

PROPOSITION 15

OGDEN VALLEY CITY INCORPORATION

Below is a sample of the ballot text. The image shows an example of what your actual ballot will look like.

BALLOT PROPOSITION 15
OGDEN VALLEY CITY INCORPORATION Shall the area described as Ogden Valley be incorporated as Ogden Valley City?
If the above incorporation proposal passes, under what form of municipal government shall Ogden Valley City operate? Vote for one: Five-member council form Six-member council form Five-member council-mayor form Seven-member council-mayor form
If the above incorporation proposal passes, shall members of the city council of Ogden Valley City be elected by district?

The arguments for or against a ballot proposition are the opinions of the authors.

Voter Information

The election will be held on Tuesday, November 5, 2024. Polls will be open from 7 am to 8 pm.

Polling locations for each voting precinct, early voting polling place, and election day voting center, including any changes to the location of a polling place and the location of an additional polling place, can be found at the following:

www.weberelections.gov
www.vote.utah.gov
801-399-8034

In-person voting:

EARLY: Oct. 29-Nov. 1, Noon - 6 pm

Weber Center
2380 Washington Blvd.,
Ogden, UT

ELECTION DAY: Nov. 5, 7 am - 8 pm

Weber County Fairgrounds Exhibit Hall
1000 N 1200 W
Ogden, UT

Ogden Valley Library
131 S 7400 E
Huntsville, UT

SCAN FOR MORE INFO ON THE INCORPORATION, INCLUDING ALL ARGUMENTS AND REBUTTALS



www.weberelections.gov/ogdenvalleycityincorporation

PROPOSITION 15 OGDEN VALLEY CITY INCORPORATION

Voter Information Pamphlet

General Election:

Tuesday, November 5, 2024

Poll Hours: 7 am-8 pm

Voter Information:

www.vote.utah.gov
www.weberelections.gov

The arguments for or against a ballot proposition are the opinions of the authors.



Weber County Elections:
www.weberelections.gov

Argument FOR the Incorporation:

Mark Ferrin - 3361 N River Dr, Eden, UT

Vote “YES” for Incorporation!

Local Representation

Incorporation will give Ogden Valley residents control over local decisions, unlike governance by Weber County, which represents a much larger region with different priorities. With local representatives, we can focus on what matters most to us—our roads, land, and Valley character. As just 3% of the county's population, our votes don't carry much weight, but with incorporation, they will. We'll be 100% of the vote, and finally have a voice that truly counts.

No Tax Increases, and Money Stays Local

Let's be clear: incorporation will not raise taxes. Two independent studies, including one that the opposition publicly declared that they commissioned, show that incorporation would create a tax surplus. Though only 3% of the county's population, we contribute 9% of its taxable property value and 56% of the Municipal Services Fund (MSF). From 2018 to 2022, we generated a surplus of 10.2% in tax revenue, much of which currently funds projects outside our Valley. With incorporation, we also gain access to new revenue sources—like short-term rental taxes, grants, and impact fees—without raising our taxes.

Incorporation ensures our tax dollars stay here, in Ogden Valley, allowing us to invest in local infrastructure, community projects, and services that directly benefit us. This isn't about adding more government but transferring control from a distant county bureaucracy to efficient, local leadership.

Shaping Our Future

By incorporating, we can enforce the Ogden Valley General Plan, guiding growth while preserving the Valley's unique character. We'll be able to protect property rights, natural resources, and local businesses while enhancing recreational opportunities—particularly important with the upcoming Olympics. By managing growth ourselves, we can ensure that our community thrives for both current residents and future generations.

A Real Seat at the Table

Currently, the county speaks for the entire region; with incorporation, Ogden Valley will have the legal status to stand up and speak for itself. Incorporation will open doors to grants, programs, and resources to improve our infrastructure, protect the environment, and support our community. We will have access to funding and support from federal, state, and local sources, including organizations like UDOT, Utah League of Cities & Towns, and the Weber Area Council of Governments. With our own voice, we can better partner with other communities for mutual benefit.

The Best is Yet to Come

A “Yes” vote for incorporation puts Ogden Valley's future in the hands of those who care most—us, the residents. Instead of distant officials without a stake in our community, we will guide the growth and direction of our Valley. It's time to take control of our future—together. Your “Yes” vote is essential.

Vote for a 6-Member Council

- Common for communities our size
- Ensures shared authority and balanced decision-making
- Prevents concentration of power
- Adaptable to meet local needs

Vote “YES” for Voting Districts

- Balanced districts with equal populations
- Fair representation for all
- Respect for traditional Valley communities

More information at Ogdenvalleyinc.org.

Sponsors:

Mark Ferrin, Nicholas Dahlkamp,
Brandi Hammon, Richard Webb,
Shanna Francis

Argument AGAINST the Incorporation:

Laura Warburton - 7328 E 1450 N, Huntsville, UT

Promise: Services will remain the same or improve

Reality:

- The proposed boundary is simply too large.

- The feasibility study's estimates for roads and other costs seem to be low—likely leading to failure in maintaining current services and certainly necessitating increased taxes. We can't afford to contract out road services with the County.

- Some people are willing to accept higher taxes, lured by the misleading promise of growth control. However, the study assumes an 8 percent increase in building permit revenue every year to sustain current services. If this is not met, the remaining citizens may bear a tax increase, which will price out retirees, creating an elite Park City-type community.

- Buildings Required: Estimates for City Hall and Roads Department buildings are likely too low, leading to potential service funding shortfalls, which can lead to bonding—resulting in increased taxes.

Promise: Limit Growth

Reality:

- Pro-incorporation advocates promise to reduce development, but their feasibility study necessitates growth. A city still has to follow state code, which considers cities as expansion locations, requiring moderate-income housing and many other possible projects. The state understands unincorporated areas are rural, not city. The promise to limit/control growth is misleading.

- Additionally, all current development agreements in place must be allowed according to state code.

Promise: The feasibility study is accurate.

Reality:

- The company that conducted the feasibility study consults with incorporated entities on issues and possibly facilitates bonding. A bond is a low-interest loan that is paid back by taxes. Clearly, this is a conflict of interest. They are not required to use historical financial data or declare any conflict of interest. There is no recourse for the average citizen to oppose the study. The county involved must stay neutral. If the study says it, then it must be accurate—and yet, it's clearly not accurate in this case. There is no public body to appeal to. Our voice is only heard if we vote.

Vote AGAINST incorporation

Promise: Local representation

Reality:

- We often assume that local elected officials will be more honest and act according to the majority's wishes. But the reality is that these officials must still operate under the same laws as the county, with even more regulations as a city. When it comes to honesty, anyone can fall prey to corruption or selfish agendas, believing they are in the right. Forming a city or relying on local officials doesn't guarantee better or healthier representation.

- There is a better way to stay rural and have better representation. We can change the form of county government! Let's do that and stay rural! Imagine if we all stood arm in arm to get that change! I'm ready!

Vote NO on incorporation.

www.keepourvalleyfree.com

Sponsors:

Bruce Warburton, Jeff Burton, Jeff Scadden,
Maureen Hefti, Shawn Durrant

Rebuttal Against the FOR Argument:

Laura Warburton - 7328 E 1450 N, Huntsville, UT

You've seen the signs and heard the claims—"Incorporation is our voice!" But was it your voice that pushed this forward? Was it your voice that dismissed efforts to grow our community according to the General Plan, while villainizing our neighbors? Was it your voice plastering the valley with signs that say, "More Park, Less City," yet advocating for more city?

Let me tell you whose voice it is: a small group that has long sought control. They claim taxes won't rise, but the very studies they rely on show that without a yearly 8% increase in building permit revenue, revenues won't cover costs—all while claiming they want to keep our valley rural. They cannot deliver on both promises. Very few newly incorporated cities have been able to keep their taxes the same.

This isn't about empowering us—it's about empowering them. If you want to preserve the rural character of our Valley, free from another level of government called a city which then demands the state's heavy-handed rules, vote against incorporation. If we become a city, we'll face more regulations, higher costs, and lose the independence that makes our community unique. Imagine living in a giant HOA. Is that your voice?

For more information, visit: www.keepourvalleyfree.com

Stay unincorporated. Stay free. Vote no.

Rebuttal Against the AGAINST Argument:

Mark Ferrin - 3361 N River Dr, Eden, UT

MISINFORMATION: Taxes will increase; the area is too large.

TRUTH: From 2018-2022, the county's Municipal Services Fund (Unicorp Services from your property taxes) ran 10% annual surpluses (\$6.5 million). The LRB and Utah Foundation's feasibility studies found there will be at least a 5% annual surplus.

We don't need a tax increase!

The Valley is one area. Our children attend the same schools. We share the same General Plan. We function as a community. The size enables us to serve our population efficiently without raising taxes.

MISINFORMATION: Supporters will limit growth, but state law requires “cities” to grow and build subsidized housing.

TRUTH: Supporters won't limit growth; they seek local management of it. They advocate encoding the General Plan, developed with local input, and protecting property rights.

Legal classification as a "City" is based on population. State law doesn't mandate growth or subsidized housing. It merely requires a written plan for moderate-income housing options.

MISINFORMATION: LRB used bad data, twisting results to get future business.

TRUTH: The county provided data and feedback to LRB. Neither the county nor state disputes the study.

MISINFORMATION: Local representation could be bad; just restructure county government.

TRUTH: How can having locally elected representatives be worse than representation by three people who may not even live here? Voting for six council members ensures local representation and the accountability it brings.

Even with restructuring, we'd be only 3% of the county's population, with little influence in county elections, despite being 9% of the county's property value.