



February 15, 2011

Notice of Public Hearing

Riverdale City Council

Tuesday, March 1, 2011
Which begins at 6:00 p.m.

Riverdale Civic Center
4600 South Weber River Drive
Riverdale, Utah

The Riverdale City Council will hold a public hearing to receive and consider public comment concerning participation in the Communities That Care (CTC) program.

A study of the CTC Program is [attached](#).

- The public is invited to attend all public meetings.
- In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons who have need of special accommodations should contact the City Recorder at 394-5541.

CTC Study

(1) Identified benefit(s) the municipality will receive in return for any money or resources appropriated;

(Response from the Petitioner)

The benefits to the municipality would include:

- An increase in networking among community leaders and residents concerning youth.
- A solid plan in place to address identified risk factors facing youth in the community.
- A decrease in youth involvement in risky behavior.
- Anticipated decrease in resources needed to address consequences of negative youth behavior.
- As a result of initiating this process, the city will be eligible to apply for a federal “Drug Free Communities” grant that would bring additional funds for prevention.
- The well being of the community will be enhanced as a result of youth being less involved in risky behavior and having more protective factors in place in the community because of the combined coordinated efforts of the community.

(Response from staff/attorney)

Staff response: These arguments are much the same as the ones proposed when DARE was first being presented to the communities. The problem is that there is far too much speculation here and credit given for things that are not realistic or verifiable. Like DARE, perhaps some side benefits are worth the investment to the City (police exposure to kids, networking, training, etc.). But to argue, and I am not saying CTC is doing this, that any program (DARE, CTC, etc.), is the “silver bullet” to ending substance abuse is simply not true. It is a very complex issue and involves things that cities have no expose to or experience in dealing with or never should be involved in. I would “dare” to say that a very large majority of individuals who went through DARE and were able to avoid contact with crime and substance abuse did NOT do so because of the DARE program but were in fact influenced by some other factor, experience or reason other than DARE. Cities do not generally assume the responsibility of social type issues. Cities provide, water, sewer, garbage, streets, police, fire, etc.

I am also concerned about what responsibility the city assumes when it is stated that “the city will be eligible to apply for a Federal Drug Free Communities grant” that would bring additional funds. Once again, where and how does this involve the city and city resources? What happens if the funds are not received? What happens when the grant runs out?

Are there benefits? I think it’s always likely you could find some benefits to the city. Whether or not they rise to the level of what return we would receive is anybody’s guess at this point. I still do not know what resources will need to be appropriated above and beyond the initial payment.

(2) The municipality's purpose for the appropriation, including an analysis of the way the appropriation will be used to enhance the safety, health, prosperity, moral well-being, peace, order, comfort, or convenience of the inhabitants of the municipality; and

(Response from the Petitioner)

- The purpose of the appropriation would be to hire and train a coordinator that would guide and assist the city in implementing a community based process called “Communities That Care”.
- A community coalition of key leaders and residents will receive ongoing training throughout the process. The coordinator will assist the coalition in collecting and analyzing local data in order to identify the most predominant risk factors affecting youth in the community. The city will receive guidance in selecting, implementing and evaluating evidence based programs and strategies that will address the identified risk factors.

(Response from staff/attorney)

Staff response: As near as I can tell the purpose and analysis is to hire an individual to begin the program. The program is then designed to address a serious community concern. The purpose is just that, to help start the program.

(3) Whether the appropriation is necessary and appropriate to accomplish the reasonable goals and objectives of the municipality in the area of economic development, job creation, affordable housing, blight elimination, job preservation, the preservation of historic structures and property, and any other public purpose.

(Response from the Petitioner)

- Without the appropriation of funds Riverdale will continue current efforts to reduce risk factors of youth. Each entity (Riverdale Police dept., Schools, Weber Human Services Prevention) that has programs or makes an effort in preventing youth from engaging in behaviors that increase the use of tobacco, alcohol or drugs, are each having an impact. The combined efforts when coordinated and with increased involvement from community leaders and parents, the effect has proven to be amplified. The appropriation of these funds allows for a coordinator to guide those individual efforts into a collaborative community mission.

(Response from staff/attorney)

Staff response: I do not feel that the appropriation accomplishes any city goals concerning the first named items. The only category that it would fit into would be the “other public purpose” portion. That is very broad and as I have mentioned above, it would be easy to find some health, safety or moral well-being benefit to the city.

The bottom line is two fold for me: 1- Gifts/Donations. We passed an ordinance merely 6 months ago that strongly discourages this kind of thing. At the time, it was presented as a

legitimate concern and option for the Council to rely upon this ordinance to avoid this exact type of issue in the near future. Gifts, donations or any similar type of appropriation made by cities do not set good precedence. If you do it for one, then you will have to do it for another. Where do you draw the line? As guardians of the public trust (using their money), we should certainly follow correct procedures in order to fully inform the public on how their money is being spent but also seriously consider the reason and justification for doing so. If the public felt that this type of program warranted their support, they could make donations to it. They don't have that choice with the money that the Council is charged with. They expect and deserve that the money collected through taxes be used on things that are commonly considered to be city issues.

2- Long term cost and commitment. It concerns me that we are just now receiving some of the information that has been requested concerning any long term type of commitment and the fact that none of that was or has been outlined in the Interlocal agreement. The last thing that should happen in this case is to get the program up and running and then funding disappear or be delayed. Where would that program turn for financial survival? The expectation is clear; it has just not been communicated. \$2,000.00 may not seem like much now but Riverdale's portion of 125K or more certainly changes things.