A. **Welcome & Roll Call**

The City Council meeting began at 6:00 p.m. Mayor Searle called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance, including all Council Members and all members of the public.

B. **Pledge of Allegiance**

Due to WebEx meetings. There will be no Pledge in tonight’s meeting.

C. **Moment of Silence**

Mayor Searle called for a moment of silence and asked everyone to remember our police officers, fire fighters, U.S. Military service members, and members of the City Council as they make decisions this evening.

D. **Public Comment**

Mayor Searle invited any member of the public with questions or concerns to address the Council and asked that they keep their comments to approximately three minutes. No action will be taken during public comment. Shalee Evans, City Recorder, read three letters from residents that were concerned about opening Ritter Drive. The three letters were from, Mike Davis, John Anderson, and Lori Fleming. Stevens stated that she would like to see Old Glory days still have activities available.

E. **Presentations and Reports**

1. **Mayors Report**

F. **Consent Items**

1. **Consideration to approve the City Council meeting minutes from: Work Session and April 21, 2020 Regular Session.**

   Mayor Searle invited any corrections or comments regarding the above referenced meeting minutes.

   **MOTION:** Councilmember Mitchell moved to approve the meeting minutes. Councilmember Arnold seconded the motion. There was not any discussion regarding this motion. The motion passed unanimously in favor.
G. Action Items

1. **Consideration of Ordinance 916, approving Amended Small Subdivision Plat approval of Riverdale Center V Subdivision, property located approximately 4035-4079 South Riverdale Road, Riverdale, Utah 84405; requested by Anderson Wahlen & Associates, Inc.**

   Mike Eggett, Community Development, went over the executive summary which explained, CCA (Kornwasser Group), as represented by Jake Tate and David Hamilton, have applied for an Amended Small Subdivision Plat review and approval for the Riverdale Center V Subdivision proposed development located at approximately 4035-4079 South Riverdale Road in a Regional Commercial (C-3) zone. On April 14, 2020, the Planning Commission approved the amended subdivision request and recommended City Council approval of the amended subdivision plat as submitted, with the understanding that outstanding staff and engineering concerns be resolved. All outstanding staff and engineering concerns have since been resolved as indicated by the reports found herein. The proposed amended small subdivision plan is now before the City Council for final review and approval of the proposed plat amendment. A public hearing is not required for review of this proposed subdivision. Following the presentation and discussion of the final amended plat proposal, the City Council may make a motion to approve the amended plat, approve with additional requirements and criteria, table the matter, or not approve the amended plat for the proposed Riverdale Center V Subdivision plat with the appropriate findings of fact. Should this proposal receive final approval, the updated plat could be prepared for signatures and recording with Weber County to formalize this approval.

   **MOTION:** Councilmember Arnold moved to approve Ordinance 916, approving Amended Small Subdivision Plat approval of Riverdale Center V Subdivision, property located approximately 4035-4079 South Riverdale Road, Riverdale, Utah 84405. Councilmember Mitchell seconded the motion.

   **ROLL CALL VOTE:** All voted in favor.

2. **Consideration of Ordinance 917, approving Amended Small Subdivision Plat approval of Riverdale Center II Lot 3 Amended Subdivision, property located approximately 4125 South Riverdale Road, Riverdale, Utah 84405; requested by Anderson Wahlen & Associates, Inc.**

   Mike Eggett went over the executive summary which explained, CCA (Kornwasser Group), as represented by Jake Tate and David Hamilton, have applied for an Amended Small Subdivision Plat review and approval for the Riverdale Center II Lot 3 Amended Subdivision proposed development located at approximately 4125 South Riverdale Road in a Retail/Commercial Park Overlay (RCP) zone. On April 14, 2020, the Planning Commission approved the amended subdivision request and recommended City Council approval of the amended subdivision plat as submitted, with the understanding that outstanding staff and engineering concerns be resolved. All outstanding staff and engineering concerns have since been resolved as indicated by the reports found herein. The proposed amended small subdivision plan is now before the City Council for final review and approval of the proposed plat amendment. A public hearing is not required for review of this proposed subdivision. Following the presentation and discussion of the final amended plat proposal, the City Council may make a motion to approve the amended plat, approve with additional requirements and criteria, table the matter, or not approve the amended plat for the proposed Riverdale Center V Subdivision plat with the appropriate findings of fact. Should this proposal receive final approval, the updated plat could be prepared for signatures and recording with Weber County to formalize this approval.

   Councilmember Ellis asked what the long-term plan is with the subdivision if it is going to be divided. Jake Tate, Anderson Wahlen & Associates, stated there are a couple parcels under contract, it will be divided, there are a few options. Sue Jagodzinski stated they are working on multiple different options in that area.

   **MOTION:** Councilmember Arnold moved to approve Ordinance 917, approving Amended Small Subdivision Plat approval of Riverdale Center II Lot 3 Amended Subdivision, property located approximately 4125 South Riverdale Road, Riverdale, Utah 84405. Councilmember Mitchell seconded the motion.

   **ROLL CALL VOTE:** All voted in favor.

3. **Consideration to approve Resolution 2020-08, to adopt the City’s tentative budget for the fiscal year 2021.**

   Cody Cardon, Business Administration, went over the executive summary which explained, the budget is the City’s fiscal planning and control document compiled by the budget officer. It reflects estimates of revenues and expenditures by the Department Heads and City Administrator of the City. It is adopted on a tentative basis by the
governing body and is then amended through a budget workshop session (following tonight’s regular City Council Meeting) prior to a public hearing and adoption on the final budget in June. Utah State Law requires municipalities to approve a tentative budget by the first meeting in May.

**MOTION:** Councilmember Arnold moved to approve Resolution 2020-08, adopting the City’s tentative budget for the fiscal year 2021. Councilmember Mitchell seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL VOTE:** All voted in favor.

4. **Discussion on opening Ritter Drive.**

Steve Brooks, City Attorney, stated that he wanted to get this on the agenda to be able to move forward with the construction, they are moving right along and Shawn Douglas, Public Works, needs an answer in order to continue going on the construction.

Shawn Douglas, he stated the current design on the Phase II Ritter Drive, there is no closure at the end, and it is a two way. There will be curb gutters and sidewalks installed, and that addressed the main concerns as to why Ritter Drive was closed initially. He noted that they put in a speed control sign at the bottom of Ritter Drive, to help with the speed concerns. He mentioned that they could even put another speed control sign at the top half as well. He noted that if the Council wants to keep it closed, he needs to let the contractor know.

Scott Brenkman, Police Chief, stated that over the last 3-4 months, the average speeding percentile is showing 32 or 34 mpg. He noted that in his opinion, with all the improvements made, it will be a lot safer pedestrians and vehicle traffic. The general average amount of traffic on that road is 600-700 cars per day.

Councilmember Arnold stated that he agrees with the improvements it is much nicer. His concerns with Ritter Drive are the top and the bottom portions. His major concerns with opening Ritter Drive back up is entering at the top, he stated no amount of improvements made will help that situation. He noted that the feel of driving it everyday is that he would like to keep it closed, neighbor wise it is very nice having it closed.

Councilmember Mitchell stated that he knows all the residents that live around Ritter Drive. He noted that when he was campaigning, he came across way more residents that wanted Ritter Drive open. He noted that he felt It was at least 10 to 1 for people who wanted it open, opposed to those who wanted to keep it closed. He also noted that the bulk of the residents will benefit from it being open.

Councilmember Ellis stated that with all the improvements, he feels it is more safe. He noted that most residents would like it open, and would benefit more from it being open, and the city has spent a lot of money on it and there needs to be action.

Mayor Searle noted that he was on the council at the time that Ritter Drive was made a one way in 2010. He stated that during that time, it was very scary. There were no sidewalks and you did not dare turn your back to the traffic, so when he was on the council, he voted to close it because of the safety concerns. He noted that with a bike lane added to the road, it will help safety, it has been proven that bike lanes and narrower roads slow down traffic. He noted that with the speed control signs, when people speed and see the red-light flashing, it makes them slow down, and that also will help with the safety concerns. He noted that with all the improvements done on that road that the council should consider opening Ritter back up.

Councilmember Stevens stated that when he campaigned two and a half years ago, he was surprised by the comments he received from residents that live off Ritter Drive, with them wanting it to be open. He noted that when it was initially closed, there was construction on Riverdale Road, and that forced the traffic to that road. He stated that in all the discussions he heard during the closure of this road, it was never meant to be permanent, was made to be temporary.

Mayor Searle noted that it was not initially closed to be a permanent closure and that it was supposed to be temporary until the safety concerns were addressed and traffic studies were done.

Councilmember Arnold noted that it is just listed as a discussion, not to take consideration. Steve Brooks stated with it being listed as an action item, that it can be voted on, but it depends on what the council would like to do. Rodger Worthen noted that when it was closed in 2010 it did not require a resolution; it was just a vote. Councilmember Stevens stated that he does not believe there even needs to be a motion on this item, and that the city already approved the plan to make it a two way, and the vote is not necessary.

Mayor Searle asked the council if we had a consensus to put this item on the next agenda. All agreed to put on the next agenda.

5. **Discussion on Cancelling/Postponing Old Glory Days.**
Rich Taylor, Community Services, went over the executive summary which explained, Due to the COVID-19 virus and the impacts it has on mass gatherings. We are recommending the City Council consider options for the Old Glory Days celebration this year. There are many public safety issues associated with holding the different Old Glory Days events. Based on Governor Herbert’s 2.0 plan, we are not able to have mass gatherings and do not project to have the ability to do so by July 4th. The Health Department is not currently issuing mass gathering permits and will not until Governor Herbert rescinds his order. With the current uncertainty it makes planning this event very difficult.

We have considered many different modified celebrations, which includes a postponing to a later date. We are concerned about the increased participation and the uncertainty in planning that we might experience with a modified or postponed event. Many cities have already cancelled their events and it could put increased demand on any events we plan. We are concerned that shooting fireworks or planning modified events would encourage people to gather in large numbers. As an organization we want to be a good example. In our current climate it is difficult to plan weeks in advance and provide a community event of this nature.

Our fireworks supplier, race vendor, and other partners have asked for a notice of 8 weeks to provide their services. As a result, we need direction from the council on how to proceed.

Mayor Searle noted that he noticed more cancellations that were listed, such as the Stadium of Fire, also Roy City will be cancelling their celebrations. The Golden Spike reenactment was cancelled, and Days of the Old West in Salt Lake were cancelled.

Councilmember Arnold stated that he would be in favor of cancelling the entire event. He noted that he attended a funeral over the weekend and that people do not listen and the city does not need the liability.

Councilmember Mitchell noted that at the clinic where he works, they had a meeting that they are expecting to receive a lot more knowledge around May 18th. He stated that he would be in favor of holding something to at least acknowledge the 4th for the residents of Riverdale.

Steve Brooks noted that the staff discussed continuing the fireworks show at Rohmer Park, so that way residents could see them. However, there were concerns from police and fire, then he would not support that.

Mayor Searle asked if there was a consensus on putting this item on the next agenda for a vote. All agreed to put on the next agenda.

Rich Taylor noted that the fireworks vendor needs an answer before the next council meeting. Mayor Searle noted that there is no plan on having the fireworks show.

Councilmember Stevens stated that he does not see why the cannon blast must be cancelled. Chief Sholly noted that the cannon blast comes with the fireworks.

H. Discretionary Items

I. Adjournment.

MOTION: Having no further business to discuss, Councilmember Mitchell made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Arnold; all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 7:14p.m.