
Minutes of the **Regular Meeting** of the **Riverdale City Council** held Tuesday, **April 6, 2010** at 6:00 p.m. at the Riverdale Civic Center, 4600 South Weber River Drive.

Members Present: Bruce Burrows, Mayor
David Gibby, Councilor
Shelly Jenkins, Councilor
Don Hunt, Councilor
Norm Searle, Councilor
Alan Arnold, Councilor

Planning Commission: Allen Miller, Chairman
Braden Mitchell, Commissioner
Brent Ellis, Commissioner
Bart Stevens, Commissioner
Michael Staten, Commissioner
Mike Hall, Commissioner

Excused: Blair Jones, Commissioner

Others Present: Larry Hansen, City Administrator; Steve Brooks, City Attorney; Randy Daily, Community Development Director; Dave Hansen, Police Chief; Lynn Fortie, Business Administrator; Marilyn Banasky, City Recorder; and 9 citizens.

A. Welcome & Roll Call

Mayor Burrows called the meeting to order and welcomed all those present. He noted that all Councilmembers were present.

B. Pledge of Allegiance

Councilor Arnold offered the Pledge of Allegiance. Mayor Burrows read a quote from William Bradford.

C. Moment of Silence

Mayor Burrow's quote was followed by a Moment of Silence.

D. Open Communications

None

E. Presentations and Reports

1. Mayor's Report

Mayor Burrows expressed condolences to Councilor Hunt at the passing of his father.

F. Consent Items

1. Approval of meeting minutes from:

March 16, 2010 Work Session

March 16, 2010 Regular City Council

March 16, 2010 Closed Executive Session

2. Approve Class A beer license for Sinclair located at 686 Riverdale Road.

Motion: Councilor Hunt moved to approve the consent items. Councilor Arnold seconded the motion.

Call the Question:

The motion passed unanimously.

G. Action Items

1. Consideration of Ordinance # 758 amending the Riverdale City Zoning Map, specifically to rezone Highland View Subdivision, Lot 15 from R-1-10 to R-1-8 Single Family Residential zone.

Randy Daily reported that a public hearing was held and the Planning Commission gave a favorable recommendation to rezone this property from R-1-10 to R-1-8. He stated that this is not a subdivision request, but if the parcel is subdivided in the future, the Hill family will be able to create two conforming lots. He recommended approval of the rezone and stated that the R-1-8 zone would allow greater flexibility to move dwellings away from 300 West and the slope and help with the access issues. He explained that if a subdivision request does come forth, they will have to give specific details such as access, geotec reports, water and soil testing, and sidewalks.

Brent Hill reported that he is representing the Hill family. He stated that they want to make a conforming lot which will beautify the area and address any safety concerns. Councilor Jenkins stated that until a site plan is presented with regard to home placement, she feels it would be hard to say that the R-1-8 zone is the best fit, because all the other lots are zoned R-1-10. She suggested having a Developer's Agreement to deal with drainage, access, setbacks, and to clearly define the development. Mr. Daily inquired if Councilor Jenkins is suggesting having a Development Agreement rather than rezoning the property and allow the Hill's to subdivide their property in the R-1-10 zone. Councilor Jenkins replied that is what she is suggesting. She stated that until the site plan is laid out so they can see geotec reports or engineering, she isn't sure that the R-1-8 zone would make the best buildable lots. Mr. Daily reported that the Planning Commission suggested to the Hill family that they rezone the property because it wouldn't make two conforming lots in the R-1-10 zone but would under the R-1-8 zone. He stated that Mr. Moulding feels the drive approaches can be done safely and that sidewalks are required by ordinance. He explained that different studies will also need to be done and that the Planning Commission can require anything they feel is necessary to ensure the safety in a subdivision. Councilor Hunt inquired about the agreement with the Hill family to sell a portion of this parcel to enable the widening of 300 West and to still be able to split the lot. Mr. Hill reported that they have only found one document stating that it looks like the property will still meet the 10,000 square foot lot requirement to subdivide, but he explained that with what was taken the square footage of the lot was just under that. He stated that there are memories and recollections of numerous people about the agreement. Mr. Daily reported that the document was from Gilson Engineering who stated that with the taking of the property for the dance studio, it was their estimation that there would be enough land for two 10,000 square foot lots.

Councilor Gibby inquired if the cleanest way to subdivide the parcel would be to rezone the property. Mr. Daily replied that in his opinion, the cleanest way would be to rezone the property as that would allow for two conforming lots. Mayor Burrows inquired if the net result would be the same either way as far as the potential to develop. Mr. Daily replied that the net result would be different as the R-1-8 zone would allow flexibility to move the home further west and put the drive approaches in a better spot. Councilor Gibby inquired if the rezone exposes the City to additional risk. Mr. Brooks replied that there is no exposure to the City either way. He stated that when this was first discussed it was his feeling to leave it as R-1-10. He explained that based upon the past history of those properties he doesn't question that there was a negotiated deal. Councilor Jenkins reported that access is her greatest concern and feels that leaving it R-1-10 with a Developer's Agreement grants the most flexibility. Larry Hansen reported that through no fault of the property owner and a third party person, the City is placed in a position where the property owner ended up with less footage than was needed to subdivide. He stated that it sounds nice to say everyone has recollections of an agreement, but he doesn't feel that is the standard the Council expects of staff and feels they are receiving mixed signals. He stated that the R-1-8 zone will provide for two conforming lots and he feels it is unfair to the property owner to enter into a Developer's Agreement and puts additional burdens on staff.

Motion: Councilor Gibby moved to approve Ordinance #758 amending the Riverdale City Zone District Map by changing the zoning of the land located at approximately 4400 South and 310 West, and rezoning it from R-1-10 to R-1-8, all of which is within Riverdale City, State of Utah; providing for severability and an effective date.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mayor Burrows stated that he agrees with Mr. Hansen that the Council is sending mixed messages to the staff and to the Planning Commission who reviewed this. He reported that the Planning Commission doesn't have the latitude of coming up with a Developer's Agreement and based on the ordinance, the cleanest and best way to move forward with this, is to follow the ordinance to make it two conforming lots. Councilor Hunt stated that he is worried they could be accused of spot zoning and wondered what happens if it is rezoned to R-1-8 and issues come up that cause a variance. He suggested leaving it R-1-10 and address any issues that come up. Councilor Jenkins stated that her concerns are setbacks and access. Councilor Searle reported that he has the same concerns that Councilors Hunt and Jenkins have. He thinks it would be a great place for one home and is also concerned with spot zoning. He stated that he is not in favor of rezoning the parcel to R-1-8.

Mr Hill reported that they have had two different public hearings and have been in front of the Planning Commission twice before coming here. He stated that they are trying to make it safe and be able to work with the City. He stated that he feels an agreement was made and that he is not asking for a variance, just to move ahead on a lot that has been vacant for 30 years. He hopes that they would be able to move ahead, put in the sidewalk, and go ahead with the Planning Commission guidelines. Councilor Arnold reported that he feels the rezone is going to create more problems and that building two homes doesn't solve any problems. He stated that he is worried about access and feels it is his obligation to hold fast and say he doesn't want to see two homes on that lot. Councilor Hunt stated that he doesn't see a problem with subdividing the property as long as there is a Developer's Agreement. Councilor Jenkins stated if they are shown that two homes can be put safely on the lot, then a Developer's Agreement could address the rest of their concerns. Mr Hill stated that they want to move forward and inquired if the Developer's Agreement could be voted on

tonight. Mr. Brooks stated that they have to follow the agenda and a Developer's Agreement is not on it, just the rezone, and that is what they have to deal with tonight. He stated that realistically he doesn't see this as a one house lot and that wasn't the agreement. He explained that he is not concerned, legally, whether they keep it R-1-10 or change it to R-1-8, but he is concerned if the Council only wants one house on the property. He stated that he doesn't believe that the Hills are overly concerned with a Developer's Agreement, and thinks that could be workable, but not tonight. Councilor Gibby stated that he thinks the point is to have two lots and that the Hill's will still have to go through all the things Mr. Daily mentioned. He feels it is in the best interest of the City to put it in an R-1-8 zone and then the ball is in their court to show the feasibility of building two single family homes. Councilor Searle stated that he thinks that there was an agreement to do this and he feels that they should support that – even though he doesn't agree with it.

Motion: Councilor Gibby moved to approve ordinance #758 amending the Riverdale City Zone District Map by changing the zoning of the land located at approximately 4400 South and 310 West, and rezoning it from R-1-10 to R-1-8, all of which is within Riverdale City, State of Utah; providing for severability and an effective date. Councilor Hunt seconded the motion.

Call the Question:

Roll Call Vote: Councilor Jenkins; Nay, Councilor Hunt, Aye; Councilor Searle, Aye; Councilor Arnold, Nay; and Councilor Gibby, Aye. The motion passed with three in favor and two opposed.

2. Consideration of amending the Parks Riverwalk PRUD site plan.

Randy Daily reported that Kent Hill has requested that the front setback requirement for the Parks Riverwalk PRUD be reduced from 20 feet to 15 feet for the dwelling portion of the home and that the driveways would still have a 20 foot setback.

Kent Hill reported that they committed to make this a nice subdivision and that the homes would be a minimum of 1,500 square feet. He stated that they cannot meet that requirement unless they are allowed to reduce the front setback. Councilor Jenkins stated that a front setback of 15 feet would eliminate a driveway. Mr. Hill replied that the driveways will still be 20 feet deep and that he is just requesting the setback reduction on the dwelling portion and not the garage. Councilor Searle stated that the Planning Commission minutes report that those homes with 3-4 car garages wouldn't have to meet the 20 foot setbacks, just the 2 car garages. Mr. Daily replied that the requirement was that they had to provide two off street parking areas with a minimum setback of 20 feet. Councilor Searle stated that he is really opposed to allowing the 3-4 car garages setbacks to be less than 20 feet. Councilor Jenkins stated that she agrees with Councilor Searle. She feels that the private roads are very congested in PRUD's and that this will bring the homes closer to the road. Mr. Hill reported that they had originally planned on a 22 foot wide road but widened it to 32 feet. He stated that they talked about having the houses being set back 15 feet but it didn't get recorded that way. Councilor Hunt inquired as to the square footage of the homes. Mr. Hill replied that on the small lots the biggest house with a 2 car garage is 1,950 square feet and that the garage is 580 square feet, which makes the home 1,370 square feet. He stated that by extending the home five feet would make it a 1,500 square foot home. He stated that they made a commitment to make a nice subdivision and this will make that happen. He feels that if the houses get too small, it becomes starter homes instead of patio homes. Councilor Arnold stated that he feels the size of the home isn't the problem, but the closeness of the homes to the street.

Motion: Councilor Hunt moved to approve the request to amend the site plan to amend the front setback from 20 feet to 15 feet in the Parks Riverwalk PRUD. Councilor Gibby seconded the motion.

Call the Question:

Roll Call Vote: Councilor Hunt; Aye, Councilor Searle, Nay; Councilor Arnold, Nay; Councilor Gibby, Aye; and Councilor Jenkins, Nay. The motion failed with two in favor and three opposed.

3. Consideration of request from Frankie's (bingo establishment) to amend Business License Agreement.

Steve Brooks reported that Attorney Elizabeth Dunning will be presenting this item for Frankie's. Elizabeth Dunning reported that she tried to make the request clear and specific to Council and thinks there were unintended consequences to the Agreement they made two years ago. She explained that Frankie's had been doing business in Riverdale for 6-7 years before the business license dispute. She stated that they served lunches and dinners and with some dinners people could play bingo for free. She explained that it was always their practice if they bought dinner, they got free bingo cards and that free cards would be supplied if requested, even if dinner wasn't purchased. She stated that the Club kept records of the free bingo cards. Ms. Dunning reported that at a later time the Club introduced a sweepstakes promotion, like McDonalds monopoly, and if they didn't buy anything they could write in and get free sweepstakes ticket. She stated that when negotiating the business license agreement it was suggested that the Club also give away free sweepstakes tickets, like bingo. She stated that they didn't see any problem with doing that and arbitrarily picked ten, because they were giving people nine bingo cards if they came for dinner. She explained that unfortunately this has turned into a big problem as that many chances to win a cash prize is attractive to people who have no interest in buying anything. She stated that the parking lot has litter and other tenants in the building have complained about the kind of people it has attracted. She stated that they have claimed to see drug deals in the parking lot and reported that there have been break ins. She reported that there was an armed robbery before closing at Frankie's with two men, one with a baseball bat and one with a gun. She feels it is a function of the free sweepstakes ticket and what was intended to demonstrate that the business wasn't about the sweepstakes, has made the business all about the sweepstakes. She is requesting that they go back to the national norm to write in for free sweepstakes pieces. She stated that they never limited the number, but many of them say one per day.

Councilor Hunt asked Chief Hansen to comment on the claims of increased crime. Police Chief, Dave Hansen reported that Ms. Dunning is correct and the crime rate has increased substantially not only to their business but to others around them. Mayor Burrows inquired if the increase coincides with the change. Chief Hansen reported that he pulled up the cases over at Frankie's prior to the agreement and after the agreement and stated that crime has gone up substantially post agreement. He stated that it is not just affecting Frankie's but other businesses as well. Councilor Jenkins stated that it sounds like the sweepstakes games go quick and wondered if there was anything Frankie's could do to keep people from loitering after they play their free games. She inquired if phone cards and internet time are still what the people purchase to play the sweepstakes game. Ms. Dunning replied that they can purchase long distance phone cards or meals and that they no longer offer internet time. Councilor Jenkins stated that the Council felt like the cost of the air time was not consistent and wondered if people were coming to buy air time or was it a token for playing the game. She stated that they felt mailing in for free tickets cost more than the game piece was worth.

Ms. Dunning reported that they never limited the number of pieces they could request and for example, could get 10 free sweepstakes tickets for one stamp. She stated that they made a commitment to have anything sold be at a fair price. She stated that it isn't how long they stay, but the sheer number. She stated that she knows it is the free sweepstake cards, because the sweepstakes machine was broken for two weeks and the problem disappeared. She suggested either allowing them to lower the number of free sweepstake cards or have mail-in requests for four free tickets for a month and then coming back and reporting. Councilor Gibby stated that in terms of value received for tokens he would like to see what they are paying for air minutes and the redemption rate of air minutes. He stated that he thinks the meals cost \$35.00 and feels a similar meal could have been purchased for less if they were not getting the premiums. He feels it comes to the issue of pay to play. Ms. Dunning stated that she disagrees and if McDonalds gave away free monopoly pieces they would have traffic jams. Councilor Gibby stated that if she is saying it is not gambling because they can get it for free, then what are people doing that are buying them. He stated that he wants to see what the true cost of the air time and meals are and what is redeemed. He explained that he feels it is important to see if this is a gambling establishment or a social club. Councilor Hunt inquired if they can request to change a legally binding agreement. Mr. Brooks replied that if both parties are willing to amend it, then it can legally be done. Councilor Hunt inquired about the recent legislation that may affect this. Mr. Brooks reported that the 2009 legislature passed a bill that now includes fringe gambling which went into effect April 1, 2010. He stated that his office is currently reviewing the new legislation and that it may or may not have great impact on everything over there.

Motion: Councilor Gibby moved to table this item pending: 1) allowing staff to finish their research on new the legislation that was passed with the State; 2) Frankies to provide answers to questions posed to be assured that those playing are getting value and not buying chances to win; and 3) the City Council to be assured that patrons are not getting pay to play. Councilor Jenkins seconded the motion.

Call the Question:

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Consideration of Resolution #2010-09 authorizing a contract with Ogden City Constable for Bailiff services.

Steve Brooks reported that after the last City Council meeting he received notice from the bailiff that he wasn't going to perform those services for Riverdale after March, 2010. Mr. Brooks stated that he needed to take action because of upcoming court dates and contacted some individuals who provide bailiff services and received bids. He stated that the only one that he would consider was Ogden City Constable who do Ogden City's constable work. He reported that they have begun providing the service last week, but their hourly rates are higher than the previous bailiff. He explained that didn't worry him as their hourly rate was the same that was submitted in all the bids. He stated that this is a win-win for the City as the new constable service will also work on warrants which will also bring in more money. He stated that this is a one year contract with optional renewals and that he could bid it out if necessary. He recommended approval of the contract.

Motion: Councilor Jenkins moved to approve Resolution #2010-09 authorizing execution and implementation of a Bailiff Services Agreement between Riverdale City and Ogden City Constable. Councilor Gibby seconded the motion.

Call the Question:

Roll Call Vote: Councilor Searle; Aye, Councilor Arnold, Aye; Councilor Gibby, Aye; Councilor Jenkins, Aye; and Councilor Hunt, Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Consideration of Resolution #2010-08 amending Title 1, Chapter 12, Section 7 – Police Service Fees.

Police Chief, Dave Hansen reported that the state legislature recently passed a bill to allow the Department of Corrections to charge \$100 and allow cities to charge \$25 to cover their administration costs for sex offender registration. He stated that this change in the Consolidated Fee schedule reflects that fee.

Motion: Councilor Gibby moved to approve Resolution #2010-08 amending the Consolidated Fee Schedule in the Riverdale Municipal Ordinance Code Title 1, Chapter 12, Section 7 – Police Service Fees. Councilor Arnold seconded the motion.

Call the Question:

Roll Call Vote: Councilor Arnold; Aye, Councilor Gibby, Aye; Councilor Jenkins, Aye; Councilor Hunt, Aye; and Councilor Searle, Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

6. a. Consideration to untable Ordinance #756 amending Title 10, Chapter 14, Section 12 – Nonresidential and Residential Development Landscape Requirements.

Mayor Burrows reported that it was suggested that the Planning Commission join the City Council for this discussion. **Mayor Burrows asked for consensus to have the Planning Commission join the City Council for this item. Consensus was reached.**

The meeting recessed at 8:23 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 8:31 p.m.

Randy Daily reported that the City Council tabled the landscaping ordinance due to their concern of the reduction of the landscaping ratio from 20% to 15% for commercial developments and the ability for landscaping to be seen in a prominent area. He stated that he took Sandy City's landscaping ordinance and changed it to fit Riverdale City's needs. He explained that Sandy City requires a 15 foot wide landscaped area in the front of commercial developments and requires 5% of parking areas to be landscaped.

Councilor Gibby stated that he likes this better than a set percentage. Councilor Jenkins felt that there wasn't enough definition for the 5% landscaping of parking areas and wondered if that could be expanded to include other decorative materials or xeriscaping in parking areas to be more conservative on water consumption. Commissioner Mitchell inquired what they mean by 15 feet and wondered if it was 15 square feet. Mr. Daily replied that it has to be the width of the landscaping in front of the property, not the building and that there would be a 15 foot strip of landscaping behind the sidewalk. Commissioner Staten reported that he has seen everything from no landscaping requirements to intense requirements and feels that setting a percentage is not effective to get quality landscaping. He stated that he likes the direction this is now taking to focus on the frontage of property and landscaping in parking areas. He stated that he would like to see more detail about the number of trees and percentages of bushes that would be required.

Councilor Gibby reported that he wants to ensure that they are not limiting the creativity of the developer to use the depth to create something unique with the use of materials. Councilor Arnold stated that he would like to ensure that landscaping is also required when the back of a building faces a street. He suggested coming up with some sort of Riverdale City character to ensure they know they are in Riverdale. Mayor Burrows stated that Clinton City has hanging baskets and that Councilor Gibby has been a proponent of that. Councilor Searle stated that they are competing with other cities for retail and feels that how a development looks is important to keeping retail business in Riverdale. Commissioner Stevens reported that he doesn't like a flat percentage but wants more flexibility per the business. He stated that a car dealer's parking stall is just as important to their business as an office cubicle is to other businesses and feels that flexibility is needed per development, per business. He feels they need to have stated criteria, objectives and purpose for each aspect of the landscaping ordinance. Councilor Gibby made several suggestions to create a signature look, such as having petroglyph's, an arboretum, or dinosaur footprints and give landscaping credit for them. Mayor Burrows suggesting looking at things they want to see as elements in the commercial landscape requirements for new developments and have staff bring back an amended ordinance. Councilor Jenkins stated that she would like to see definitions and breakdowns included on how it will be installed and maintained. Commissioner Staten reported that he wants to see the front landscaping include different materials but doesn't exclude them from using only one material. He would like more detail about varieties, quality features, and types of trees.

Motion: Councilor Jenkins moved to untable Ordinance #756. Councilor Gibby seconded the motion.

Call the Question:

The motion passed unanimously.

b. Consideration of Ordinance #756 amending Title 10, Chapter 14, Section 12 – Nonresidential and Residential Development Landscape Requirements.

Motion: Councilor Gibby moved to have the Planning Commission re-work Ordinance #756. Councilor Jenkins seconded the motion.

Call the Question:

The motion passed unanimously.

7. a. Discussion with the Planning Commission on Title 10, Chapter 8 - Agricultural Zone (A-1) in conjunction with the General Plan.

Randy Daily reported that he included a map of the City specifying the A-1 zones and both A-1 ordinances recommended by the Planning Commission to the City Council. Councilor Jenkins stated that she thought the Planning Commission brought a decent ordinance to them, but felt that if there was an adjacent residential area next to the A-1 zone it didn't fit. She felt they tried to make it a one size fits all. She explained that is why she wanted to look at the agricultural zones with the General Plan. Commissioner Mitchell stated that was what they were trying to accomplish with the A-2 zone language changes, which would have pulled out the commercial uses from the current A-1 zone and if someone wanted one of those uses, they would have to rezone their property to A-2. He explained that the City Council sent that ordinance back with instructions to pull out the commercial uses all together, which is what they did, and the City

Council sent it back again. Councilor Jenkins stated that she saw the ordinance as effective for the south side of the City but not for the odd lots. She suggested looking at each A-1 parcel to see what uses fit. She stated that the Brine Shrimp Factory no longer fits with the adjacent properties and is problematic. Mayor Burrows suggested leaving the underlying zone as it exists now and going through the City and identifying situations where the agricultural zone may not fit. Mr. Daily stated that the A-2 zone proposal took into account the surrounding properties and if the requested use didn't fit, then the rezone could be denied. Councilor Searle reported that he thinks there is merit to the A-2 zone because it does protect the surrounding neighborhoods from future uses that they don't want.

b. Consideration of Ordinance #754 amending Title 10, Chapter 8 - Agricultural Zone (A-1).

Mayor Burrows asked for consensus to have the previously worded A-2 zone ordinance on the next City Council agenda for review and comment. Consensus was reached.

8. a. Discussion with the Planning Commission on Title 10, Chapter 12 Infill Lots.

Mayor Burrows reported that the City Council wanted the infill lot ordinance re-looked at and the Planning Commission chose to take no further action. Councilor Jenkins reported that she thought the ordinance would be used to look at odd shaped lots in areas that may not be developable. She stated that the first time it was used was to build a twin home in an R-10 zone which could have accommodated a single family dwelling. She stated that if the ordinance is being used to increase density, that is not the way she thought it would be used. Councilor Arnold stated that he felt the ordinance would accomplish two different things: 1) allow the property owner to develop their property and 2) protect the surrounding area. Councilor Searle reported that he helped draft that ordinance and that it has to improve the quality of the neighborhood. He feels that if something slipped through he feels it isn't the fault of the ordinance. Mr. Daily reported that he thinks the end result of that dwelling is not detrimental and has improved the area. He stated that maybe he should have looked at the ordinance differently and thinks he can change the wording in section 10-12-1 entitled Purpose, to satisfy the Council. He suggested deleting the words "isolated, flag, odd-shaped or other" from that section. Councilor Hunt stated that they wanted to protect the integrity of the surrounding areas by not increasing the density. Commissioner Staten reported that his problem with making the changes the City Council wanted was that it only allowed the density to be built that was adjacent to the infill lot. He was concerned if the zone of the infill lot was R-2, but the adjacent properties only had single family homes on them, that a two family dwelling couldn't be built, even though the zone allowed it. He feels that the zoning ordinance should determine the density and not the infill lot ordinance. Councilor Gibby stated that the intent of the ordinance was to improve the neighborhood rather than to maintain the status quo. He reported that most of the time an infill lot is not maintained and if the infill lot improves the neighborhood, then why not allow it. Mayor Burrows discussed the proposed language from Mr. Daily.

b. Consideration of amending Title 10, Chapter 12 Infill Lots.

Mayor Burrows asked for consensus to have the proposed language for the Infill Lot ordinance on the next City Council agenda for review and comment. Consensus was reached.

H. Discretionary Items

Councilor Arnold reported that he is on the Trek Committee for the LDS church and that they are doing a fun run in Riverdale to prepare for trek. He stated that they were told there would be a \$100 fee for the event and wondered why the fee would be assessed if the church wasn't charging a fee to participate. Larry Hansen reported that the fun run falls under the Special Event ordinance and that he feels there is a degree of latitude to work with them, but that we need to follow our ordinance. He stated that he encouraged the organizers to move the fun run to the trail.

I. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Council at this time, Councilor Arnold moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilor Gibby seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:18 p.m.

Approved: April 20, 2010

Bruce Burrows, Mayor

Attest:

Marilyn Banasky, City Recorder