

ARGUMENT AGAINST THE GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND

Greg Montgomery

I have no argument about the need for additional winter recreation facilities that house basketball and volleyball. The larger question is can the approximate 2,000 households carry the minimum additional tax obligation of a general obligation bond for up to 26 years while existing current city facilities are decreasing in usefulness and desirability because of tight budgets? The recent tax hike was to help keep the city's quality personal, but little has been directed to improve existing recreation facilities to bring them up to par with other communities. Will the same hold true for a new facility once it ages and demands additional costs for maintenance before the 26 year payment is complete? The answer to the question needs to be addressed for voters to have a comfort level about further obligations they are being asked to carry.

The 2019 General plan talks about a future municipal recreation facility. In many people's mind a recreation facility is more than just a gym. To my understanding, there has not been a survey of what the real recreation needs are of the community and then understanding the construction and ongoing maintenance and replacement costs for such a facility. Have there been concept drawings of what the facility would actual have for a \$6,000,000 price tag so the public knows what they are giving approval for?

Partnerships are an important means to stretch dollars to meet common goals. Over time Harrisville has missed some opportunities for those partnerships to meet the common goals. We see communities around use develop facilities and we see them be a community and area attraction. Are there opportunities to work with others to create a proper recreation complex that would benefit the entire northern Weber County communities before looking at an individual Harrisville gym? This should be explored. There is a benefit in having more participation in funding and maintaining a facility by a recreational special district that reaches out to a wider group. Many citizens go to other communities in southern Weber County or Davis County to use their recreation facilities. The language in the city master plan seemed to indicate a full recreation facility that is more than a gym is the future direction of the city. Bringing this broader scope plan into play should be explored.

The proposal seems to be premature as additional information is needed so the voters can make an informed decision about what has been considered and discussed. The facility should be a long term benefit to the community but presently are too many unanswered questions.