choose one of the following.

1. Would you prefer to be able to vote for all of the County elected representatives?

2. Would you prefer to have districts? Even if it means you do not get to vote for the majority of all of the County elected representatives.

3. Would you prefer to have districts? Only if you got to vote for the Majority of the the County elected representatives.

Question #2

Choose one of the following. In regards to your County elected representatives being a full time or part time position what do you prefer.

1. Full time

2. Part time

3. A mix of full time and part time

also the survey should have a list of the 4 different forms of Government that will be available to us and what they would prefer.

Jeramy Day
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Preferred Date</th>
<th>Additional Dates and Notes</th>
<th>Statute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Election Day</td>
<td>November 5, 2019</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>11/5/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-52a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Optional Plan in Newspaper</td>
<td>Oct 4, 2019 (30 days before Election)</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
<td>TI Publication Deadline is 30-Sept</td>
<td>501(5)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting of Optional Plan on County Website</td>
<td>September 20, 2019 (45 days before Election)</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>9/20/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>501(5)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Atty (CA) Review of Optional Plan</td>
<td>45 days After Council Referral (at least 45 days before Election)</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>8/26 OR 9/9/2019 OR 9/19 if referred as late as 8/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral of Optional Plan to CA for Review</td>
<td>10 days after County Council Approves Resolution</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>302(3), 406(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral of Optional Plan to CA for Review*</td>
<td>10 days after Study Committee approves Optional Plan</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>403(3)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Adopting Optional Plan</td>
<td>ASAP after Study Committee Approves Optional Plan</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>7/2/2019 (Reg Mtg) OR 7/16 (Reg Mtg) OR 7/26 (Spec Mtg)</td>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations Report and Optional Plan Due</td>
<td>July 8, 2019 (120 days before Election, and no later 1 yr after first mtg)</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>6/21/2019 (Reg Mtg) OR 7/8 (Spec Mtg) OR 7/16 (Spec Mtg)</td>
<td></td>
<td>403(3)(a)(iv), (5)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Committee’s (SC) First Meeting</td>
<td>March 8, 2019</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>3/8/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For convenience only as CA review is triggered by Council submission after Resolution approved

**Public hearing requirement of 17-52a-305 does not apply because 305(1) and (2) are not applicable to GC

***60 day timeframe in 17-52a-501 does not apply because 501(1), (2), and (3) are not applicable to GC

**CONCLUSION:** Study Committee must approve Optional Plan at least 120 days before the general election, or by July 8, 2019; provided, however, if the CA determines the Optional Plan is not consistent with Utah law and requires modifications, then the timeframe starts over. Thus, if the Study Committee recommends a valid Optional Plan by July 8, the matter may be decided on November 5. However, if the Optional Plan requires modification after July 8, then the matter may not be decided in the 2019 general election.
Part 5
Adoption and Implementation of Optional Plan

17-52a-501 Election on recommended optional plan -- Resolution or petition to submit plan to voters in certain counties.

(1) If the county or district attorney finds that a proposed optional plan does not violate a statutory or constitutional provision under Section 17-52a-406 or, for a county under a pending process described in Section 17-52a-104, under Section 17-52-204 as that section was in effect on March 14, 2018:

(a) in a county with a population of 225,000 or more or in a county in which voters approved the appointment of a study committee by a vote of at least 60%, the county legislative body shall hold an election on the optional plan under Subsection (3); or

(b) in a county with a population of less than 225,000 in which voters did not approve the appointment of a study committee by a vote of at least 60%, an election may not be held for the optional plan under Subsection (3) until:

(i) the county legislative body adopts a resolution to submit the optional plan to voters; or

(ii) the county clerk certifies a petition under Subsection (2).

(2)

(a) In a county with a population of less than 225,000 in which voters did not approve the appointment of a study committee by a vote of at least 60%, to qualify the proposed optional plan described in Subsection (1) for an election described in Subsection (3), registered voters may file a petition with the county clerk that:

(i) requests that the proposed optional plan be submitted to voters; and

(ii) is signed by registered voters residing in the county equal in number to at least 5% of the total number of votes cast in the county for all candidates for president of the United States at the most recent election at which a president of the United States was elected.

(b) Registered voters who file a petition under Subsection (2)(a) shall, at the time the registered voters file the petition:

(i) designate up to five of the petition signers as sponsors;

(ii) provide the county clerk with the mailing address and telephone number of each petition sponsor; and

(iii) designate one of the petition sponsors as the contact sponsor.

(c) The county clerk shall certify or reject a petition filed under this Subsection (2) in the same manner as the county clerk certifies or rejects a petition under Subsection 17-52a-303(3).

(3) When the conditions described in Subsection (1) are met, a county shall hold an election on the optional plan at the next regular general or municipal general election that is not less than 60 days after:

(a) for a county with a population of 225,000 or more or for a county in which voters approved the appointment of a study committee by a vote of at least 60%, the day on which the county or district attorney submits to the county clerk the attorney's report described in Subsection 17-52a-406(4) or, for a county under a pending process described in Section 17-52a-104, the attorney's report that is described in Section 17-52-204 as that section was in effect on March 14, 2018 and that contains a statement described in Subsection 17-52-204(5) as that subsection was in effect on March 14, 2018; or

(b) for a county with a population of less than 225,000 in which voters did not approve the appointment of a study committee by a vote of at least 60%, the day on which:
(i) the county legislative body adopts a resolution under Subsection (1)(b)(i); or
(ii) the county clerk certifies a petition under Subsection (2)(b).

(4) The county clerk shall prepare the ballot for an election under this section so that the question on the ballot states substantially the following: "Shall ____________ County adopt the alternate form of government known as the (insert the proposed form of government) that the study committee has recommended?"

(5) The county clerk shall:
(a) publish the complete text of the proposed optional plan in a newspaper of general circulation within the county at least once during two different calendar weeks within the 30-day period immediately before the date of the election described in Subsection (1);
(b) post the complete text of the proposed optional plan in a conspicuous place on the county's website during the 45-day period that immediately precedes the election on the optional plan; and
(c) make a complete copy of the optional plan and the study committee report available free of charge to any member of the public who requests a copy.

(6) A county clerk shall declare an optional plan as adopted by the voters if a majority of voters voting on the optional plan vote in favor of the optional plan.

Renumbered and Amended by Chapter 68, 2018 General Session

17-52a-502 Voter information pamphlet.
(1) In anticipation of an election under Section 17-52a-501, the county clerk may prepare a voter information pamphlet to inform the public of the proposed optional plan.
(2) In preparing a voter information pamphlet under this section, the county clerk may:
(a) allow proponents and opponents of the proposed optional plan to provide written statements to be included in the pamphlet; and
(b) use as a guideline the provisions of Title 20A, Chapter 7, Part 7, Voter Information Pamphlet.
(3) A county clerk who prepares a voter information pamphlet under this section shall cause the publication and distribution of the pamphlet in a manner that the county clerk determines is adequate.

Renumbered and Amended by Chapter 68, 2018 General Session

17-52a-503 Adoption of optional plan -- Election of new county officers -- Effect of adoption.
(1) If a proposed optional plan is approved at an election held under Section 17-52a-501:
(a) the elected county officers specified in the plan shall be elected at the next regular general election following the election under Section 17-52a-501, according to the procedure and schedule established under Title 20A, Election Code, for the election of county officers;
(b) the proposed optional plan:
(i) becomes effective according to the optional plan's terms;
(ii) subject to Subsection 17-52a-404(1)(c), at the time specified in the optional plan, is a public record open to inspection by the public; and
(iii) is judicially noticeable by all courts;
(c) the county clerk shall, within 10 days of the canvass of the election, file with the lieutenant governor a copy of the optional plan, certified by the clerk to be a true and correct copy;
(d) all public officers and employees shall cooperate fully in making the transition between forms of county government; and
(e) the county legislative body may enact and enforce necessary ordinances to bring about an orderly transition to the new form of government, including any transfer of power, records, documents, properties, assets, funds, liabilities, or personnel that are consistent with the approved optional plan and necessary or convenient to place it into full effect.

(2) Adoption of an optional plan changing only the form of county government without adopting one of the structural forms under Chapter 35b, Part 3, Structural Forms of County Government, does not alter or affect the boundaries, organization, powers, duties, or functions of any:
(a) school district;
(b) justice court;
(c) local district under Title 17B, Limited Purpose Local Government Entities - Local Districts;
(d) special service district under Title 17D, Chapter 1, Special Service District Act;
(e) city or town; or
(f) entity created by an interlocal agreement under Title 11, Chapter 13, Interlocal Cooperation Act.

(3) After the adoption of an optional plan, the county remains vested with all powers and duties vested generally in counties by statute.

Renumbered and Amended by Chapter 68, 2018 General Session

17-52a-504 Amendment of optional plan.
(1) Subject to Subsection (2), an optional plan, after going into effect following an election held under Section 17-52a-501, may be amended by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the county legislative body.

(2) Notwithstanding Subsection (1), an amendment to an optional plan that is in effect may not take effect until a majority of registered voters voting in a general or special election at which the amendment is proposed approve the amendment, if the amendment changes:
(a) the size or makeup of the legislative body, except for adjustments necessary due to decennial reapportionment;
(b) the distribution of powers between the executive and legislative branches of county government; or
(c) the status of the county executive or legislative body from full-time to part-time or vice versa.

Renumbered and Amended by Chapter 68, 2018 General Session

17-52a-505 Repeal of optional plan.
(1) An optional plan that the voters in an election adopt under this chapter may be repealed as provided in this section.

(2) Registered voters of a county that has adopted an optional plan may initiate the process of repealing an optional plan by filing a petition for the repeal of the optional plan.

(3) Registered voters of a county may not file a petition to repeal an optional plan sooner than four years or more than five years after the election of county officers under Section 17-52a-503.

(b) If the registered voters file a petition to repeal an optional plan under this section, the petition is certified, and the optional plan is not repealed at an election described in Subsection (8), the voters may not circulate or file a subsequent petition to repeal until at least four, and not more than five, years after the certification of the original petition.
(ii) If, after four years, the voters file a subsequent petition under Subsection (3)(b)(i), the voters:
(A) may not circulate or file another petition to repeal until at least four, and not more than five, years after certification of the subsequent petition; and
(B) shall wait an additional four, and not more than five, years after the date of certification of the previous petition for each petition filed thereafter.

(4) A petition described in Subsection (2) shall:
(a) be signed by registered voters residing in the county:
   (i) equal in number to at least 15% of the total number of votes cast in each precinct described in Subsection (4)(a)(ii) for all candidates for president of the United States at the most recent election in which a president of the United States was elected; and
   (ii) who represent at least 85% of the voting precincts located within the county;
(b) designate up to five of the petition signers as sponsors, designating one petition signer as the contact sponsor, with the mailing address and telephone number of each; and
(c) be filed in the office of the clerk of the county in which the petition signers reside.

(5) Within 30 days after the filing of a petition under Subsection (2) or an amended petition under Subsection (6), the county clerk shall:
(a) determine whether the required number of voters have signed the petition or amended petition has been signed by the required number of registered voters; and
(b) if a sufficient number of voters have signed the petition, certify the petition or amended petition and deliver it to the county legislative body, and notify in writing the contact sponsor of the certification; or
   (i) if a sufficient number of voters have not signed the petition, reject the petition or the amended petition and notify the county legislative body and the contact sponsor in writing of the rejection and the reasons for the rejection.

(6) If a county clerk rejects a petition or an amended petition under Subsection (5)(b)(ii), the petition may be amended or an amended petition may be further amended with additional signatures and refilled within 20 days of the date of rejection.

(7) If a county clerk certifies a petition under Subsection (2), the county legislative body shall hold an election on the proposal to repeal the optional plan at the next regular general election that is at least 60 days after the day on which the county clerk certifies the petition.

(8) If, at an election held under Subsection (7), a majority of voters voting on the proposal to repeal the optional plan vote in favor of repealing:
   (a) the optional plan is repealed, effective January 1 of the year following the election of county officers under Subsection (8)(c);
   (b) upon the effective date of the repeal under Subsection (8)(a), the form of government under which the county operates reverts to the form it had before the optional plan was adopted; and
   (c) the county officers under the form of government to which the county reverts, who are different than the county officers under the repealed optional plan, shall be elected at the next regular general election following the election under Subsection (7).

Renumbered and Amended by Chapter 68, 2018 General Session