

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
SUGAR CITY COUNCIL
THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2020

Presiding: Mayor Steven Adams
Meeting Via Internet and at City Hall Convened at 6:40 p.m.
Prayer: Councilwoman Nielsen
Pledge of Allegiance: Councilwoman Ball

Present Online: Mayor Steven Adams; Clerk-Treasurer Wendy McLaughlin; Councilors Joy M. Ball, Connie Fogle, and Catherine Nielsen; City Public Works Director Arlynn Jacobson; City Code Enforcement Officer Jonathan Turner; City Building Inspector Quinton Owens; Design Review Chairman Paul Jeppson; Chairman Dave Thompson of the Planning and Zoning Commission; City Engineer Dick Dyer; Attorney Chase T Hendricks; Targhee Townhomes Representative Jeff Patlovich; Old Farm Estates Developers Ryan & Jeff Lerwill; Old Farm Estates Development Attorney Michael Brown; Citizens Barbara Lusk, Bert McLaughlin, Lawrence Nielsen, Nathan Williams; and others who joined electronically but not identified. Sugar Salem School District Board Member Kristen Galbraith; Citizens William Barnhill and Timothy Frogue were present at City Hall. Councilman Davis was excused.

CONSENT AGENDA:

Minutes 5-20-2020 – removed from the consent agenda

Minutes 5-28-2020 – removed from the consent agenda

Treasurer's Report

Payment Approval Report

MOTION: It was moved by Councilwoman Fogle and seconded by Councilwoman Ball to approve Consent Agenda as amended and accept the Treasurer's and Payment Approval Reports; motion carried.

MINUTES OF 5-20-2020 and 5-28-2020: The minutes of 5-20-2020 were added by friendly amendment.

MOTION: It was moved by Councilwoman Fogle and seconded by Councilwoman Nielsen to approve the May 20, 2020 and 5-28-2020 minutes as amended; motion carried.

NEW JR HIGH SCHOOL UTILITY AND BUILDING FEES: The Council would consider a proposal for fees for the new Jr High School at the next council meeting.

Utility Fees: The one time connection fee for both water and sewer is \$73,920. The council reviewed with City Engineer Dick Dyer the calculation of both water and sewer connection fees to connect into the city water and sewer systems and approximate monthly costs. He explained that the process is not new and is derived from comparing the cost of one equivalent residential unit or ERU (see Attachment #1).

Building Fees: The building permit fee is \$55,750. The council reviewed with City Building Inspector Quinton Owens how the building permit fees are calculated using the value of the building and a fee schedule adopted by the city (see Attachment #2).

PUBLIC COMMENT: 7:00 PM – No public comments.

CITY WIDE CLEAN-UP SURVEY RESULTS – Councilwoman Nielsen: The council reviewed the survey results and may set a public hearing at the next council meeting. Most responses to the survey were in favor of having at least one dumpster and one clean-up. Some citizens felt the clean-up fee was an illegal tax and several didn't know about the two city-wide cleanups. There is concern of citizens dumping debris in alleys well before the clean-up dates and the dumpster is too high to lift heavy items in (see Attachment #3). The city-wide cleanup has been an ongoing tradition since the 1980s. Public Works Director Arlynn Jacobson will check with the Public Health District for any guidelines.

GENERAL BUSINESS (Discussion Only):

Possible Multi-Family Unit Building Moratorium – Councilwoman Nielsen – The council discussed the possibility of putting a temporary moratorium on all multi-family building until a new park could be completed and percentage of single family residents to multi-family units is more in line with the Comprehensive Plan. Councilwoman Fogle felt that a moratorium was ungrounded and would take away private property rights. City Attorney Chase Hendricks warned that although the city council passed a moratorium in 2005 for a similar matter, the political climate is different and the city could be implicated in an illegal taking. A moratorium is considered if there is an emergency where health and safety are impacted. The mayor counseled against a moratorium.

PUBLIC WORKS: - Arlynn Jacobson

3rd S Street Project Update – The project is completed. The reconstruction to the road and railroad crossing is well built and will service the city for many years.

Fiber Optic Line – the school district would like to run a fiber optic line through the city's utility easement on the east side of North Park Avenue. The council will consider this at the next council meeting.

Work Schedule – the public works department would like to experiment with working four 10 hour days instead of five 8 hour days during the summer months. The crew will be rotated so that each day in the week will be covered. He will report to the council at the end of the trial.

PLANNING AND ZONING REPORT: Dave Thompson reported on the following items:

Enlarging the Impact Area - Planning and Zoning have been working on enlarging the impact area.

Business Park Committee Meeting - a meeting with the Business Park is being scheduled tomorrow.

Comprehensive Plan – He is working with the committee on recommended revisions. They will involve the public through town hall meetings and a survey.

GENERAL BUSINESS:

City Hall Roof Bids – The cost to replace the City Hall roof membrane will be around \$14,000 and the contractor will need to have a public works license. Bids from Briggs Roofing and Gibson Roofing have been received and were within \$300 of each other. However, Gibson was unable to obtain a public works license.

MOTION: It was moved by Councilwoman Fogle and seconded by Councilwoman Ball to accept the bid contract from Briggs Roofing for \$13,679 for the city hall roof. Thereupon, the Clerk called roll upon the motion.

Those voting aye: Councilors Ball, Fogle, and Nielsen

Those voting nay: None

Councilman Davis was excused.

Thereupon, the Mayor declared the motion passed.

Meter Costs – Mr. Jacobson worked with City Clerk McLaughlin and determined that meter costs are not part of the city code and do not have to go to public hearing. The cost of meters for new hookups has gone up from about \$730 to \$800. City Attorney Chase Hendricks will verify. The item will be put on the next agenda for a final decision.

Business Park Name Change: No report. The committee to discuss the name change will schedule a meeting tomorrow.

Possible Council Emergency Extension: The council unanimously voted to extend the Council Emergency Declaration.

MOTION: It was moved by Councilwoman Fogle and seconded by Councilwoman Ball to extend the Council Emergency Declaration from June 14, 2020 to September 9, 2020; motion carried.

VETO: Mayor Adams vetoed the extension. His explanation is attached as Attachment #4.

Sugar Days Possible Cancellation: The council unanimously voted to cancel Sugar Days events because of COVID 19 and concern for public safety.

MOTION: It was moved by Councilwoman Nielsen and seconded by Councilwoman Fogle to cancel Sugar Days and the community breakfast; motion carried.

VETO: Mayor Adams vetoed the Sugar Days events cancellation. His explanation is attached as Attachment #4.

Proposed Budget and Work Meeting: The council set a budget work meeting by ZOOM for Monday July 13, 2020 at 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm. The public is invited. A draft budget year comparison will be available to the council by July 9.

CALENDARED ITEMS:

First Discussion/Reading:

Campaign Sign Ordinance Amendment - the council felt the sign ordinance amendment was very reasonable and clear and thanked Councilwoman Nielsen for her work.

Second Discussion/Reading:

Misdemeanors to Infractions Ordinance Amendment – Code Enforcement Officer Jonathan Turner will revise several penalty fees and reword the code for bicycle and motorized

bikes for the next meeting.

Third Discussion/Reading:

Business Park Truck Route Ordinance – the council tabled the adoption of the truck route ordinance amendment until next meeting since it was not marked as an action item.

MAYOR’S REPORT:

Garbage Fee Increase Delay Update: No report.

Citizen’s Training Day – the council asked the mayor to explain the Citizen’s Training Day. The mayor will explain his desires.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS: No Report

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m. Councilwoman Ball motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Signed: _____
Steven Adams, Mayor

Attested: _____
Wendy McLaughlin, Clerk-Treasurer

Calculation of Jr High Utility Fees

Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs)

Using Heavy User Rate (by meter size):

3" meter = $(3)^2$ school meter size / $(0.75)^2$ typ residential meter size = 16 Equivalent Residential Units (ERU's)

<u>Water: (16 ERU's)</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Water Connection Fee	
Capacity Fee = 16 ERU's x \$2,441 per ERU =	\$39,056.00
3" Combo Meter w/ Radio =	\$2,302.00
Inspection Fee = \$225	\$225.00
Total Water Connection Fee:	<u><u>\$41,583.00</u></u>
Monthly Water User Fees	
Base Rate = 16 ERU's x \$45.00/ERU/Month	\$720.00 per month
Usage Rate = \$0.95 per 1,000 gallons	? varies with usage
Total	<u><u>\$720.00</u></u> per month, plus usage
<u>Sewer: (16 ERU's)</u>	
Sewer Connection Fee	
Capacity Fee = 16 ERU's x \$2,007 per ERU =	\$32,112.00
Inspection Fee = \$225	\$225.00
Total Sewer Connection:	<u><u>\$32,337.00</u></u>
Monthly Sewer User Fees	
Base Rate = 16 ERU's x \$17.97/ERU/Month	\$287.52 per month
Usage Rate = \$3.30 per 1,000 gallons	? varies with usage
Total	<u><u>\$287.52</u></u> per month, plus usage
Grand Total to Connect City Water and Sewer Facilities:	<u><u>73,920.00</u></u>

Calculation for Jr. High Building Permits

February 2020 International Building Code Building Valuation Data:

72,107 sq feet x \$148.75 = \$10,725,916 Value of Building

Resolution 2016-18:

Value of building (\$10,725,916) –

Table Tier - \$1,000,000 and up -

\$7,100 plus \$5.00 for each additional \$1,000 = \$55,730.00

CITY CLEANUP SURVEY RESULTS

Councilwoman Ball and Nielsen distributed 387 surveys to single-family dwellings.

138 Surveys were returned (35.4%)

1. City Cleanup (no dumpster)	13
2. 2 City Cleanups (no dumpsters)	21
3. 1 Dumpster (no Cleanups)	19
4. 2 Dumpsters (no Cleanups)	14
5. 1 Cleanup, 1 Dumpster	24
6. 1 Cleanup, 2 Dumpsters	9
7. 2 Cleanups, 1 Dumpster	32
8. 2 Cleanups, 2 Dumpsters	5
9. Opinion Letter	1

1. Spring Clean Up	47	(34%)
2. Fall Clean Up	53	(38%)
3. No Opinion	38	(28%)

104 of survey replies wanted at least 1 Cleanup (75.3%)

103 of survey replies wanted at least 1 Dumpster (74.6%)

Sugar City Survey Comments

The clean-up's and dumpsters are great – the cost is not much for the ability to have a dumpster and cleanup.

Thank you! For all of your hard work, it is appreciated.

Thank you for taking the time to get community input!

Maybe in the future newsletters, instead of admonishing residents to not put anything in the alley 2 weeks before pick-up, you encourage them to take it to the dumpsters to keep things from being an eyesore.

Thanks for all you do-you are appreciated.

We appreciate living in this city for the past 5 years and are concerned that prices keep going up. While some services are going down. Water costs are a concern to us as senior citizens on a fixed income. It would be helpful if the dumpster was dumped a little more often-if possible.

I think our little town will be cleaner if we have 2 dumpsters we can take our own garbage to the dumpsters. I mostly have tree branches and yard cleanup. The dumpster is often full, it looks like we need 2.

Sometimes my leaves haven't fallen off the trees by the time the city has their cleanup, so I end up taking them to the dumpster later.

We love the city dumpster!

Thank you for tackling this issue. You guys are awesome.

I would like to know if the cleanup is something that we can do where we live as well. (Dalling Circle).

This year's dumpster is taller and much harder to load, even standing in a truck bed. It can also only be accessed from one side. It's much more inconvenient and consequently I often find piles of debris blocking the way to the dumpster. There's no way older folks can use it because it takes a strong back to throw stuff up that high. I'm not sure what your options are, but a shorter, lidless, version like we had before would be more user-friendly.

Times and city finances are tough-I understand it. But they always have been and we were able to have, the small town privilege of clean-up and beautification of the town. You promised to reduce our city water bill-lets have the spring clean-up instead.

I have marked my preference but even the biggest money amount option is very affordable.

The current dumpster is too tall for people to get refuse in to especially for those who are old or who do not have a truck.

I have found the dumpster is always full. It is also very difficult to put the limbs in the very tall dumpster.

Maybe don't use orange, pink or other colors you commonly use for "Final Notice" notes. Kind of gives a person a mini heart attack. You guys do a great job-keep it up!

I do not even need the one city cleanup. All trees are pine. We surely do not need appliance etc. cleanup. Rexburg has a dump for such items. Each household should be responsible to take care of their own. Thank you!

What does "dumpster mean? I barely use my garbage can and nothing else.

Thank you!

How about NO dumpster NO clean-up and reduce our payments!

The two clean-ups (Fall and Spring) are great services provided by the city. I support any of the options above that provide the two clean-ups, although option 7 is my preference. Option 7 provides a Fall and Spring clean-up and a dumpster for when you have excess debris piling up that you want to get rid of and not wait until Fall or Spring. An extra \$2.50/month is a fair price for this great service. We thank the city for doing this.

I rather have the clean ups because I have no way to take stuff to dumpster.

Thank You for adding city cleanup back!!

No city cleanup and one dumpster.

Want to contribute our fair share to keep the city financial stable!

It's kind of hard for those of us who are old and/or can't drive to always have to ask others for help to take to a dumpster yard waste. Could there be another can and separate pick up for the stuff going to the dumpster? (through summer, anyway?) I do realize the yard waste can be saved for the clean-up, but that's a storage nuisance.

I want NO cleanup and NO dumpster. I don't and have not used these services. If there was a way for only those who use the service to pay that would be great. I take my garbage to transfer station when needed and don't rely on or expect the city to do it. I think many households don't use or rarely use the dumpsters and cleanup. To use the dumpster a

person must load it in a vehicle to take it there. Why not just drive 3 more miles and take it to Madison transfer station rather than have other city citizens share the cost of their garbage and refuse. The city cleanup promotes cleanliness (I think) but each person could be responsible to take their own trimmings, refuse, garbage etc. to the transfer station. I think that is a responsibility of a home/land owner...not the responsibility of all citizens to share the cost.

Haven't felt dumpsters were very helpful for us they are always full not emptied enough.

Thanks for the survey and allowing us to have a voice.

The city does a great job doing city clean-up which reflect on the cleanness of our city. Let's have spring and fall clean-up as in the past.

Voted for one clean-up and I mean my neighbors they need to clean up their yards so bring me a dumpster and I will do it!!

I understand the need to increase the price, but please DO WHAT YOU CAN TO NOT RAISE THE PRICES. We have lived here for five years and every year we have had an increase on our city bill. I don't want to suffer because of the development many didn't want in the first place.

I have lived in Sugar City 6 years and not used the dumpster or city clean up. I do not want to continue to be charged for something I do not use. Residents should drive their junk out to the city dump. I've lived here 6 years and never used the clean up or dumpster. I always just take care of my trash and do my own runs to the county dump. I don't like how a month before clean up trash starts piling up on streets and alleys. It looks trashy. Usually the dumpsters have restrictions and I'm not confident that they are, and I don't want to use it incorrectly. A suggestion would be have a few designated weeks through the season where people could schedule a cleanup service, AKA city dump truck. They could get to the city their address name, payment, and description of what they needed removed. Then during that week if they've paid, the city removes it. That way some people who use the service could still benefit, but not everyone is paying for it.

The City cleanup is poorly advertized. Our 1st year we lived here we received a letter letting us know when cleanup would take place. Then, somehow we were removed from the mailing list for reasons unknown to us and so when we notice junk out for city cleanup is a joke and a waste of our money.

Love the dumpster option. So helpful to have them close by when we need it. Thank you!

We like being able to get rid of lawn debris and other junk multiple times. We usually clean up over several weekends. We'd also be open to having a cleanup as long as there is also a dumpster.

The huge dumpster is too tall for most people to get stuff in. Can they dig down or build a earth ramp. It'd save you cleaning up a lot

I would prefer not to have city clean up and have not participated for a couple of years as the cleanup crew is destroying my vinyl fence and even knocked a portion of it down once. When I call to inquire about city responsibility I get no response. Please don't cleanup along my property. I can't afford any more damage.

Why not have an internet poll on issues like this. Let's get more bids on garbage removal

As a suggestion of how you could save money. One city employee is enough to service this whole city therefore get rid of all but one city employee and require that employee to be qualified. We do not need more city employees. Sometimes we have seen a man just driving slowly around the streets, killing time until lunch---

Number 6 costs us the most money but – we need to keep our city clean and neat. We need the services of an alley clean up – and even two dumpsters are not emptied often enough to meet the city needs. They are always running over and that makes that area of the City look really trashy.

Please empty dumpster more often.

Thank you so much for including us in this decision! If the issue ever arises, I would also be interested in a recycling program for an extra cost.

We have lived here for about 5 years and have loved the city clean up. It makes our town look so much better than their yards. We have loved the clean ups!!!

People clean up their yards in the spring and put stuff in the alley that will sit there all summer if we don't have a cleanup in the spring. In the fall the alleys are encumbered again and that stuff will sit there all winter if there is no cleanup. The additional \$60 a year is nothing. People who have visited us throughout the years have commented on the great service the city provides with the Bi Annual Cleanup.

Thank you! You guys are great!

City cleanup is a luxury. Dumpsters are a service.

One dumpster dumped twice a week. May be the same as 2 dumpsters.

I would like to know how much more is spent on the Sugar City Days. With the breakfast, renting of bouncy on houses, other inflatables, and rock climbing wall. If the city is not making money or breaking even the Sugar City Days I would like to see this cancelled and the money used to help lower the cost of the dumpsters or the city clean up. I would rather see ~~money to go towards keeping our town cleaned up than one fun day of events.~~

Response from a Patron of Sugar City:

The Sugar City Cleanup Survey Response for 2020

Where does the City Council and the Mayor think that they have the right and responsibility to set a policy to further provide its citizens of any imposed tax for a city cleanup of any kind? Where does it feel it has such a responsibility and where does it state that such a policy is declared as part of the city code, laws, and requirements outlining this city for such a right and responsibility.

If this city administration understood the free enterprise (capitalist system) and how it works, and if the city understood the private sector duties that are able to address each individuals needs and how citizens are to live in a city, the city would abandon this cleanup policy. There is no right or power that is rightfully given to any city for the right or obligation to set taxes on patrons for such services defined in this example so cited in this questionnaire. For this city to expand such a policy of taxes designed to provide spring and fall cleanup, or spring or fall cleanup, etc. is beyond the scope of city government. This questionnaire is a prime example of socialism in its pure and simple form.

Private run enterprises are setup to collect waste disposal and are allowed to charge a fee to do such. This City must get off the attitude of imposing a tax on its patrons by providing such services that is the duties of our free enterprise system and is setup to do. This city is not to provide such a service for its patrons and assume such un-rightful and unlawful duties. Laws do not allow a city to unlawfully usurp this right and have no right to take upon themselves such tax imposing duties.

When a city takes on unwarranted duties it costs greater expenses and it is proven many times over government never has and never will do a job for less money than the private enterprise system.

Such policies take away missed opportunities for neighbors to be neighbors which would allow opportunities for neighbors to minister to neighbors. Government should only be engaged in just causes and not to increase taxes.

Think over what is a cities duties and one is not to use the excuse of providing services which increases taxes for services people can do for themselves.



Wendy McLaughlin <wmclaughlin@blackknightnetworks.com>

Response to Sugar City Cleanup Survey

4 messages

David & Pam Ogden <pdogden396@gmail.com>
To: Wendy McLaughlin <wendy@sugarcityidaho.gov>

Mon, May 18, 2020 at 5:43 PM

Wendy,

Could you please forward the following comments to the Mayor and City Council:

Dear Mayor and Council,

One of the things that I have always thought to be a little one sided was the fact that many of us who have no access to the "city wide" cleanup are still paying for that service. The cleanup is not really city wide, and since I and many others do not have access to a backyard road where others can put their trash or yard waste, we are paying for a service that we do not have access to. That is one of the reasons I had convinced the prior city council that we needed to stop this so called "city wide" cleanup. The other reason is that it would save the city more than \$10,000 each year, even with a second dumpster being provided.

I am more than happy to pay for the extra dumpster because I will have access to it like everyone else in town. But continuing to provide the cleanup forces me to pay for a service that is not provided. It makes me wonder if others in the city who also do not have access to this service would feel the same. I believe that this constitutes an illegal tax, and I would recommend against it.

Thanks for your consideration

--

Dave & Pam Ogden
105 E 1st S, Sugar City, ID 83448
(208) 201-2471

Wendy McLaughlin <wendy@sugarcityidaho.gov>
To: David & Pam Ogden <pdogden396@gmail.com>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:24 AM

Yes, thank you I will send this on.

[Quoted text hidden]

Wendy McLaughlin <wendy@sugarcityidaho.gov>
To: Catherine Nielsen <cnielsen@sugarcityidaho.gov>, Connie Fogle <cfogle@sugarcityidaho.gov>, Joy Ball <jball@sugarcityidaho.gov>, Steve Davis <sdavis@sugarcityidaho.gov>, Steven Adams <mayor@sugarcityidaho.gov>, Arlynn Jacobson <ajacobson@sugarcityidaho.gov>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:25 AM

FYI

[Quoted text hidden]

Wendy McLaughlin <wendy@sugarcityidaho.gov>
To: Chase Hendricks <chendricks@rex-law.com>

Tue, May 19, 2020 at 9:26 AM

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----
From: David & Pam Ogden <pdogden396@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, May 18, 2020 at 5:44 PM
Subject: Response to Sugar City Cleanup Survey
To: Wendy McLaughlin <wendy@sugarcityidaho.gov>



Written Explanation of Vetos

2 messages

Mayor of Sugar City <mayor@sugarcityidaho.gov>
To: Wendy McLaughlin <wendy@sugarcityidaho.gov>
Cc: Chase Hendricks <chendricks@rex-law.com>

Fri, Jun 12, 2020 at 5:43 PM

Please place the following our city records and provide it to the members of the city council:

Members of the council,

The following is written in such a way that I can share my explanation with the council and citizens of the city at the same time. Please let me know if you have any question, or if you would like to discuss it again.

Veto of Emergency Declaration

You can watch the discussion of this item at approximately 2:21 on the Facebook recording below.

A little background first: I declared an emergency will council support when the governor and the director of public health made their first emergency declaration, as that declaration presented a serious threat to the property and rights of the people in Sugar City. There was also a reasonable concern for the pandemic overburdening our local medical supplies and resources if some of the worst-case models proved true.

After a few weeks it was clear the worst-case scenarios were not accurate and the emergency itself was creating the other problems, including new health problems as people were much less likely to access needed medical care. I did not ask the council to renew the declaration of emergency. They chose to do so on their own.

At the meeting last night, the council voted to extend their emergency declaration until September 13th. I asked the council to provide evidence of an emergency and was not satisfied that they had reasonable rational for declaring an emergency. I also asked them why they would want to grant the mayor power to alter the budget and make binding declarations, which is an assumption of their legislative and fiscal authority, when they could easily convene to do so on their own. Again, I did not receive what I felt was a convincing response.

If a state of emergency does come about in Sugar City, I can declare an emergency immediately and ask the council for their approval very quickly. I see no reason for a declaration as a pre-emptive action in case something happens. The original rational for the emergency was impact to health care services. The perceived need was to flatten the curve of cases to not overwhelm services and equipment specialized for those type of cases. This has never materialized in Madison County where our services are mainly provided. If those services are ever in threat of being overwhelmed, I will again declare an emergency in the city.

The authority to declare an emergency is clearly intended for the mayor. While I do agree that there is a legal way for the council to make such a declaration on their own, I do not think it is a responsible act as it requires they take upon themselves authority clearly intended for the mayor. It is a violation of the intent of separation of powers and the proper

checks and balances in our system. Just as I should not assume the legislative and financial oversight powers delegated to the city council in time of an emergency even though it is legal, unless absolutely necessary because the nature of the emergency does not allow for timely action by the council, they should not assume the authority of the mayor.

A mayor's veto is largely symbolic as it can be overruled by a majority vote of the council at their next meeting. I would encourage the citizens to watch the recording of the meeting below at the time mentioned above to get some additional background and hear the various perspectives. If you would like to express your thoughts on the issue, you can come to the next meeting on June 25th. The meeting starts at 6:30 p.m. with public comments at 7:00 p.m.

Veto of Cancellation of Sugar Days

You can watch the discussion of this item at approximately 2:35 on the Facebook recording below.

At the city council meeting last night, the council chose to approve a motion to cancel Sugar Days and the public breakfast that morning. I chose to veto that motion. I asked the council to wait and continue to monitor the situation before canceling the event.

I let the council know that we would follow whatever guidance was in place from the state or regional public health office and would cancel the full event or any specific activity that could not meet those guidelines.

The city staff checked with our insurance company and legal counsel. We were assured there was almost no liability concern for this event, even with the COVID situation. The only liability is that which always accompanies events like this.

I chose to veto the motion because I am not convinced there is a need to cancel at this time. I also believe that individuals have the right and ability to make their own choices related to any risk associated with whatever disease may be spreading at any given time. Those who are concerned with COVID can choose not to attend the event. Those who have high risk individuals in their home may also choose to stay home. This would still allow those who could like to participate the opportunity. I do not think it is the role of city government to make that choice for individuals and families unless there is a clear danger to the community. I did not hear convincing evidence from the council that such a danger exists.

There are many choices available to the council. The event could be postponed, specific activities could be cancelled, or any number of other options. It is highly possible the limited restrictions in place will be rescinded by the time we hold this event. Even with the current stage 4 restrictions, compliance should be fairly simple.

A mayor's veto is largely symbolic as it can be overruled by a majority vote of the council at their next meeting. I would encourage the citizens to watch the recording of the meeting below at the time mentioned above to get additional background and hear the various perspectives. If you would like to express your thoughts on the issue, you can come to the next meeting on June 25th. The meeting starts at 6:30 p.m. with public comments at 7:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

Steven Adams, Ph.D.

Mayor, Sugar City Idaho