

MINUTES
Goshen City Council
June 10, 2025 at 6:30PM
Goshen Community Building, 244 Clark Street

A meeting of the Goshen City Council was held on June 10, 2025 at 6:30pm at the Goshen Community Center.

City Council

Call to Order: Mayor Stroud @ 6:31pm

Roll Call: PRESENT - Paula Anderson, Curtis Vaughan, John Vaillancourt, Colton Martin, Birch Wright. City Attorney Brian Hogue in attendance

Not Present: Shawn Mayfield

Approval of Agenda:

Mayor added Item A - Riparian Zone (Old City Business) - Both Mayor Stroud and Mike Nimmo added summaries that they will each read

Birch Wright made a motion to approve the agenda with the change; Paula Anderson seconded

All in favor; None opposed

Pledge of Allegiance

Public Input - Highland Gravel Classic Follow Up

Bruce Dunn (Event Director) - Mr. Dunn feels that the event was a success as far as simple numbers; this was the 4th edition with the first 2 years being just outside of town and the most recent 2 years being here in Goshen at the Community Center. In 2024 there were 363 participants (6 countries, 39 states); in 2025 there were 406 participants (43 States, including the District of Columbia, 8 countries). 99.9% of participants are outside of the Goshen zip code with the coastlines are the top 10% of participants. The event appreciates the warm welcome that Goshen community has offered in addition to Madison County that also houses portions of the routes and is a big supporter of the event. From an investment standpoint, All Sports Production is making a heavy investment in this event (10,000 euros, sanctioning fees, has to be paid to the National Society before anything is done) but they believe in this event and even though they never know how many people will sign up, they believe in it, so they pay it. The goal for next year is to host the event at the same time of year (the last Saturday in April); Looking for more community involvement, whether cyclists or not.

Birch Wright asked about lessons learned from last year to this year; Mr. Dunn responded 'inside the ropes' is handled just fine but he understands that (outside the ropes) there's nothing that can be done about the weather, but small issues will be addressed that arose (parking in people's driveways, etc). The event seeks to add a fun ride of 18-20 miles that is non competitive. John Vaillancourt suggested more advertising although it was posted on the City facebook page and website, and the two Goshen facebook pages. Mike Nimmo offered that local kids could come out and bring their bikes and do a short race (as a means to increase awareness to the event/sport).

Bernadette Boyle (Public) thanks Mike and Cheryl Nimmo for their involvement with the Sheep Dog group and helping community members following the recent storm with clean-up, etc. She also offered that the Goshen Extension Homemakers are hosting a sheep dog event on 6/11/25 from 1-2 to thank them for what they did.

Approval of Minutes May 13, 2025 - TABLED - Not enough time to review

Paula Anderson made a motion to table; John Vaillancourt seconded
All in favor; None opposed

Approval of Minutes from Special Session held on April 29, 2025 - NOT READY TO BE REVIEWED

Approval of Financial Report

As of 05/31/25 the General Fund has \$1,075,407.08; \$660,407 is the restricted amount for use due to (\$415K from interest in surrender of CDs)

Street Fund has \$323,403.28 with \$135K of that being set aside for culvert work; available amount for use is \$188,403

Police ACT988 Fund has \$10,719; May call those funds back to be used for upfit charges (closer to end of the year);

State Park/ARDOT funds combined \$3,075.74; is a holding fund for Grants received/remainder funds;

Farmers Market fund \$4907.54;

CDs \$651,413.04

Birch Wright asked for clarity as he sees a sales tax uptick. Jerry Jackson confirmed that we are at about 11% more than 2024 (currently). The community building was the biggest change with a 39% increase for fees of use of the building (from 2024); we now have a waiting list. Franchise fees are up 22.5% from May of 2024; Interest income has come down because of the withdraw of CD funds. Washington County treasury is up 14% from May of 2024; we are 10% of ahead (overall) of last year currently. In 2024 we were at \$616,000 and today we are at \$684,000. Overall revenue is in a good position and we will end up with a surplus and should ease concerns about ongoing projects.

Costs have been raised through the city of Elkins (court system); estimating to be closer to \$60K for year 2025 and the City of Elkins. Colton asked if that's just from increased fee OR if we're sending more cases their way - response was it is for both. Paula Anderson says we have a signed contract with the City of Elkins and it should not vary for that contract term length; Jerry Jackson will follow up on that with KaSeana (staff). Overtime is up due to animal control costs which have added quite a bit costs (unaccounted for position when budget was created); a new mower (D-R Mower) was purchased for \$10K on June 2 (combination of credit card and Mayor paying remainder); New trailer will be purchased for \$3k-\$4K; Paula Anderson mentioned to check the load-n-go trailers for good trailers that are inexpensive. John Vaillancourt asked why we sold the one we had (trailer) and Mayor responded that it wasn't wide enough to accommodate the mowers. Birch Wright asked about any concerns regarding auto insurance rates because of recent accidents (police); Jerry Jackson will review and no raising of deductibles has happened currently. Insurance is through the Municipal League - Jerry asked if our equipment is insured? Mayor says mowers are not insured, the bucket truck is insured. Mayor also forewarned the Council that the engine on the mower is going to have to be replaced due to an exhaust coupling coming loose and dirt got down in there - not a warranty issue and Mayor confirmed that; no one knew it was disconnected. Have now created a checklist for maintenance personnel to try and not have this happen again.

Jerry Jackson also added that the city is looking at a cost to redo the website (more user-friendly/navigation friendly) and there will be PR costs associated with that. Maybe hire someone to do this as current office staff struggles with the additional work. Truck will need to be retrofitted as an animal control vehicle, once we get the truck from the police department. City Hall Park irrigation has gone up (RPZ, etc - 4 meters) - Mayor said he had no idea it would be this expensive with all of these fees. Higher costs for maintaining the park due to weather and that we only have 2 maintenance personnel currently. Potential to add another person.

Police Department unit outfit - John Vaillancourt asked how much is an outfit on vehicles - most recent outfits (per Chief Travis) have been about \$15K which does not include the radio or camera system. When all is said and done, it will be about \$18K (roughly) plus striping (reflective striping) at \$1600 / non-reflective is \$1200. Mayor asked Chief Travis if any of the ACT988 funds can be used for outfitting? Chief says he will check; doesn't know if it's for switching equipment out or if it has to be brand new equipment only.

Jerry Jackson - auto insurance is being tracked right now; added that maintenance costs are coming from aging of the vehicles and as we get new vehicles on line, that number should go down. Fuel has come down and has been adjusted down for the remainder of the year; subscription dues have come down. Paula Anderson asked about the shop costs and Jerry Jackson (before opening bids), we will most likely have an excess and we've got room to maneuver.

Paula Anderson made a motion to approve the financial report; Birch Wright seconded
All in favor; None opposed

Mayor Stroud - In regards to Elkins/Court Costs - Per Kaseana (staff) - salaries and IT costs have caused contract prices to go up and it does not specify in the contract that it wouldn't be able to go up when those items go up.

NOTATION - If you seek more clarity/definition/description of numbers, please reach out to City Hall directly.

Police Report (7A) - Chief Travis

229 calls for service. 40 total charges, 10 criminal, 5 PCS/PDP charges, 2 warrants, 30 moving violations, 66 Moving citations. Chief Travis indicated there may be a member of the force retiring so that will put the department in a position to be looking toward a new hire.

Birch Wright stated Chief Travis that a community member reported/asked him about a police vehicle sitting/hiding in the ditch near the veterinarian clinic with their radar gun - Chief Travis was unaware but said he would find out.

Infrastructure and Facilities Report

Planted 6 trees and 70 shrubs along creek at north park entrance; added rock to mud area at stream crossing near spring house; added and spread mulch around trees; removed fallen trees from roads after storm; installed street signs; expanding parking lot at the community building so that bikers can park behind the building (signs up); replaced bicycle pump;

Future Projects:

Seal the fence at the south entrance

Continue installing new street signs

Install Welcome Stone at Northpark Entrance

Patch pot holes

Clean concrete on bridges (seal coat)

Coordinate striping on Blue Springs, Hale, Goshen Tuttle, and Firetower

Continue installing new street signs for all streets in Goshen

Install a welcome stone at the Community Bldg and North and South Park entrances (Gibson monument says north park entrance stone should be completed next week and ready for pick up)

Patch potholes on city streets

Seal cleaned concrete on Oxford Bend Bridge and Blue Springs Rd bridge - important because after you seal and clean concrete, it shows up favorably on our inspections and the lifespan is longer (pictures presented)

John Vaillancourt mentioned that Nimmo Lane is an incorrect street sign and that it is not Nimmo Lane; Mayor Stroud advised that Salisbury Lane was vacated and approved by Council and logged with the Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning as Nimmo Lane; John Vaillancourt says you need to check the Washington Assessor site. In addition, it is recognized as Nimmo Lane with dispatch (Per Chief Travis).

Goshen Fire District Report

Total of 58 calls; continue to have rescue and emergency medical services at 26; 7 counts for fires; 5 building fires; 9 hazardous conditions

Planning Commission Financial Report

As of August, the City will not be doing anything in regards to planning relative to the legislative session (per Mayor Stroud)

Building Inspection Report

All building inspections passed for the month of May. Contact City Hall for types of permits issues.

Parks and Recreation Report

See Attached Addendum A for Statement made by Mike Nimmo

At last month's City Council Meeting the Parks Commission was directed to provide recommendations for the management of Mill Branchy Park. Accordingly, the following was approved by a unanimous vote at the last Parks Commission meeting held on May 27 (2025):

- A. The planting of non-native vegetation is not prohibited so long as it does not pose a foreseeable risk of becoming invasive.
- B. The Parks Commission recommends that we support the preference of native vegetation that is native to Northwest Arkansas, including the Ozark Region, when considering any future planting.
- C. The Parks Commission recognizes the need to help prevent streamside erosion and plan for streamside management. We would recommend that, in general, a 15'-25' buffer should ideally be preserved along the streambank. This does not mean that this area cannot be managed in a way that promotes approved access points along the creek for future improved steps to mitigate erosion and promote healthy stream ecology.
- D. The Parks Commission recognizes the importance of riparian zones and desires to allow use of riparian zones at Mill Branch Park for public access and enjoyment. This can be accomplished through collaboration with the Arbor Board and City Staff.

- E. The Comprehensive Management Plan that was provided by the Beaver Watershed Alliance for the City of Goshen will continue to be utilized as a 'best practices' document for guidance on the Parks ongoing development and maintenance.

Again, these are the unanimous recommendations of the Parks Commission we would encourage the City Council to agree to this in order for trail maintenance and other improvements in the park, which has been stopped by order of the City Council, resume immediately. It's very overgrown

A citizen contingent along with City officials, Arbor Board, and Parks Commission members met at Mill Branch Park on Friday, May 23 (2025) to discuss grievances being brought forward about streamside management. The group included Nate Weston, a recognized expert in this area. The meeting started off quite contentious but after some neutral input by Mr. Weston, which seemed to diffuse the situation, it appeared to yield some positive results toward the end of the park walk-through and a possible path forward through some compromise.

The Parks Commission would ask the City Council to support the nomination of Day Crowne to the Parks Commission. We are excited to welcome Day who brings excellent horticulture credentials and a pragmatic approach to park development. Her dedication to the job has already been demonstrated by her willingness to not only attend recent parks meetings but also to show up as a non-voting participant in the discussions at those meetings. At the recent field trip mentioned earlier, Day took time to join us and offer her insight, despite being rudely talked down to by one of the private citizens that was in attendance regarding her right, also as a private citizen to speak about the issues at hand. Yet she was unperturbed and continued with the group in our collective task. Please support (her) nomination."

Work was done by volunteers on a rain garden using donated equipment by Mayor to facilitate the removal and relocation of the tree that was growing under the power lines; re-planting it gave it a chance at survival - placed where the dying cedar tree was.

Mayor Stroud added that the pavilion that we are looking to build requires City to come up with an engineered design and we've been working with a company in Kansas City on that; there are still things that need adjusting but the cost (to build) was substantially more than on their proposal. We can use the drawing and send it out for bid and see if we can get it at a lower price and believe it's still doable; right now we are waiting on finished design work and then will put it out for bid. Then we will follow up with State then that's when we will receive the money for the project.

Birch Wright thanked Mike for all his work and stated that he supports Mike's sound recommendations.

Old City Business

Riparian Management Follow Up

Discussion were had that did not include the Mayor or any of his city staff. There were a lot of assumptions made by concerned citizens that brought an expert with them to the meeting. Mayor felt that the expert was good in pointing out things that we could benefit from. Accusations were made (by citizens) of the city planting a lot of non-native plants, which is incorrect. Mayor acknowledged a non-native tree that was planted; all else was native and Nate (Geo-Spatial Ecologist and helped write our comprehensive maintenance plan) confirmed (from

receipt) this and did not say that anything that had been done was wrong or inappropriate (you do have to mow once or twice per year - per Nate).

The weather has hampered a lot of what was planted due to unprecedented rain but there was resolution from that meeting on that Friday that it is ok for us to manage the riparian zones the way it's been managed; Nate was helpful in looking at some of the trees needing to come out; lessons learned; identified several points of access along the creek (all in agreement on those accesses); signage ordered to identify the access points. Main trail needs repair as it is the worst area of erosion. Nate provided in regards to the erosion that he felt it would be in upwards of \$100K to repair/fix in one area of the bank; doesn't include other erosion. Mayor believes we can fix some areas at a lesser cost (with local equipment) than hiring a company. Mayor says we may not get a large grant for this (given our order w/in the totem pole). We still need to make this a priority.

Mike Nimmo Statement - See Addendum

Resolution Approving Mill Branch Park Master Plan

Brian Hogue (Attorney) says The Resolution is premature; need to read and adopt the Ordinance, which then directs the Council to approve the Master Plan by Resolution which would have to be done at a later date. It's the 3rd reading but the ordinance will not take effect for 90 days.

John Vaillancourt made a motion to table resolution approving Mill Branch Park Master Plan; Birch Wright seconded

All in favor; none opposed

Birch Wright asked for a point of clarification - the recommendation for the park and the rec committee on the riparian zone falls into what? Mayor says it doesn't really fall into anything with the exception that it is their recommendation. Brian Hogue says it would need to be part of the master plan (as recommended by parks and rec commission) if that is some directive that they want included, it needs to be in the master plan. Mayor asked Abby (staff) to notate to add those.

Birch Wright made a motion to rescind the 'pause' and accept the recommendation of the park and rec committee and at a later date, add that to the Master Plan; Colton Martin seconded

All in favor; none opposed

Paula Anderson made a motion to read and title only for 3rd reading; Birch Wright seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Brian Hogue read aloud:

An ordinance establishing the process for adopting the master plan for parks in the City of Goshen and for amending said master plan.

Paula Anderson made a motion to approve the reading; John Vaillancourt seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Paula Anderson made a motion to adopt; Birch Wright seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Mill Branch Park Maintenance Plan Revised May 27, 2025

John Vaillancourt asked about which document is being revised. Mayor stated this is a revision from the original 2022 document which was adopted by Council and is the working document since then; this is the first revision of that document.

Birch Wright made a motion to adopt the revised plan; John Vaillancourt seconded

All in favor; none opposed

Brian Hogue (Attorney) added that it might be advisable to come back and have a resolution formally adopting this as an exhibit to the resolution just for record keeping so we can track it. Mayor asked for Abby (staff) to put it on the agenda for July. Mayor clarified that we have 3 separate documents with 3 separate functions - a Comprehensive Management Plan, a Comprehensive Maintenance Plan, and a Park Master Plan. Mayor says he may call for a separate Environmental Review and may even do it himself (Mayor) and turn it in so it's updated and correct as a revised version.

Mill Branch Park Comprehensive Management Plan

Mayor Stroud stated that this plan was done by Beavershed Water Alliance with Grant that they received from the Walton Family Foundation. This is a best practices document and we follow it almost completely but not exactly as lined out. This topic was placed on here for clarity to the Council. Nothing further at this time to do (per Brian Hogue, Attorney).

Ordinance Adopting Sign Regulations - 2nd Reading

Paula Anderson made a motion to do a 2nd reading in title only of the sign ordinance. Birch Wright seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - Abstained; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Ordinance Read aloud by Brian Hogue, Attorney

“An ordinance repealing Ordinance #156 and adopting new sign regulations for the City of Goshen, Arkansas and for other purposes”

Paula Anderson has several areas for/clarity - whenever it says that somebody wants to apply for a variance, the way it's worded, makes it sound like there's just a form and a payment. Paula feels that is not a detailed explanation to the public.

Paula Anderson had the following concerns:

1. - ***Fee (pg 3 section 3 item b)*** - “Applicant shall pay the fee as adopted from time-to-time”; Mayor says it was worded that way because we are going to a codified system and if the fee is changed then it doesn't change the ordinance. The code would get updated without ordinance changes.

Resolution: Remove 'time-to-time'; Brian Hogue recommended strike out the dollar amounts and add 'to be set by City Council by later resolution'.

2. - **Street Frontage (pg 4)** - grammatical change(s) - comma and extra space; “measured by property lines”;

Resolution: Brian suggests striking that entire sentence - change to: “street frontage is determined by each individual street that abutts a parcel of property” (could be two, could be three)

3. - **Page 5 item f** - “Variance application will be filled out but...”

Resolution: Brian says we don’t need the variance process(es) in the ordinances and it (variance process) will be established in a separate ordinance that will be applicable to all of these in the Plan. All references to this (variance process) will be taken out of the Plan. The process needs to be identical for each of these.

4. - **Natural Resources Zone(s)** - Paula asked if this includes parks where there is a baseball stadium or basketball court as illuminated signs would not be allowed in a natural resource zone but if we wanted an illuminated scoreboard, that would conflict with that. Is a sport facility part of a natural zone? Mayor says it could be built on a natural resource zone; Brian asked if that was a ‘use-by-right’ zone and Mayor advised he’d have to look into that. Birch Wright suggested that if someone wanted an illuminated sign, they could ask for a variance. Mayor agrees (leave it in and ask for a variance).

Resolution - Leave it alone

5. - **Page 8 Section D** - “move from permitted signs”

Resolution: Strike (it was only a side notation)

6. - **Page 10 Section M** - “commercial construction site signs (**encouraged**) to advertised...”

Resolution: Use wording “**permitted** to advertise but must adhere to these restrictions.”

7. - **Crowne Signs Page 11** - Question from Paula Anderson - is there a reason we are saying 2-story high buildings (as we don’t have many 2-story buildings vs 1-story).

Resolution: Leave it alone and ask for a variance, if needed

8. - **Non Compliant Fees** - Don’t want to be charging exorbitant amount for minor violations; fee is \$250/day - if someone can’t get it taken down, the city is well within their rights to charge that amount, daily;

Resolution: Brian says that anyone putting up a sign, needs to familiarize themselves of the rules beforehand. Brian suggests keeping it in place. Others say that if you don’t put it high enough, people will just constantly violate the rules.

Public Comment: Ordinance 156 - New vs. Old differences are that the new encompasses more definitions and more information on types of signs not addressed in prior sign ordinance. Small signage and directional signs are allowed (garage sales, etc) per Mayor. There are regulations about leaving the signs out to long or if it’s put out in a manner that blocks visuals, then the City can remove them.

Cheryl Nimmo (Public) asked about existing signs being grandfathered. Yes, they are (per Mayor). If a sign is changed then it must comply with the new standards. (example Andersons to Scotts which was NOT changed).

Clarity was provided on questions of illuminated/electronic light times of operation - per Mayor, you can’t have it on from midnight to 6AM and it can’t change more than 1x per hour unless there’s a variance; lumens are set to not make it super bright.

Birch Wright made a motion to approve the 2nd reading; Paula Anderson seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - abstained; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Ordinance Adopting Driveway Regulations

Paula Anderson made a motion to read and title only on the 2nd reading; John Vaillancourt seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Paula Anderson had following concerns:

1. **A1** - "All driveways must comply".....does this mean everyone's driveway, even existing? Brian Hogue says, no.

Resolution: "Any existing driveways are exempt from these unless they are substantially altered in the future".

Question remains: If you have an existing driveway and you build a new garage (or guest house or pool) then you would have to update your driveway with the new garage add-on because it's requiring a new building permit. Mayor doesn't think it's appropriate but some of the Planning commission feels that it is and some do not. Brian suggested leaving it alone; all agree

2. **Page 6 Ingress/Egress** - "If a driveway slopes down....." Paula Anderson says the statement implies that water flows uphill.

Resolution - Brian Hogue says to strike "design to prevent water and loose gravel" - still require an apron but we're not providing rationale for that, it's required.

3. **Section F1 (and E) Culverts** - "we want all culverts to go in to be concrete" - Paula Anderson asks is this also going to cover private drives??? Mayor says ALL CULVERTS and only private drives that meet with a public street.

Resolution: Brian suggested "Culverts and Right-Of-Ways"; also to strike E

4. **Section F(b)** - wordy and convoluted (per Paula Anderson). Mayor says intent is to comply and be in accordance with the ARDOT standards and the way it's installed. It must be concrete but will also be installed by the specifications of the Highway Department for ARDOT.

Resolution: Stay as drafted because on the highway they'll do whatever the state says.

5. **Page 7, #2, Right of Way Standards** - "engineer inspection letter at the cost of the developer....." Paula Anderson asked in terms of a private drive, does the developer term apply? Mayor says, if you are owner, you can do an owner affidavit and then you are the contractor.

Resolution: Should say property owner (as suggested by Brian Hogue-make it as broad as possible)

Paula Anderson made a motion to approve the reading; seconded by John Vaillancourt

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Ordinance Adopting Lighting Regulations - 2nd Reading

Paula Anderson made a motion read the ordinance in title only for the 2nd reading ; Birch Wright seconded
Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Brian Hogue Read Aloud:

An ordinance repealing Ordinance 107 and adopting new outdoor light regulations for the City of Goshen, Arkansas and for other purposes

Paula Anderson had the following concerns:

1. **Page 2, Section 3A - Lighting Intensity** - "for the purpose of....."

Resolution: Strike "for the purpose" AND remove "landscape" (per Mayor - walkway OR security - you can't exceed 1100 around your house unless the lighting is on a timer that is not to exceed 10 minutes)

2. We need to be clear on variances (and the radius) as to whom needs to be notified as "surrounding adjacent homes/land owners" (per Paula Anderson)

Resolution: Per Mayor, adjacent properties should be notified via certified letter (by the property owner)

Paul Anderson made a motion to approve the reading; Colton Martin seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Variance Process

Brian Hogue posed questions to the Council - is everyone in agreement with 200' radius of the applicant's property, they must provide notice - all agree, yes.

Resolution: Advanced notice required before hearing is at least 15 days; proof of certified mail; public notice; sign in yard at least 15 days in advance.

Appeal Process - Who gets to appeal (asked Brian Hogue)? Can any citizen appeal? Mayor suggested only the adjoining property owners should be able to appeal AND you had to have been at the meeting to state your concern. Colton Martin asked about including those in 'line of sight' to be able to appeal; all agree that it should **only include "adjacent"**.

Resolution: Brian Hogue would like to think on this as he doesn't want it to be too restrictive; wants it to hold up and make sense. Also has concerns about the 'timing' of the appeal; does it have to be filed at City Hall w/in 30 days of any variance decision? Is there a form for the appeal and provide notice that it's been appealed so any interested parties can show up (same way as when you first made application)? Mayor says, yes, yes, and feels this is adequate.

Mayor asked about the application process being more affordable for a non-profit, or church, would the Council consider that?

Resolution: "a fee reduction or fee waiver may be granted by City Council upon the showing of good cause"

Metal Shop Building Bid Opening - All Bids Opened (for first time) in this public forum

Wayne Ford WFC - \$385,190

Ozark Ag - \$293,000

Mayor will proceed to enter into a contract with OzarkAg at next month's meeting

Resolution Authorizing NEC Contract (MBP Trail)

Bid for ARDOT Project - \$313,744 total price (in budget)

Birch Wright made a motion to read and title only resolution authorizing Mayor to contract with NEC; John Vaillancourt seconded

All in favor; none opposed

Brian Hogue read aloud:

Resolution authorizing Mayor to contract with NEC Inc.

Paula Anderson made a motion to approve the resolution; John Vaillancourt seconded

All in favor; none opposed

Resolution Authorizing M&M Contracting Excavating Contract (Culverts)

Paula Anderson made a motion to read the resolution in title only; John Vaillancourt seconded

All in favor; none opposed

Brian Hogue read aloud:

Resolution authorizing Mayor to contract with M&M Excavating

Paula Anderson made a motion to approve the resolution; Birch Wright seconded

All in favor; none opposed

Ordinance Amending Ord. 171 - Organizational Chart

Brian Hogue asked if this needs to be adopted now? How critical is it for City Council right now? Does it need to be adopted now? You can waive the rules; you can suspend the rules; waive the 2nd and 3rd reading; adopt it tonight - he's just bringing it up. John Vaillancourt says it's not correct - he wants an arrow between City Council and Recorder/Treasurer. Brian says position answers to the citizens. John Vaillancourt says it's in an ordinance somewhere. Brian says there have been ordinances to separate the positions and back to being combined - there's no oversight. Birch agrees that is correct. Paula Anderson suggested doing first reading tonight.

Paula Anderson made a motion to read and title only for the first reading; Birch Wright seconded.

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - No; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Brian Hogue read aloud:

An ordinance amending ordinance 171 which formalized the administrative framework of the City of Goshen, Arkansas and for other purposes.

Colton Martin added that he does not approve of the Mayor being over/arrow to the Commissions and Attorney; says Mayor does not direct their work;

Resolution: change to a dotted line from Mayor to Commissions

Paula Anderson made a motion to approve the first reading; Birch Wright seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes

Colton Martin - yes
Curtis Vaughan - yes
John Vaillancourt - yes
Birch Wright - yes

New City Business

Stroud/Crowne Annexation

Mayor says it has finally been approved by the county. Paula Anderson asked for the documents. Paula and John says they have nothing from the County. Need letter from County Judge. Mayor will get that for next meeting.

Paula Anderson made motion to read and title only for the first reading; John Vaillancourt seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Brian Hogue read aloud:

An ordinance accepting the annexation of certain territory to the City of Goshen approving the schedule of services to be extended to said area and assigning such area to a ward.

Paula Anderson made a motion to approve the first reading; Birch Wright seconded

Roll Call Vote:

Paula Anderson - yes; Colton Martin - yes; Curtis Vaughan - yes; John Vaillancourt - yes; Birch Wright - yes

Resolution Appointing Day Crowne to Parks Commission

Paula Anderson made a motion to TABLE; Birch Wright seconded

All in favor; none opposed

TABLED due to annexation being delayed

Resolution Authorizing Boston Mountain Solid Waste Permanent Proxy

Mayor would like to assign Abby Bryan (Office) as a proxy when he has to miss

Paula Anderson made a motion to read and title only; Birch Wright seconded

All in favor; none opposed

Brian Hogue read aloud:

A resolution to appoint a representative to the Boston Mountain Solid Waste District Board for the City of Goshen Arkansas

Paula Anderson made a motion to approve the resolution; Birch Wright seconded

All in favor; none opposed

General Fund Budget Amendment

Birch Wright made a motion to accept the amended budget as presented earlier in title only the resolution adopting the revised 2025 General Fund Budget; John Vaillancourt seconded

All in favor; none opposed

Brian Hogue read aloud:

A resolution adopting revised 2025 General Fund Budget

Paula Anderson made a motion to approve the resolution adopting the revised budget; Birch Wright seconded
All in favor; none opposed

July 3, 2025 - Community Day - Linda Moore says Activity Committee is working with City Hall to schedule this community day at the Goshen Farmers Market. Linda wants to be sure that City Council is on board; lots of additional vendors at Farmers Market; sponsorship from State Farm for \$2K; inviting all of the community groups to have a table/booth; music, decorations, and free food.

Birch Wright made a motion to adjourn; John Vaillancourt seconded

Adjournment at 9:40pm



Gina Swanson
Recorder/Treasurer



Russell Stroud
Mayor

ADDENDUM - City Council Meeting 06/10/2025 (under 'Old Business') - Statement by Mike Nimmo

"Thank you for allowing me to speak for a couple of minutes. I am reading a prepared statement today because I tend to ramble and want to keep this short and to the point.

At last month's City Council meeting I was directly attacked by a member of the council regarding work that was being done at Mill Branch Park during the city cleanup project on May 3rd. The accusation was that I was intentionally subverting the directive of City Council by removing vegetation from the riparian zone near the creek. I want to point out a few things in answer to that.

First, the work we are doing was in accordance with the plan that was previously laid out and was directed by the Mayor, that being, removal of deadfall tree debris. The chainsaws used by the Mayor and I were primarily to cut up larger dead material to facilitate easier loading into the trailer generously being donated by Andrew Eden. Was there a small amount of living material removed to allow access of the deadfall? Yes. A small number of sapling suckers from larger trees were taken where they interfered with the removal of the deadfall, but nothing consequential.

Second, while not pointed out by my accuser, I was working shoulder-to-shoulder with a member of this City Council, The Chairperson of the Arbor Board, a second member of the Arbor Board and the chairperson of the Parks and Recreation Commission - none of whom expressed any objection whatsoever to the work that was being done. Curiously, the Councilman who found this activity to be wrong decided to address this with the Mayor but not directly with me, after, I'm told, being asked to do so. Instead he took long distance photos as supposed 'evidence' of wrong doing before going to his vehicle and leaving without lifting a finger to help with any of the actual work being done. Well, I don't know about you, but this tells me everything I need to know about the lack of fortitude and character that Councilman Martin possesses. And, I'm sorry to say, I am one of his constituents and hope to help change that with my vote at the next election - or possibly through other lawful means available to the citizens of this town prior to then. I no longer have confidence that he represented the interests of the community. But I digress.

When I walked out on the meeting last month, to my regret, I made an unfortunate statement that probably only a few citizens heard, which was "YOU WIN". This is regrettable because after thinking about it, this whole controversy with the park had been reduced to a competition where there are winners and losers. And if we allow that kind of thinking to prevail - we all lose. So tonight, I retract that statement.

While I am a member of the Parks Commission, my primary goals, as I stated from the get go, has been to volunteer my time, equipment and energy to improving the Park for the citizens of Goshen and surrounding area. I have never claimed to possess the book learning that some folks around here tout as their reasoning for a louder voice about what should be done with our park, but in the nearly 40 years I have lived in Goshen, I have carved out 2 homes from these woods - not with heavy equipment, but primarily by hand - selectively and lovingly removing undergrowth to rejuvenate and enhance the landscape. Doing so did not cause permanent damage to the vegetation, inhibit pollinators or biological diversity in any way. Just the opposite. Anyone who doubts this has an open invitation to come up to my place and see for yourself. So to accuse me of malicious intent in our park, Alberman Martin, is not only insulting but is downright wrong!

Finally, because of our apparent inability to compromise on the balance of what is seen as good stewardship to nature and the promise made by the City to provide welcoming recreational opportunities to the public, we seem to have decided that moratoriums, rule-making, and ordinances that restrict responsible development in the park are the way to go.

Well, I would submit that we already have everything we need in place. The citizens of Goshen, in their collective wisdom, elected a Mayor, who over the last 2 years or thereabouts, has proven his dedication to the job and spirit of volunteerism doesn't just stop with the asking of others, but extends to his own time, sweat, and personal resources to carry out an intelligent and responsible vision for the park that not only accomplishes the goals previously mentioned, but also complies with the Master Plan and the Comprehensive Maintenance Plan. I would challenge anyone to prove where Mayor Stroud has done otherwise. This is true leadership. This is what I respect and gains my trust. We are so fortunate. But this is his job, not that of the City Council and we should be trusting him to do it. If he doesn't, we should all hold him accountable as we do any elected official - but may I point out that this applies equally to members of the City Council as well. Make no mistake, the citizens of Goshen are watching.

Look I would think that it would be in the best interest of the City Council to encourage volunteering in the Park to offset some costs and encourage community involvement but if this kind of back biting and bullying over every detail to do with judgment calls in the park persists, then I hope the Council is prepared to allocate substantial funds toward Park maintenance personnel, because if the status quo persists, it will serve only as demoralizing to potential volunteers, and will result in no interest in contributing whatsoever to the development or maintenance of our park. So please consider carefully before regulating our park and our potential volunteers out of existence.

We have an opportunity here to work together with direct and respectful communication and a spirit of cooperation that can accomplish collective goals to bring to life a beautiful, accessible and yes, conservation friendly Park that citizens from all walks of life and interests can enjoy and will want to visit. This will be accomplished, not through condescension and preaching a single minded point of view, but through mutual respect, understanding, and the trust that we all have good intentions. Will mistakes be made along the way? Of course and by any of us interested enough to give of our time and effort. But for heaven's sake, let's cut each other a break and understand the difference between an occasional misstep and malicious intent. This is the path to a successful outcome, not through needless regulation that only serves to stifle progress and community involvement.

Thank you.