

Josh Ellis
PO Box 1406
Boulder, UT 84716

May 3, 2023

Dear Boulder Town Council:

This letter is a public comment in regards to the Tree City complaint and follow up public conversations and letters. The **core role** of Town Council is to ensure the proper and timely administration of town ordinances. It is unfortunately clear from this situation that you failed at this core role as Councilmembers and this has caused noteworthy damage to the public trust. The following questions are appropriate for Town Council to answer regarding this incident, in order to rebuild the public trust:

- **Why is it acceptable to use town funds to protect private property when the town has no liability/responsibility?** This is in reference to the removal of a tree with no compelling town interest, one over Boulder Farmstead's mainline on UDOT's right of way.
 - Identical situation: Should the town also pay for trimming the tree at Halls Store to protect the gas pumps?
 - What is the consequence for this and what is preventing this from happening again?
- **Under what conditions, if any, is it permissible for a Councilmember to act unilaterally (without public majority Council support) on behalf of "the town"?**
 - Can any and all ordinances and Council processes for review and approval be usurped by any Councilmember at their personal discretion for, e.g., "safety"?
 - Can a Councilmember unilaterally bring contractors in the park and do as they individually see fit because they personally feel the Park Committee is failing in its duties?
 - What is the consequence for this and what is preventing this from happening again?
- **What does it take for an appointed member of Town government to have their appointment revoked?** The Council is setting a very dangerous precedent because it appears as though appointed officials can pursue their own personal beliefs and interests, at a clear expense to the public trust and community relationships, without any consequence or oversight.
 - The Councilmember at the core of this complaint was appointed to a voting position under a conflict of interest (by a family member). In an official capacity as a public servant he has lied about communications or lack thereof with community members at least two times. He unilaterally acted on behalf of "the town". He knowingly violated an ordinance. He has repeatedly violated state ethics law by failing to make required disclosures or recusing himself from matters involving the privately-owned water company which employs him and his family.
 - If this list actions does not qualify an appointed position for removal, then what does? Certainly there must be a hard stop—Is it 4 willful violations of ordinances and 7 documented instances of lying about communications with community members?

Regardless of how you proceed, *at least* the simplest approach to taking responsibility should be pursued: Honest, thoughtful apologies both individually and as a group. The actions of the Town Council over the last year have compiled to significantly damage the public trust across many, many community members. This relationship desperately needs healed and apologies are a good starting ground.

Sincerely,



Josh Ellis