February 1, 2019

To: United States District Court for the District of Arizona

From: Roger Carter, Court Monitor

Re: February 2019 Monitoring Report for the cities of Colorado City, Arizona and Hildale, Utah.

This report is submitted in compliance with § V.C. (39) of the Judgement and Decree Granting Injunctive Relief ("Order"), requiring a written report every 90 days on injunction compliance by the Defendant Cities and the activities of the Court Monitor.

This report will cover the period from November 1, 2018, to January 31, 2019, and include a current status of compliance on all the Order requirements, identify any obstacles to the work of the Monitor and provide general observations (§ V.C. (40)).

Fair Housing Injunction Requirements

<u>Items in Compliance with the Injunction</u>

The towns of Hildale, Utah and Colorado City, Arizona are currently in compliance with the following Court injunction requirements.

- 1. Subdivision Plat Recorded September 26, 2017.
- 2. Adoption of Building Department policies and codes Adopted September 2017.
- 3. Water Service regulations Adopted September 2017.
- Culinary Water Impact Fee Hildale, Utah adopted a new water impact fee on January
 25, 2018, and by Colorado City on February 13, 2018. This requirement is complete.
- 5. Elected and Staff Contact Information on the website All information is current.
- Notice of all Meetings, Minutes, etc. Meeting agendas have been posted correctly, however, there is a limited number of minutes displayed. Only two Planning
 Commission meeting minutes were posted in 2018 (January 8 & February 5) and

one posting of Utility Board minutes (January 30). The Monitor recommends that all public meeting minutes be timely posted in accordance to open meeting laws and for public review.

- 7. All Department Codes, policies, regulations All information is current.
- 8. Mandatory Education & Training The second year of Constitutional training occurred on October 24, 2018. The Fair Housing Training was conducted on November 28, 2018. Injunction Training has not happened for the second year of the Injunction but is being scheduled sometime in the next couple of months. The Court Monitor does note an area of concern as it relates to these trainings, however. While the first year training resulted in full compliance, with almost 90% in attendance at the actual meetings and the remaining employees viewing a video of the training, the second year has not seen the same level of participation. Participation in the Fair Housing training has only resulted in 48% compliance among the employees and government officials (34 of 71 participating). The Constitutional Training has a compliance percentage of 39% (29 of 74 participating). Employees are required to sign in when they attend the live trainings and sign an affidavit of compliance when they view the videos. The Monitor has also attended all the trainings to ensure compliance with the Injunction. The communities need to place this as a high priority within the next reporting period to stay in compliance with court orders. This will be monitored closely to ensure compliance (Exhibit A).

Outstanding Injunction Items

Injunction training is still to be scheduled within the next couple of months. Public officials need to ensure that all identified employees have received all three training

components. Public officials need to ensure that all legislative or appointed bodies meeting minutes are timely posted to the city websites.

Current Monitoring Efforts

Marshalls Office

The Monitor is to ensure that there are no violations of Fair Housing requirements by employees of the Marshal's Office during their interaction with the public.

- A. The Monitor continues to evaluate fair housing-related Incident Reports and Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) reports ensuring that all calls are reported and done so accurately. There has been good cooperation between Chief Askerlund and the Monitor.
- B. The Monitor works closely with both the Police Consultant and Mentor and provides the following summary, as provided by them.
 - a. Consultant The Marshall's office has completed the hiring of the two new officers and two sergeants. The department is now fully staffed. The office continues to grow and develop professionally. Department policies are expected to be received back from the DOJ by the end of February, at which time a full policy manual will be provided. Once completed, daily training bulletins will then be issued to the department to help guide their functions.
 - b. Mentor The department is working better than expected at this stage of compliance. This is mainly due to the new chief marshall and the new hires. The Mentor does note some concern in the relationship between the marshall's office and the fire department as some of the previous officers are now working in that department. The chief marshall will work on strengthening his department's relationship with the fire department.

Monitor

During this reporting period, the Monitor:

- A. The Monitor attended city and town council meetings, planning commission meetings, utility board meetings, and executive sessions.
- B. Met with staff and elected officials.
- C. Reviewed modifications to codes or ordinances that pertain to Fair Housing.
- D. Attended and provided input on the creation of the new zoning codes for Hildale, Utah.
- E. The two communities have requested a change to the culinary water impact fee.

 Per sections 21 and 34(c) of the Court Injunction, the United States and Court

 Monitor are required to review the request and provide an opinion. The Court

 Monitor provided his response on January 22, 2019 (Exhibit B).
- F. Audited building and zoning applications, utility applications and work orders, business license applications, GRAMA requests, and land-use related police calls for service.
- G. Followed up on the following complaints by residents:
 - a. The Monitor received one complaint this past quarter concerning specific building department requirements. A direction was provided to the complainant, and the matter was resolved.
 - b. A complaint from the previous quarter regarding disparate treatment by the utility department was resolved to all parties satisfaction.

Summary

Public official work slowed down during the last quarter due to the holiday season. However, in November a new member of the Colorado City Council was elected. The Monitor met with this newly elected official to provide training on the Court Injunction. Colorado City continues to work on their zoning codes and is anticipating adoption of these in the upcoming year. Policies and procedures continue to be put in place in the utility department. These policies include language which allows citizens, who may feel aggrieved by a governmental decision, to pursue an appeal route within the organization. These new policies will ensure more sound due process and a more transparent decision-making procedure.

The concern for government officials as they move into the second year of court oversight will be maintaining the vigilance in compliance with all court-ordered requirements. Each of the mandates imposed upon the communities is to not only ensure that the system provides equal treatment to all citizens but also to guarantee that this fairness becomes fundamental, cultural, systemic, and enduring within the organization. To this end, both the injunctive requirements and oversight length of time was imposed.

I am confident that the communities will continue to respond to the Court Injunction and the direction of the Court Monitor in a positive way and with an eye towards a bright future.

Communication

This report was provided electronically and in hard copy to:

To plaintiff:

Sean Richard Keveney

United States Department of Justice

Civil Rights Division

950 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W. Washington, DC 20053

To Colorado City:

Jeffrey C. Matura

Graif Barrett & Matura P.C.

1850 North Central Avenue, Ste. 500

Phoenix, AZ 85004

Town Manager Colorado City PO Box 70

Colorado City, AZ 86021

To Hildale City:

Christian Kesselring 320 East Newel Ave PO Box 840490 Hildale, UT 84784

Mayor - Hildale City, Utah 320 East Newel Ave PO Box 840490 Hildale, UT 84784

DATED at Washington, Utah, this 1st day of February 2019.

Roger Carter, Court Monitor

Exhibit A

Fair Hous	ing and Constitutional Trair	ning		
	rict Court Mandatory Educa		g Workshops	
	ing Training: September 5,		.8	
	ional Training: September :			
	x = Attended in person			
	X = Viewed later (separate	e affidavit)		
	NLW = No longer with the	•		
	NR = Not required to rece			
			Training	Received
Category	Name	Fair Housing	Constitutional	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Colorado	City Town Council			
	Joseph Allred	x	x	х
	Anthus Barlow	x	X	X
	Jeffery Jessop	х	X	x
	Ralph Johnson	х	X	х
	Donald Richter	х	X	x
	Karen Barlow	Х	x	х
	Anthony Barlow	x	X	NLW
	Joanne Shapley	Х	X	х
Hildale To	own Council			
	Philip Barlow	х	x	NLW
	Carlos Jessop	Χ	X	NLW
	Brian Jessop	Χ	X	NLW
	Elmer Johnson	х	X	x
	Doran Jessop	Х	X	x
	Edwin Barlow	х	x	NLW
	Donia Jessop	Х	X	x
	Maha Layton	Х	X	x
	Jared Nicol	Х	X	x
	Jvar Dutson	Χ	Χ	
	Stacy Seay	Χ	Χ	х
Utility Bo	ard			
	Jacob Jessop	x	х	NLW
	Craig Roundy	Х	Χ	NLW
	Berklee Holm	x	NLW	NLW
	Sterling Jessop Jr	x	х	X
	Moroni Johnson	NLW	NLW	NLW
	Alan Dockstader	X	x	NLW
	Patrick Johnson	X	x	NLW
	Jason Black	X	X	X
	Arvin Black	X	X	x
	Nathan Burnham	X	X	X
	Alma Cawley	X	X	X
	Haven Barlow	X	X	X
	Michael Cawley			
	in since carrier		<u>.i</u>	

Colorada	 City/Hildale Planning Co	mmission	<u> </u>		
Colorado	:		V	V	
	Nephi Allred	X	X	X	
	Paul Stanley Jessop	X	X	X	
	Millward Barlow Jr.	X	X	NLW	
	Kim Knudson	X	X	X	
	Charles Hammon				
	Charles Bradshaw				
	Aaron LaCorti				
STAFF					
Administ	rative Staff				
	Andrew Barlow	х	х	х	
	Raymond Barlow	х	x	NLW	
	Vance Barlow	х	x	х	
	Leonard Black	NR	NR	NR	
	David Darger	х	х	NLW	
	Rachel Fischer	Х	Х	x	
	Kent Page	Х	NLW	NLW	
	Jim Peterson	Χ	Х	х	
	Louise Stubbs	Χ	х	х	
	Lovisa White	Х	х	X	
	Rosaleta White	x	Х	х	
	Christian Kesselring	Х	X	х	
	C: (f				
Janitorial	· ·	ND	ND		
	Makayla Barlow	NR	NR	X	
	Midge Barlow	NR	NR	NR	
	Mildred Barlow	NR	NR	NR	
	Katrina Stubbs	NR	NR	NR	
Airport B	oard & Staff				
	Daniel Barlow Jr.	Х	X	Χ	
	Ladell Bistline Jr.	х	х	х	
	Paul Black	х	х	х	
	Charles Cooke	Х	Х	х	
	Jacob Jessop	X	X		
	ov Dispostob Stoff				
Emergen	cy Dispatch Staff	ND	ND	ND	
	Kevin Barlow Jr.	NR	NR	NR NB	
	Lorenzo Barlow	NR	NR	NR NB	
	Mary Barlow	NR	NR	NR NB	
	Natalie Barlow	NR	NR	NR NB	
	Patton Barlow	NR	NR	NR	
	Sterling Barlow	NR	NR	NR	

	Rozina Chatwin	NR	NR	NR	
	Warren Darger	NR	NR	NR	
	Kendrick Johnson	NR	NR	NR	
	Stacie Knudson	NR	NR	NR	
	Lucille Barlow		İ		
	Vienna Barlow				
	Tamara Steed				
	April Reusch				
Landfi	III Staff				
	Lyle Barlow	NR	NR	NR	
	John Todd Barlow	Х	X	x	
	Winford Barlow	X	X	x	
	Isaac Johnson	NR	NR	NR	
	Ralph Johnson Jr.	NR	NR	NR	
	Heber Roundy	NR	NR	NR	
	Tiebel Roulluy	INIX	INIX	IVIX	
Law Fi	nforcement Staff				
Law Li	Mark Askerlund	Χ	X	Χ	
	Daniel Roy Barlow		X		
	Jacob Barlow Jr.	X X	X	NLW	
	:				
	Taylor Barlow Shaun Cox	X X	X	X	
		X			
	Jerry Darger	X	X	NLW	
	Max Horsley	•	X	X	
	Shem Jessop	X	X	X	
	Sam Johnson	X	X	X	
	Daniel Musser	X	X	X	
	Hyrum Musser	X	X	X	
	Hyrum Roundy	X	X		
Magic	trata Court				
iviagis	trate Court	ND	ND	ND	
	Barbara Brown	NR	NR	NR	
C+raa+	e & Boads/Darks Stoff	<u> </u>	i i	i	
Street	s & Roads/Parks Staff		ND	ND	
	Moroni Barlow	X	NR	NR 	
	Dean Cooke	X	X	X	
	Heber White	X	X	X	
	Jayson Cooke	NR	NR	NR	
	Vergel Jessop	X	NLW	NLW	
	Ed Lane	X	X	NR	
	Nathaniel Barlow	NR	NR	X	

Case 3:12-cv-08123-HRH Document 1168-1 Filed 02/01/19 Page 11 of 18

John R. Barlow	Χ	Х	x	
Justin Barlow	X	x	NLW	
Melvin Barlow	Х	NLW	NLW	
Patton Barlow	х	x	NLW	
Richard J. Barlow	Х	x	NLW	
Susie Barlow	Χ	X	x	
Vincen Barlow	Χ	X	Χ	
Weston Barlow	Х	x	x	
David Boshard	Χ	X	х	
Angelene Chatwin	Χ	X	x	
Michelle Chatwin	Х	x	NLW	
Lavern Fischer	Х	x	NLW	
Leslie Jessop	Χ	x	Χ	
Nap Jessop	Х	X	Χ	
Victor Jessop	Х	x	Χ	
Mary Ellen Johnson	Х	x	x	
Mariah Lacorti	Χ	X	х	
Cathryn Steed	Х	x	NLW	
Harrison Johnson				

Fair Hous	ing and Constitutional Train	ing		
	rict Court Mandatory Educat		g Workshons	
	ing Training: November 28,		g workshops	
	ional Training: October 24, 3			
Constituti	x = Attended in person	2010		
	X = Viewed later (separate	affidavit)		
	NLW = No longer with the	· ·		
	NR = Not required to receive			
		3	Training	Received
Category	Name	Fair Housing	:	Requirements of Injunction
·	City Town Council			
	Joseph Allred	х	x	
	Anthus Barlow	х		
	Jeffery Jessop	x	х	
	Ralph Johnson			
	Donald Richter	x		
	Alma Hammon	Х		
	Joanne Shapley			
Hildale To	wn Council			
	Donia Jessop			
	Maha Layton		x	
	Jared Nicol	x	x	
	Jvar Dutson			
	Lawrence Barlow			
	Stacy Seay	x		
Utility Bo	ard			
	Arvin Black			
	Haven Barlow			
	Michael Cawley	х		
	Sterling Jessop Jr	x		
	Stacy Seay			
ļ	Jason Black			
	Nathan Burnham			
ļ	Ralph Johnson			•
	Jvar Dutson			
	<u>:</u>	<u>:</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Colorado	i City/Hildale Planning Comm	ission		
COIOIGGO	Charles Bradshaw			
	Aaron LaCorti	Х		
	Paul Stanley Jessop	^		
	Charles Hammon	v		
	-	X		
	Jennifer Kesselring	ND	v	
	Randy Barlow	NR	X	
	Brigham Holm	X		

			T.	
CTAFF				
STAFF				
Administ	rative Staff			
	Andrew Barlow	X	X	
	John R. Barlow		Х	
	Vance Barlow	X		
	Vincen Barlow		X	
	Louise Stubbs	Χ	X	
	Lovisa White	NR	X	
	Rosaleta White	X	X	
	Christian Kesselring	X		
	Rachel Fischer		X	
	Dean Cooke		X	
	Warren Darger	Χ		
	John T. Barlow	Х		
Airport E	Board & Staff			
	Daniel Barlow Jr.			
	Ladell Bistline Jr.	Х	x	
	Paul Black	Х	x	
	Charles Cooke			
	Jacob Jessop		X	
Law Enfo	orcement Staff			
	Mark Askerlund		X	
	Daniel Roy Barlow		X	
	Taylor Barlow	Х	x	
	Shaun Cox		X	
	Max Horsley		x	
	Shem Jessop			
	Sam Johnson	NR		
	Daniel Musser		x	
	Hyrum Musser	х		
	Robbins Radley	X		
	Shane Barnard	х		
	Benjamin Barlow	х		
	Hyrum Roundy			
Magistra	te Court			
	Barbara Brown			

Case 3:12-cv-08123-HRH Document 1168-1 Filed 02/01/19 Page 14 of 18

Utiliti	es Department			
	Harrison Johnson	х		
	Susie Barlow			
	Weston Barlow	х	x	
	Angelene Chatwin			
	Nap Jessop			
	Victor Jessop			
	Mariah Lacorti			
	Ammon Todd Jim	х	x	
	Ralph Johnson Jr.	х	x	
	Athena Cawley	х		
Othe	r Employees (were not required)			
	Heber White	х	x	
	Nathaniel Barlow	x	x	
	David Lane	x		
	Katrina Stubbs	х		

Exhibit B

January 22, 2019

Via E-mail and U.S. Mail

Steven Ryals
United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20053

Jeff Matura
Barrett & Matura
8925 East Pima Pkwy
Suite 100
Scottsdale, AZ 85258

Christian Kesselring Hildale City, Utah 320 East Newell Ave Hildale, UT 84784

Re: Hildale, Utah and Colorado City, Arizona Notice of Intent to Change Culinary Water Impact Fee

I am in receipt of both Hildale City and Colorado City's request for a reduction in the Culinary Water Impact Fee ("Impact Fee"). Both cities have complied with the requirement of requesting a change in Impact Fee as outlined in section 21 on page 38 of the Court's April 18, 2017, Injunctive Order which states:

Except as indicated in paragraph 17, above, the amount of any impact fee for culinary water connections may only be modified if written notice is given to counsel for the United States and the Monitor 30 days before the proposed modification is to take effect and the United States and the Monitor makes no objection thereto. The notice referenced in this paragraph must specify the new impact fee amount and must include any reports or analyses supporting the modification. The Culinary Water Impact Fee Plan shall be reviewed by a licensed engineer or engineering firm at no less than five-year intervals.

Furthermore, section 34(e) states that the Monitor should

review any changes proposed by the Defendant Cities to the Building Department Policies and Procedures, the Water Services Regulations, or the culinary water impact fee and provide a statement of objection or non-objection to the Defendant Cities and the United States within 30 days of receiving notice of the proposed changes.

This response satisfies both sections 21 and 34 of the April 18, 2017, Injunctive Order.

The Court Monitor finds no objection to the reduction of the Impact Fee to the amount of \$0.00. This opinion is based upon the following:

- 1. There is no prima facia indication that this reduction will result in any discriminatory policy as long as it is applied to all applicants equally.
- 2. Although state statutes do require engineering analysis as a basis for Impact Fee calculation, it is let to the discretion of the legislative bodies to enact an Impact Fee that is less than the proposed maximum amount as outlined in the engineers Capital Facilities Plan.
- 3. The cursory analysis provided by the joint Hildale/Colorado City Utility Department does indicate that due to population decline there is a surplus of resources that were not anticipated in the current Capital Facilities Plan, thereby, not requiring the future expansion of originally expected infrastructure. The analysis provided is sufficient to meet the requirement of section 21 of the Injunctive Order.

The Capital Facilities Plan and Impact Fee for these two communities is unique because it provides a joint analysis and similar fee requirement on two different cities because they share an integrated water system, in essence, a regional facility. The complication arises in that each community will need to be cognizant of the particular Utah and Arizona statutes that govern the changing of each municipalities Capital Facilities Plan and Impact Fee. Due to this complication, the Court Monitor recommends the following.

- 1. Both cities should coordinate the timing of the elimination of the Impact Fee to be effective at the same point after they have met the requirements for modification under their appropriate statutes. Coordination of timing will provide equal treatment to all applicants being served by the same regional facilities. Arizona Statutes appear to have a higher threshold requirement for both modification and public involvement of their Plan and Impact Fee (see A.R.S 9-463.05). Therefore, Hildale should adjust their timing of implementation to coordinate with that of Colorado City.
- 2. An Impact Fee represents an agreement between the applicant and the communities that specific infrastructure will be provided in exchange for the payment of a fee. Based upon this, the cities should evaluate the number of applicants who have paid Impact Fees (including the community of Centennial Park) and consider refunding those fees or the pro-rata portion that will not be used to construct any originally anticipated facilities at the time of payment which will now not be built.

I commend both cities for their efforts in providing fair and equal policy and treatment to the members of their respective communities and look forward to their cooperatively implementing their recommendations.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Roger Carter Court Monitor