

Aiken City Council MinutesWORK SESSION

June 13, 2016

Present: Mayor Osbon, Councilmembers Dewar, Diggs, Ebner, Merry and Price.

Absent: Councilman Homoki

Others Present: John Klimm, Stuart Bedenbaugh, Kim Abney, Sara Ridout, Alicia Davis, Nola Grant, Jessica Campbell, Tim Coakley, Charles Barranco, Bryan Mills, Mike Jordan, George Grinton, Dan Brown from the Aiken Standard, and 3 citizens.

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Osbon called the work session to order at 4:00 P.M. Mayor Osbon stated the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed budget for 2016-17. He stated John Wade had asked to speak to Council about a matter regarding the water and sewer policy and he had placed Mr. Wade on the agenda before the discussion on the budget.

WATER AND SEWER POLICYAnnexationJohn Wade

Mr. John Wade, of 1180 Cornish Street in Crosland Park, stated he had several segments to talk to Council about. Initially on April 26, 2016, when he read the article in the newspaper about the Northside Park he was totally appalled at the statement that the city wanted to save money by using a septic tank and well water. He said he called a Councilmember that night and had a good discussion with that Councilmember. That Councilmember suggested he sit down with Mr. Klimm and have a discussion about this matter. He said time went by and he got no phone call. He called the Councilmember again and the Councilmember did not answer the phone, but Mr. Klimm called him and said he could not meet with him that week, but would do it the next week. He said it has now been six weeks and he still has not met with Mr. Klimm. He said he called the Councilmember again several times and just got voice mail so he then went to the newspaper office and they said were not interested in anything unless it was on record. He said when he initially read the article about the septic tank and water well, his thought was "do as I say, not as I do." He said the government agency requires citizens to do certain things, but in his opinion the city is not following the same guidelines.

Mr. Wade said he had several questions for Council. He wondered in the beginning or in the future for the Northside Park is Council going to annex it to the city. Several Councilmembers responded that the city could not annex the property because it is not contiguous to the city, and Mayor Osbon stated when it becomes contiguous he would like to see the park annexed to the city. Mr. Wade stated the next question is how does the city provide fire protection and police protection for an area outside the city. Mr. Wade asked if the U.S. corridor was annexed to the city like the Whiskey Road corridor. It was noted that the Northside Park property is within the City of Aiken's fire district and that the U.S. 1 corridor is not annexed to the city. It was pointed out that City of Aiken fire protection would be provided for the property since it is within the city's fire district. Police protection would be provided by Aiken County since the property is outside the city.

Mr. Wade asked if at any time in the future of the Northside Park was the city going to decide to connect to the city water and sanitary sewer lines in the area. He noted that the city water line exists on US 1 on the same side of the park property and on the back side of the property is the sanitary sewer line. He wondered if the city would come back to the citizens and say X amount was spent on the Northside Park initially and now ask to be able to spend more money to connect to the city water and sewer lines instead of doing it initially in the first phase.

Councilman Dewar stated his understanding is that we are using well water to save money until we get to the point of building infrastructure in the park where it is more conducive to have the connection to the city water. Ms. Campbell pointed out that at that time the wells would just be used for irrigation.

Mr. Wade asked if the city was willing and able to provide city water to people outside the city limits. Councilmembers responded that the city does provide water to people outside the city limits. Mr. Wade stated he could find information back to the 40's in minutes and ordinances where the City of Aiken has addressed sewer and water. He noted Ordinance 62667B in 1967-- "where public sanitary sewer is reasonably accessible for the purpose of this section, reasonably accessible is considered 1,000 feet from the proposed property." Mr. Wade pointed out that the property where the Northside Park is to be located is adjacent to Highway 1. The water line is on the side of the road where the park is to be located and adjacent to the railroad track. Most of the portion is on the side of the railroad track so you would not have to bore underneath the railroad tracks. He noted several more articles regarding water service. He said he also had information from the Planning Department regarding water service stating "the use of wells to provide water for commercial purposes or domestic properties within the city limits is hereby prohibited and declared to be unlawful." He also noted new service for water where the property owner has to execute an agreement to be annexed into the city when the property becomes contiguous to the city. Mr. Wade stated that was his question earlier, at what point in time is the property going to become contiguous and will the city use Highway 1 as a corridor to make it contiguous like it did the By-pass and Whiskey Road.

Councilman Dewar noted that the city has not used Whiskey Road as a measure to make property contiguous to annex property. He pointed out that the city could use it to annex, but there was some question as to whether the city might lose in the case of a lawsuit.

Councilman Ebner asked about the location of the water line being on the same side as the park. Mr. Wade responded that he had said the line is on the same side of the road as the park. Councilman Ebner felt that should be checked as there was an amount in the costs for the park for boring under the road for the water. He said there was \$25,000 in the original scope of work to bring the water under the road with an 8 inch line before the last cost estimate with the wells.

Councilman Dewar pointed out that use of a well was discussed instead of the expense for running the water line to the property. He pointed out in looking at the overall plan, we don't have enough money to do much in the development beyond the amphitheater, playground area, picnic shelter, open space and walking trail. The thought was to use a well to save money and in the next phase tie into the water line.

Mr. Wade stated he had not seen that type of thinking in all the planning and zoning and City Council meetings that he had attended. He said that was his real beef—"do as I say, not as I do." He said it is a matter of Council looking fairly upon businesses and citizens as upon themselves. He said he has sat in meetings and Council did not seem, in his opinion, to care at the time for that customer and what they had to pay whether it was for irrigation, landscaping, sewer, water and boring under the road, traffic study, and lanes being added. He said he felt those things need to be considered, but he did not see it from what he read in the newspaper why we were going to save this money as the City of Aiken. Councilman Dewar responded that we are trying to maximize what little money we have to develop the park. Mr. Wade stated business people do that every day.

Mr. Wade stated he had another beef regarding water. He said he had mentioned regarding property being contiguous to the city. He said DHEC supersedes what the city says on delivering water to this piece of property. He said if property is contiguous and the city has water available to the property, then the only way you can circumvent tying onto that water is by doing a feasibility study. He said he chose to do that for his property on the 118 Bypass. He said he became a small utility because when he evaluated what it was going to cost for landscaping on his property, it was almost \$100,000. He said he spent \$30,000 to become a small public utility serving 24 people or

less a day. He said when you look at a facility of the magnitude of the Northside Park, you would not fall under that ruling, but under the Federal EPA guidelines as a large facility. He said Josh Schander had been working with him on other projects, and also working with him on this project. R6158.1 of the state regulations state that unless you can do a feasibility study and prove why you don't need to tie onto the water line, then you have to. He said if the cost is as high as stated the city may be able to do a feasibility study and DHEC may look at it and think it is expensive. He pointed out that on small business people instead of \$300,000 they may be talking about \$10,000 or \$15,000. He said he wanted Council to really think about and address this as a citizen or a business coming into Aiken and wanting city water or sewer and not address it as "we are the government and this is what we want to do." He said he has the water system liability guidelines from DHEC and what has to be proven through them before you can use the well. First there has to be a test well. "Please note that one component of DHEC strategy to enhance the liability of a public water system is to minimize the proliferation of small water systems. Therefore if a water line from an existing viable system is adjacent to the applicant's property and the existing system is willing and able to allow citizens outside the city to have city sewer and city water. Willing and able to serve the project-- it will be difficult for the applicant to prove that it will not be feasible to connect.

Councilman Dewar asked if Mr. Wade was saying that under DHEC law the city has to use our own water. Mr. Wade responded that was not correct, he said the city has to do a liability study. He said if the city chooses not to do a feasibility study, then the city has to tie on to the city water. He said the city could not drill the well without the study. No well driller can legally drill the well without the study.

Mr. Wade pointed out that the city has the character banners on the light poles downtown. He asked that when Council works on this and when they work with other businesses or individuals that Council think about the character traits. He pointed out one that is on the banner now is "honesty." He said the definition of "honesty" is being truthful in what I say and what I do. He asked that Council be truthful to the citizens in Aiken and the citizens who want to come into Aiken on decisions like the one for water and sewer for the Northside Park and saving money. Mr. Wade stated he was not accusing Council of being untruthful. Councilman Dewar stated Council was doing what they felt was right, and he thanked Mr. Wade for bringing this matter to the attention of Council.

Mayor Osbon stated we would ask staff to check into the situation, and he appreciated Mr. Wade bringing the matter up. He said in working with Council he could say there is no one that is not working to the best of their ability and for the citizens. Mr. Wade responded that he did not say that Council was untruthful. He said his statement was to maintain that in particular situations and in this case in this situation. Mayor Osbon stated he felt Mr. Wade had presented a lot of good information and thanked him for sharing the information with Council.

BUDGET

2016-17

Mayor Osbon stated that Council needed to discuss the proposed budget for fiscal year 2016-17 at this time.

Mr. John Klimm stated staff is pleased to meet with Council on the fourth work session on the budget. He said Ms. Abney wanted to make some comments on the latest iteration of the budget which includes comments we have received from the general public and from members of Council to improve the document. He pointed out the department heads were present again to answer any individual questions about their budget. He noted there will be an executive session after the work session, but there will be another work session on the budget on Tuesday, June 14, 2016, at 4 p.m.

Ms. Abney stated she had distributed version 2 of the proposed budget, and it has been posted on the website. She noted that no numbers had changed in this version of the budget, there had only been editorial changes. Some of the charts had been updated and the readers guide had been revamped. She reviewed other editorial changes made in the

budget. She pointed out if there were other suggestions from Council to let her know. She stated the budget is an ever evolving document. She pointed out it will not be the same next year and not stay the same for the next 50 years. She reviewed all those who had helped with the budget. She pointed out there were 227 pages in the proposed budget and almost 48,000 words. Last year's budget did not contain many words, but there were a lot of numbers. She pointed out and reviewed the nine sections of the budget. She pointed out the proposed budget is totally different from what we have had for the last 50 years. It basically slices and dices the numbers in different ways so you can see how the city is meeting its obligations. There is a section for each department's information with the same information for each division of what they do, highlight issues, summaries, departmental budget with its funding source and the objective and goals for each division.

Councilman Ebner questioned Section 3 of the budget ordinance. He said it was still his opinion that we should budget money for the funds and not have an open comment that says "City Council will commit the fund balance of the following funds...." He felt that should go away and we should put the right amount of money in the budget. He said we have a history of these funds over the years as to how much we spend. Ms. Abney pointed out that the AECOM Theatre, Ventures Industrial Fund, the Verenes Industrial Park Fund and the Willow Run Industrial Park Fund are not included in the budget because there were no new appropriations for those funds. The Economic Re-Investment Fund is included only as a balance left over. She pointed out she would answer as she has for the last few years. This is a requirement of the Government Finance Officers Association. She pointed out the statement was added some years ago as a requirement when the new fund balance statement came out. She stated we have to categorize our fund balance in order to prepare financial statements in accordance with governmental accounting standards and generally accepted accounting principles. To win our award from the Government Finance Officers Association, we have to do certain things. One of those is to categorize our fund balance according to the requirement which is restricted, committed, assigned, unassigned, and non-spendable. This means the governing body has to make a commitment prior to the beginning of our fiscal year. She said this is asking that Council state that the funds are for the purpose for which they are named. Councilman Ebner pointed out there used to be more funds in the listing such as the Airport, Northside Development, etc. He wondered what happened. Ms. Abney responded that the Airport is now an enterprise fund.

Councilman Ebner pointed out that in the past what he had noted in the statement that Council will commit the fund balance, the budgets were less than what was needed to do the work. Then money was automatically taken from the General Fund and put in these funds rather than have the right budgeted amount. He said it is his opinion that these funds should have their right amount of budget and the statement is there just to meet all the government requirements.

Ms. Abney stated as far as transferring from the General Fund she would have to research when we would have transferred money from the General Fund. She stated the Theater Fund is funded by transfers from the Sunday Alcohol fund taxes and Local Accommodations Taxes. She noted there is a page in the proposed budget listing all the transfers. Ms. Abney stated the AECOM Theater Fund is funded by \$80,000 from the Sunday Alcohol Fund and \$4,450 from the Local Accommodations Tax fund. She pointed out that was the transfers, but they were not from the General Fund.

Councilman Ebner stated he needed more explanation about the headings. He noted the Beginning Fund Balance FY 16. He asked if the city has \$17 million in the checking account. He asked if that was real money. Ms. Abney responded the figures were the 6-30-15 audit numbers—where we stood at the end of last year. Then there is the current year budget, and the next two columns are the budget that we are discussing. Councilman Ebner asked about the Victim Services Fund of \$162,000. He wondered where the funds came from. Ms. Abney stated for every ticket that is written a percentage of it goes into the fund for Victim Services. Councilman Ebner asked if the \$125,000 for the Industrial Park was real money in the bank. Ms. Abney responded that is our fund balance. She said fund balance does not always mean money. Ms. Abney stated fund balance is all assets minus all liabilities. She said the total assets are not cash assets only.

Councilwoman Price asked about the rental lease payment from AECOM and wondered where it is shown in the budget. It was pointed out that the lease is with Aiken Corporation and the lease payment goes to LED of the Aiken Corporation to pay on the loan for the building. Aiken Corporation gives the city about \$12,000 per month for the land lease. Ms. Abney pointed out that in the AECOM Theater the city receives \$1 for every ticket they sell and that income to the city is about \$13,000 per year. Rental of the theater brings in about \$11,000. The Theater supports the city by paying for part of the staff member at the theater which is \$22,500. The ground lease for the land for the AECOM building is in the General Fund. When people rent the theater that money goes into the Theater Fund.

Councilman Dewar asked what is in the budget for unfunded mandates. Ms. Abney pointed out that is for the Indigent Defense. Councilman Dewar stated he was willing to not approve the budget with an unfunded mandate. He felt that is ridiculous. He said a line has to be drawn sometime. He said he would support taking it out of the budget and let the State deal with it however they want to deal with it.

Councilman Dewar asked if anything was being done with the Pension Plan. Mr. Klimm responded we have funding in the budget at Councilmember Dewar and Homoki's request to hire an actuary to make recommendations for the redesign of the pension plan. It is very clear without an actuary that there are things that we could implement that would lead us down a path of more fiscal solvency. For example, the fact that we have a pension plan that does not require a match. He said he was not talking about existing employees, but a redesign for new employees. He said it would be hard to find another government entity that has a pension plan that does not require a match, much less a private entity. There are items that we might want to look at that would require an actuarial study to quantify potential savings. He said he agrees that we need an overall look at the pension plan with recommendations to Council to address the fact that we spend a lot of money for this item. He pointed out that most other governmental entities and the private sector have made reforms to rein in the overall cost of the pension plan.

Councilman Dewar asked if Mr. Klimm was saying we need an actuarial study to change the plan for new hires effective the beginning of the fiscal year so they are on a 401K or some similar type program. Mr. Klimm stated he did not feel that we would need an actuary to implement that. He said but if we wanted to know the 60 year implications of that, then an actuary would have to be employed to calculate that. He said it is very clear that if we begin a new program for new employees that requires a match that there are obvious savings from the first year. Councilman Dewar asked why we would need to know the long term implications of a 401K with a match. Mr. Klimm stated he felt Council might ultimately want to know because you probably want to configure or a redesign that has some quantifiable cost savings and it would be helpful to know what the cost savings are for requiring new employees to match. The other item that he feels does not require an actuary is a decision to get out of the pension business and move more towards a 401K or similar program and ultimately down the line not impact the existing employees but at some point get out of the pension business. Many municipalities and more corporations have done that decades ago. Councilman Dewar asked if there was money in the budget to do the audit of the pension plan to be able to make recommendations to Council. Mr. Klimm responded there is money in the budget for the audit.

Councilman Dewar asked about plans to put members of Council on the Pension Committee. He pointed out that everyone on the Pension Committee except Mr. Klimm is part of the Pension Plan. He felt that did not make sense. Mr. Klimm stated he did not know the origin of the genesis of the committee and who put it in place. Ms. Abney stated she felt that is something that would be included in the overall review. Mr. Klimm stated all of our committee members are employees, but there are other jurisdictions in the state where you can't be a future recipient and serve on the committee. He said in the community where he came from the committee was Council. Councilman Dewar stated it boggles his mind that our auditors don't see anything wrong with that. Mr. Klimm stated there is the issue of whether it is legally appropriate. Councilman Dewar stated it is not a legal issue. Mr. Klimm stated you have the Pension Committee and you have Council and the City Manager's interest as management and you have the employees. One could raise the issue as to who is on the committee to represent the taxpayers. He

said he did not know the genesis of the committee so he did not know if Council wanted to change it whether it would be a Council vote.

Councilman Ebner pointed out that a few years back there was a vote at Council to put Councilmembers on the Pension Committee. He said he had Gary Smith, City Attorney, to look into the matter and there were some issues about some members of Council asking for some information on the Plan and were turned down. He said he took it to the Attorney General to ask if Council could get the information and the answer was yes. It is a monitored public fund, but Council voted down to put Councilmembers on the Pension Committee about five years ago. He said the vote was 4 to 3 to not put Councilmembers on the Pension Committee.

Public Safety Department

Mr. Klimm stated Chief Barranco is here to give Council an overview and answer questions about day to day operations or any budgetary item. He said he was planning to discuss the issue of the Hospitality Tax on Tuesday, June 14, regarding the Economic Reinvestment Fund and some other items. He asked if Council wanted a review or just ask questions. The general consensus was just to ask questions. Mr. Klimm stated in working with Chief Barranco two of his major concerns were that we really have an issue that needs to be addressed with the Public Safety Headquarters facility. We know that it is inadequate, there are code issues, there are legal requirements that are not being met, there are space issues, the building is old and tired, and the infrastructure of the building the HVAC system and others need to be addressed. We have the FOIA request to do an evaluation and Chief and staff have worked on that. He said it is a major issue. We either need to do a major rehab on the building or we need to build a new building either of which will be very, very costly.

Mr. Klimm stated the second issue is the number of retirements to happen soon. He said he and the Chief had had a lot of conversations about that. It was pointed out that there are 8 retirements coming up next year. There were 10, but two have already taken opportunities at other places.

Councilman Dewar asked about the manning as of today. Chief Barranco stated he was one PSO short. He pointed out that some of the PSOs are still in training, but all the slots are filled. Councilman Dewar asked how many vehicles the department has and how many are take home vehicles. Chief Barranco stated he did not have that information with him but could get that for Councilman Dewar. He said there are about 60 vehicles assigned to a patrol function, including Community Services. Some of those are take home vehicles and some are fleet vehicles. The majority of them are take home cars. Chief Barranco stated they still have 12 PSOs assigned to each shift.

Councilwoman Diggs asked what positions those who are retiring hold, patrol duty or what and if there were people to replace the retirees. Chief Barranco stated the retirements all over the staff, with some in Patrol, some in Support Services and some in Community Services. As far as replacements they will have to go through the process of replacement. He said in talking with the City Manager historically what they have done at Public Safety is have four or five openings before advertising for the positions. He felt that could be done preemptively to cut some of the time for the process. He pointed out it is a lengthy process to determine who we are able to hire with the background checks, etc. Getting ahead of that would shorten the length of time for the process.

Councilman Dewar asked how much work Public Safety does for the County on a regular shift. Chief Barranco responded that it goes both ways. He pointed out with the donut hole situation that we have they request the County's assistance as much or more than they request us to assist them. We have some joint ventures in our Narcotics Unit, Bloodhound Track Team, major crime scenes, etc. He said he had prepared a document for Council's information on assistance for other agencies a couple of years ago. He said that also includes EMS. Within our fire response district we do go to medical first responder calls. He said Public Safety does not spend a lot of time in the County answering calls. It may be two or three a day. They are usually calls to back up an officer in an alarm. Regarding the County's one fire station, the County does not have a

response district. The fire station is used for assistance. The County does not have a specific area to respond to.

Councilwoman Diggs asked if it was our intention to bring on the special investigator for the claims against Public Safety. Mr. Klimm stated he is almost done and is well into the analysis. He pointed out there are two investigations going on, one by the FBI and one independently. He said as soon as we get a report he will let Council know. It was also pointed out there is an operational audit going on and two investigations.

Councilman Dewar asked Chief Barranco what he would want that he had not asked for in the proposed budget. Chief Barranco stated he appreciated the training that has been a focus of the budget. He said he needed some staffing in Dispatch, and he felt the operational audit would recognize that. Councilman Dewar asked if there was a need for Public Safety Officers to be able to have more medical qualifications for emergency responses beyond what they have now. Chief Barranco responded that if we went to another level it would be very expensive. We would be getting into transportation and Paramedic type stuff. He felt Public Safety is already at a level that they do serve the citizens in a positive way. He said they are always looking to improve their training. Councilman Ebner asked if Chief Barranco had money for more body cameras as that was one thing they talked about and also storage for the videos. Chief Barranco stated there is \$22,000 in the budget and storage has been paid for out of this year's budget, but we were not able to buy as many cameras as they wanted to buy.

Councilman Ebner stated another thing that should be considered in the building design for the Headquarters Station is to build a flexible building so changes can be made in 10 to 15 years from now. Chief Barranco stated one of the things mentioned in the groups was flexibility and space.

Public Services Department

Tim Coakley

Mr. Klimm stated he had asked Tim Coakley to talk about his budget next. He asked him to talk about the inmates and the implications.

Mr. Coakley, Public Services Director, stated the state had closed us off from inmates a couple of weeks ago and shipped them to the Trenton facility. They have now opened a 60 day window and will let us have inmates for another 60 days. Senator Young was very instrumental in getting the Governor to give us some extra time as 30 days was a short notice. He said \$250,000 had been placed in the Public Services budget for temporary labor for next year. The plan is to replace 20 inmates a day with 10 temporary workers. He said 4 to 6 inmates a day are used in the Solid Waste divisions in Public Services. He said he was working on some operational changes to bring back to Council for consideration.

Councilman Ebner pointed out one thing that was discussed was to schedule recycle pickup every other week which would eliminate a truck. He asked if that was in the budget. Mr. Coakley stated that was what he was referring to and he would bring some information back to Council in August. He said that could possibly save a driver and a couple of employees on the crew.

Councilman Ebner asked how Norman Dunagan and Dumpster Depot fit into the picture with recycling. Mr. Coakley stated the city picks up the recycling materials, and we take it to his facility on the Bypass. It was pointed out that the market had dropped significantly for recyclable materials.

Councilman Dewar stated there seems to be a sense to close The Alley to vehicles. He wondered if there is a way to do that and still collect garbage from the restaurants. Mr. Coakley stated we had asked for Requests for Qualifications two weeks ago for qualified businesses that would be interested in helping us transition that block to a zero waste zone which is a lofty goal to recycle everything, including the food scraps. Appointments are set up with two candidates. The hope is to transition to compactors which change the frequency of how often they have to come. The goal is to be able to do it without putting

a vehicle of any type in The Alley. The portion being considered for closing to vehicle traffic is The Alley, not Bee Lane.

Councilman Dewar asked if there was a plan to maintain the parkways for mowing, edging, etc. Mr. Coakley stated there is nothing in writing, but there are plans as to how they operate. Mr. Coakley stated the maintenance is usually on about a two week cycle, but it fluctuates with how much rain we are getting. If it is hot and dry, sometimes we can go to a three week cycle as it does not grow as much. He said currently we are behind so we have put out extra crews. In response to a question regarding mowing the Airport, Mr. Coakley stated his crews do not mow the airport. That is done with the Engineering & Utilities crews.

Councilman Dewar asked Mr. Coakley if he was happy with the budget he proposed. Mr. Coakley responded that he is for the two distinct parts of the Public Services Department. He pointed out that the Solid Waste Division is an enterprise fund and the budget is very similar to last year's budget. The other budget is the Buildings and Grounds maintenance. He pointed out in that budget he plans to replace one temporary employee for two inmates. He noted that a lot of that budget depends on how much it rains.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Hopeland Farms

Law Suit

Mayor Osbon stated Council needs to go into executive session.

Mr. Gary Smith, City Attorney, stated the purpose of the executive session is to receive legal advice where the legal advice relates to a pending, threatened, or potential claim or other matters covered by the attorney, client privilege, settlement of legal claims, or the position of the public agency in other adversary situations involving the assertion against the agency of a claim. Specifically, City Council will discuss the possible settlement of a lawsuit against the City of Aiken by the residents of the Hopeland Farms neighborhood.

Councilman Dewar moved, seconded by Councilwoman Price, that Council go into executive session to discuss the matter stated by the City Attorney. The motion was unanimously approved.

Council went into executive session at 5:30 p.m.

After discussion Councilman Dewar moved, seconded by Councilwoman Price, that Council come out of executive session. The motion was unanimously approved.

Council came out of executive session at 6:00 p.m. Mayor Osbon reported Council had discussed the matter reported by the City Attorney and that no voting took place in the executive session.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.



Sara B. Ridout
City Clerk