



CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES February 27, 2018

The scheduled meeting of the Ontario City Council was called to order by Mayor Ronald Verini at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 27, 2018, in the Council Chambers of City Hall. Council members present were Ronald Verini, Norm Crume, Dan Capron, Ramon Palomo, Betty Carter, and Marty Justus. Tessa Winebarger was excused.

Members of staff present were Adam Brown, Tori Barnett, Larry Sullivan, Kari Ott, Terry Leighton, Cal Kunz, and Cliff Leeper.

The meeting was recorded and copies are available at City Hall.

Betty Carter led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA

This Agenda was posted on February 23, 2018. Copies of the Agenda are available from the City Hall Customer Service Counter and on the city's website www.ontariooregon.org.

Council direction to move New Business before Old Business, and to change New Business A to New Business B, and New Business B to New Business A.

CRUME moved, PALOMO seconded, **TO ADOPT THE AGENDA AS AMENDED**. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Carter-yes; Palomo-yes; Justus-yes; Capron-yes; Winebarger-out; Verini-yes. Motion carried 6/0/1.

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution #2018-112: Residency Requirement and Incentives for Residency Within the City of Ontario

Adam Brown, City Manager, presented.

This was a resolution requiring residency for certain positions employed by the City of Ontario and incentives for other employees to live in the city. Many in the community voiced beliefs that more city employees should live within the city boundaries or within the immediate area. The Ontario City Council was addressed by a local business owner at their February 8, 2018, meeting and took up discussion on the topic in their meeting. The Council's consensus was to bring a resolution back that would require high level positions with the city to live within the city boundaries and to provide an incentive available to all employees to live within the city.

By City Charter, the City Manager, Police Chief, and Fire Chief were required to live within the city boundaries, and all three currently met that requirement. It was his recommendation that all Department Heads should live within the city boundaries, or at least within the Urban Growth Area.

Discussions with the city's labor attorney convinced him that while the city could require new police officers and firefighters to live within the city limits because they were not yet covered by the union, it would likely be challenged by the unions, and the Employee Relations Board (ERB) would very likely rule in favor of the union members right to reside wherever they wanted.

The Council appeared to be amenable to offering an incentive for employees to live in the city. An incentive with no General Fund impact and minimal city financial impact would be to offer a credit of up to \$50 on a city employee's water and sewer account. The enacting resolution would read that the credit would not exceed the amount of the monthly utility bill. This would only be available for employees receiving water and sewer service from the city.

The city's current employee's residence was shown below as a percentage:

Where Employees Live	Percentage
Employees in Ontario Plus 97914	52%
Employees in Ontario	45%
Fire Personnel in Ontario	73%
Police Personnel in Ontario	30%
Living in Oregon	67%

The financial impact was the cost of providing the incentive. The Council had the option of setting a point at which the incentive would cease. For example, when 75% of employees lived within the city, the incentive would go away. This, however, would likely dis-incentivize employees who were thinking about moving if they thought it would only be a temporary incentive.

If every employee were to reside within the city, the total cost of providing an incentive would be \$28,200, which would be split between the Water and Sewer Fund. The cost of providing the incentive for employees who currently lived in the city would be \$11,400.

It was within the city's power to require Department Heads to live in the City of Ontario boundaries and to offer incentives for other employees to live within the city. It was recommended that the 97914 zip code be used for "living within the city"; however, the incentive would only apply to employees getting water and/or sewer service from the city.

If the Council opted to take no action on this issue, Department Heads should still be hired from within the city, but no incentives would be made to draw other employees into the city limits.

Councilor Capron asked, when they went out to hire someone, moving forward, would something be said about wanting that individual to live in the city? What could they legally do?

Mr. Brown stated that was how the conversation needed to go, that we wanted people who wanted to live in the city. He wouldn't be opposed to making that a preference. The candidate who might be close with another candidate for a position, would have a preference, particularly with law enforcement. That had a benefit to the city, having a local presence for officers, and firefighters, too.

Councilor Justus stated he thought that they were not just asking for the managers to live in the city, but asking that all employees live in the city. That included police and fire. Was that not correct?

Mr. Brown stated the discussion held was that they could go down the road of requiring or asking police and fire to have residency, but that it would likely be challenged, based on the cases heard by the Employee Relations Board in Oregon, and that they'd likely be successful in making that a mandatory term of bargaining. It was done in other states, and other states had been successful, but based on case law in Oregon, he didn't believe they'd be successful. He didn't have a problem, either, of including administrative staff that were not represented, going forward. He believed they could find for the very few, maybe five employees that were administrative, not department heads, but he had no issues with including them in the resolution. He wanted people to live in the city.

Councilor Justus verified it cost the city \$136K for one police officer? And a full-time firefighter was about \$92-93K?

Mr. Brown stated that those were actually closer together; he didn't have the exact numbers with him.

Councilor Justus stated for him, for the city to spend that kind of money on both fire and police, understanding they wanted the best, the city was close to being the highest paid place for fire and police. He really wanted the city's police and fire to live within the city limits, because of the cost. Someone said that we want the best, and he told them the city was offering the best pay, so that should bring the best here. For him, he wanted to include the fire and police personnel. If they wanted to sue the city because they didn't want to live within the Ontario city limits, that was understandable, and they had that right, but for him, he wanted them to live here. He was good with giving them a discount on the water bill, too, for living here, but because of the amount of money it cost the city, knowing that entry-level firemen and policemen did not receive the \$136K in their pocket, that was the cost for everything. That's what the citizens were paying for these people to work here. He wanted them here.

Councilor Crume asked Mr. Brown for his best guess if the city followed Councilor Justus's suggestion to require all employees – new hires – to live within the city limits, or within the 97914 area, if it came to union negotiation time, and they wanted to bargain for it, did he have a clue on how that might turn out?

Mr. Brown stated based on the best legal advice he had, the union would win in Oregon.

Councilor Crume stated if they had to bargain for it, what would the city have to bargain? Would the union be able to stop it completely or would they ask for more money for the requirement, or how would that play out?

Mr. Brown stated it was possible they could ask for more money, but he guessed they'd probably just say they didn't want that requirement placed on them.

Councilor Crume stated if they didn't try something, nothing was gained, but if they tried something, it could mean a change in the resolution.

Mr. Brown stated yes, and there would be the cost of litigation expense, too. They would lose nothing by passing a resolution that stated all employees were required to live in the 97914 zip code area. All *future* hires.

Councilor Crume stated if they did that, it wouldn't cost anything, unless they decided to fight a lawsuit from whichever union filed against it. At that time, the Council could discuss if they wanted to back off or fight it.

Mr. Brown stated it could be changed easily enough, if that was the direction the Council wanted to go.

Councilor Crume stated his agreement with Councilor Justus's idea. He would like to see something where Department Heads had to live within the city limits, and the remaining employees should live within the 97914 zip code area. He did want to hear what the citizens in attendance had to say on the matter.

Councilor Palomo voiced his agreement with Councilors Justus and Crume. If it was challenged, they'd deal with that, then.

Councilor Carter stated she was also in agreement.

Councilor Crume asked if they wanted to make the resolution for inside the city limits, or for all other employees besides Department Heads (mandatorily, they'd be in the city limits), but for new hires, should it be within the city limits, or should it be in the 97914 area, or the 8C School District, or what?

Mayor Verini stated he wanted further discussion,. He had no problem with the Department Head positions, hired after February 27, 2018, to be required to live in the city; and, if the employees receive a promotion, then they'd have a requirement over the next twelve months to also live in the city. But, he had a challenge with police and fire because, if he wasn't mistaken, many of the recent hires were hired from police departments in the local area, like just across the river, or down the road. So, they might have a situation that while there were people living in the community, had established homes, established residence with their families, and now, if they wanted to join the Ontario Police Department, they had to pull up roots in Nyssa, or Fruitland, and he thought they might get less people applying for jobs here at OPD, that had already been trained. He was referring to new hires.

Councilor Crume stated then how about trying this – and he wanted to hear from both Chief Kunz and Chief Leighton, to give their opinions on the issue – give it a try, see what it did to the employment pool in the future. They could always make changes to the resolution. Nothing ventured, nothing gained.

Councilor Capron stated if he was paid \$30K more a year, he'd ask where they wanted him to move. Name the town, he'd go. If to make that much money he was required to live there, he'd go. It wasn't that big a deal. You just make a place a home. If someone said they'd pay him that much to live in Burns, Oregon, well "hello Burns!".

Councilor Carter stated they were looking at this as something favorable for this community.

Councilor Palomo stated even if they had fewer applicants, they'd get the ones who wanted to be here.

Cal Kunz, Police Chief, stated he had heard things back and forth, and he did think there were pros and cons to this action. As far as hiring, when he hired someone, he looked at it as someone who would outlast him, so some who were being hired might work for this city for 20-30 years, so when they were searching for somebody, they wanted the most qualified candidate to fill that position. They had hired the last several laterals. One huge benefit was that they already had the police training and experience, and they were normally on the road within a month. Hiring someone fresh, they usually had to go through the state



academy, and it could take a year for that person to be on the streets, rather than a month. He thought the lateral pool would get much smaller, because there were people established maybe a mile outside the city, so it might limit the potential candidates. It would pretty much do away with laterals, or decrease it quite a bit. It was a big commitment to pick up roots for someone who was literally only a mile away. It was a crap shoot when hiring, but the bigger pool for potential hires, the better chance to get someone who was going to be successful for the next 20 or 30 years. Regarding dedication to the city, personally, when he first got hired with the Salt Lake City Police Department, he was the first class that had to live within the city. He signed a document agreeing, and he got the job. Within about a year, there was a union fight and the city decided to do away with that requirement. He stayed living in the city for another couple years; moved outside the city after that, and as far as dedication to the Salt Lake City Police Department, he has 21+ years of his life dedicated to that organization and that city. He didn't believe he felt any different depending where he drove to at the end of his shift. Looking at the officers here now, there were some that lived in Idaho, some here, some county, and these were some of the best cops he'd ever seen. Whether they lived here, there, or wherever, they were all committed to this community and he'd seen, over the past two years, a commitment beyond what they could expect for their employees. It was the person you got to bring into our community that had a passion for this community, not necessarily what their zip code was.

Terry Leighton, Fire Chief, stated his last employee was a very dedicated employee to Ontario Fire for over ten years. But he did, and does, live in Fruitland. He was one that they wanted to work here very bad. Another thought he had on it was definitely if it was anything, he agreed with living in this community. He wanted to move here when he got the job because he wanted to be involved. But, a big portion of his staff was part of this community. They grew up in this community, but lived outside the city limits. For 97914, they'd still have the people as part of Ontario, and they very much were, but a big part of his staff lived right across the street from the city limits. He thought they'd lose the opportunity to have a lot of good staff, people that were committed here. A lot of staff were volunteers, that had given many years, and they were ones that were being groomed and mentored to be part of the department, but to not be able to give them a job, would hurt a lot. He understood the commitment, but there was also the commitment to a lot of the firemen for a lot of years. It would be hard to not hire any of them after so many years of training being provided to them.

Dr. Ben Peterson: *I want to thank everybody for having me back and considering this topic, as I think it is critical to the future of Ontario. I want to thank everybody who showed up here tonight to support this idea to try to make this a better place for all of us to live. I just have to say, from my experience, I could not disagree with our Police Chief more. I have lived in Fruitland. I'm a dentist in Ontario. I did just as good a job as a dentist when I was in Ontario, as I did when I lived in Fruitland. In fact, I definitely do a better job now that I live in Ontario. When I lived in Fruitland, just by the fact that I was more connected to the people I was serving. I was aware of their individual situations, I was a resource, I'm a resource for my neighbors across the street, they know where to find me my patients. They know who I am; they know where to find me if there's a problem. For a police officer in particular, that was pretty critical. Some things that I've been able to do since moving to Ontario: bought a house; stabilized the neighborhood. Every time we don't have a police officer living in the neighborhood, or a teacher, or a principal, it creates instability in that neighborhood. Nine times out of ten, a house that came up for sale in Ontario, people were shaking in their boots, wondering what in the hell we're going to get. It's never a lateral thing in Ontario. Every time they pull a police officer or some middle class people in this community, instead of having a police car parked across the street from one of us, we have something we have to pay more money to police for. And I know that the city has a study that was done that specifically says that it does increase public safety if you have police officers living in your community and parking cars in the community. And here we are in a community, we're begging to have people like our police officers living with us. We pay them a tremendous amount of money. They can stabilize our communities, make them safer, they can buy a home, they can vote for a school bond, hold an elected position in the community, pay property taxes, promote our local schools, have children who go to our local schools, lead clubs, go to church, donate to churches, these are all things they can't do when they're not part of the community, and they don't do. And I'll tell you, working on school bonds and the baseball field, those projects. You cannot find one dollar and one minute of time that was ever donated by a teacher or administrator who did not live in Ontario. If you go look, who are our coaches at school? Who coaches after school? Of our teaching staff, about half live in Ontario, and half live across the river. Almost every single coach we have lives in Ontario. It's human nature. Look at someone's rental property compared to their home residence. We need these people living with us. We spend a tremendous amount of money paying them to be here, and their presence makes our community more stable and it makes it much safer. So I completely disagree with our Police Chief. I hope you guys do what you originally talked about and try to have these people live here to set an example not just for, set an example that we can then apply to our public school system, which is probably the worst offender, and then on to the either the prison or the college, and I think this would completely change the landscape of this community. Thank you very much.*

Bruce Tuttle: *My name is Bruce Tuttle, and I'm a former Council member. I was born in this town and I would like to see this town grow. I don't know if I'm going to die here, but I don't want to see Ontario die. I think we need all the people, administration, I do agree with the Chief, if you got a new hire and he has to live somewhere in the 97914, fine. If he's an administrator, he needs to be in the city limits. He needs to pay the taxes. We need them. We don't have a pool; we don't have this, and we don't have that. We're not going to get it until we make a statement. If you don't want to live in Ontario, don't apply for the job. If we can get a lateral hire from a police officer that we know is going to be good for Ontario, good for the citizens, then let's hire him and say, "you know, can you ease into the 97914", but if you are an administrator, you should have a form that says you're going to. If we have to make that fight at some time, they say "no, we're not going to do that", then let's*

take it up at that time. I think that everything that we do, I heard by the grapevine that there are great incentives for building a house in Ontario; there's great incentives for buying a house in Ontario, tax wise and permit wise, and everything that you have to do to have a new build in Ontario. I heard this not through the newspaper, but through word of mouth. I think if we have these things going on that are positive to Ontario, we need it in our newspaper. If we're not going to get it in our newspaper, change the name to The Fruitland Observer. Thank you very much.

Michelle Grimaldo: I am Michelle Grimaldo, and for the record, I am married to an Ontario City Police Officer. So, what a tough issue. Tough, tough, tough. I understand the goal behind it to grow Ontario, the city, the commitment to the city. I can tell ya, attacking police and fire is not the way to go. If you've ever been involved in a mutual aid situation where we need every community around us, regardless of whether they're across the river or not, you'd know that's the way to go. However, the idea of having administrators in our schools and in our city, if we can encourage them to live within 97914, I might be in to that, if we can figure out how to make it happen. But strong arming them to do that, I'm just not a fan of that. I don't think that's wise in any way. So many of our community organizations in this area, in the Treasure Valley, focus on it's a river, not a wall, and I think that this policy violates that. It's a river, not a wall. We need everyone within the radius to accomplish so many of things that we accomplish. We pursue economic development beyond mutual aid and that's a big deal. If you've ever gotten a call at 2:00 a.m. to say hey Payette, we've got a fire in Ontario, we need your resources, and they're there within 15 minutes, ya, it's a river, not a wall. Economic development, we pursue that through SREDA together across the river. Again, I understand what we want to accomplish by having administrators live in Ontario, and maybe we can get to that, but demanding it or strong arming it is not the way to go.

Niki Cutler: My name is Niki Cutler, and like Michelle, my husband is a police officer here in Ontario. I agree and disagree with that a little bit on the fact that please be clear when we talk about our police officers. My husband and I both, we moved to Ontario, I was a teacher here at the time, and he came on the police force we moved here to be part of our community. There have been multiple discussions in that time of moving out of city limits. It's hard to raise a family when you're a police officer and you live in town. It's hard to have people follow your kids home. It's hard to have your house targeted, and to have people arrested with your address in their pocket. All of which has happened in the six years since my husband's been a police officer here. We never wanted to leave Ontario; we still don't. But please be very clear on the city limits and the zip code issue, especially when you're talking about the people who do live with some of the people that aren't as savory in our community that do have a way of finding things out and realizing that some part of the reason people are officers in a city away from where they live is to keep their families safe, and to keep them out of that spotlight. So please, consider that when making your decision.

Randy Bower: My name is Randy Bower. I agree with Ben. I think we need the tax revenue. We need the people living here. It's, I guess, if we post our speed limits and said hey these speed limits are suggestions, nobody would follow them. They need to be enforced. They need to live here. They need to live in our community. They're living in other communities. They're working here because they're getting paid more money. They can live here. There's housing. I agree with Niki. I think they should have some latitude. We're in a farming community. I live outside the city limits. I have acreage. I have horses. I have animals. You can't have those in the city limits. So I think there should be some latitude of where they could live, within this 979, this community here, so they can have acreage, and they can have animals if they wanted to, where they couldn't inside the city limits. We have superintendents, we have a lot of people that don't live here in this community, and I just think it's crazy. I was born in Boise, but I've lived here my whole life. I moved back to this area. My wife's a school teacher. We've planted roots. Kids go to this school. I went to this school. I graduated from the high school. This town, when I was here, was different. Fruitland, Gayway Junction, was kind of the seedy area of town, and it's just kind of flipped. Everybody wants to go there. I don't get it. I don't know if it's cheaper taxes or what it is, but we need to draw more people, there's no growth. There's no growth. You see the houses going over there, and they have a few subdivisions over here where there's just a few brand new homes that are being built in this community, and I just don't get it. I don't understand how come we can't get them here and live here and be a part of it and have some pride in the community. I know it's tough for new hires, but if you just said, hey, this is where you have to live, and give them a grace period and say you've got to figure it out and get it done, you have so much time to sell your house and move to this community, but they need to be here. They need to be part of this community. This is our community. They can't vote, they can't pay taxes, they can't do those things. They can't come here and be a part of the City Council because they don't live in this state. They live in a different state. And it's the State of Idaho, not the State of Oregon. We live here. This is our community. We take pride in it, and we want those people to live here and be a part of this community.

Councilor Capron asked Dr. Peterson if when he first wrote this up, was he pushing for everybody in the city or was he pushing for the administration of the city, and everyone else just in 97914? What was his goal?

Dr. Peterson: Originally, it was just administrators and the top brass, department heads, and then creating incentives for rank and file, within the confines of the 8C School District boundary. This has kind of evolved beyond that, which I'm great with. I just think from a public safety standpoint, as many police officers that we can get in the community, the better. I love it. On a street where my office is, we have a Malheur County Sheriff's officer and she parks her car in her driveway. It's nice to see. I think as many police officers and I definitely understand the concerns that Niki brought up, without a doubt, but I would venture to guess that a majority of our police officers live in Fruitland or Payette. You could live a lot further away from Ontario and still be in the 8C district boundaries. If these people were living in Boise, I'd understand that, but I don't think that's the case. I think most of



the Fruitland Police Officers live in Fruitland, the majority, so it's kind of contradictory. 8C school district boundaries are what I envisioned.

Councilor Crume asked if anybody knew what the boundary difference was between 8C and 97914.

Councilor Capron stated growing up, he lived on Morgan Avenue. It was a Vale school district with an Ontario address, the 97914. The name changed to Arabian. That went down on the west side of the Butte. It was still 97914 in part of that.

Dan Cummings, Economic Development Director, stated he wasn't sure exactly where the 8C boundary was, but Imperial Avenue was one border. Years ago, in '73, he lived on the south side, so he was in the Nyssa school district, but he had an Ontario address of 97914. He was supposed to have sent his kids to Nyssa, but they were too young for school at that time. He didn't know if the 97914 would be the answer, because 97914 went clear to Annex, so they'd need to include the people in Annex in that.

Councilor Justus asked if the Library District mirrored the school district.

Mr. Cummings stated it did.

Councilor Crume stated if they were to do something of this nature, moving forward, to have all new hires live within the 8C district, in the resolution they'd have to add a time frame for them to move here, correct?

Mr. Brown stated yes. He'd also sent an alternative amendment to the resolution, if the Council wanted to do that. It read the zip code, but they could change that to the school boundaries, if that was what Council wanted. It also said, which was something he worked with Dr. Peterson on, the language would be six months for new hires, and twelve months for promotions, or vice-versus. He had emailed it.

Councilor Palomo stated he knew they were talking about the police officers, when they started this, everyone that was already employed was grandfathered in, correct? Anything moving forward would be affected. Whoever was already here, wherever they were living, that stayed the same.

Councilor Carter stated they were grandfathered in, but with a promotion it would change.

Mr. Brown confirmed that was correct. His amendment addressed the promotion.

Mayor Verini read the amendment to the audience: "All Department Head positions hired after February 27, 2018, which are not contracted out, shall be required to live within the city limits and all employees are required to live within the 97914 zip code, within six months of the commencement of employment. Existing city employees who are promoted to Department Head positions shall also be required to comply with the terms hereof within twelve months of said promotion. Failure to comply shall be deemed a voluntary termination of employment."

Councilor Crume stated there had been a recommendation that they could have a \$50 utility incentive for each employee who lived within the city. Would that be included in the amendment, or would that wording have to be added in?

Mr. Brown stated it was in a subsequent paragraph in the resolution. The Council would only be amending that first section.

Councilor Justus asked if someone was eligible for rehire, and they lived outside the city limits, and they applied, and the city wanted to rehire them, that applicant would be subject to residency.

Mr. Brown stated yes.

Councilor Justus stated they had to look at the city from a point of weakness, not a point of strength, because that was where the city was. They needed, as a Council, to show that they wanted the city to grow, and they wanted the people that benefited from the city's tax dollars, that they cared about that and wanted them here. He wanted the Council to say that city employees, including police and fire, had to come into the city limits. He understood that as they grew, and the whole idea was for them to grow, they could amend that. When they had a strong, three police officers living within the city limits, and one that didn't, it was a different position then they were in now. Right now, it was one police officer inside and four outside the city limits. It's because of the policies that had been set forth in the past, and not wanting to confront it. The Council was in a position now to say Ontario Strong, Ontario First, and if it was going to be said, then SAY it, and not be weak about it. Ontario Strong, Ontario First. That was his position.

Councilor Crume asked how to propose a motion with those changes.

Councilor Capron asked if the city would be hit with the same lawsuit if they said 8C compared to the city.

Mr. Brown stated yes. He believed it would be challenged either way. That was based upon a conversation with the union attorney. The real issue was out of state. He had included the numbers of employees living out of the state for Council. Some were in Nyssa, some toward Vale. But they would all be grandfathered in. It wasn't necessarily about growing it, but more about making it stronger. Ontario didn't have to be Boise; they just wanted to make our community stronger.

CAPRON moved, CRUME seconded, **THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE RESOLUTION #2018-112, A RESOLUTION REQUIRING RESIDENCY FOR ALL DEPARTMENT HEAD POSITIONS HIRED AFTER FEBRUARY 27, 2018, WHICH ARE NOT CONTRACTED OUT, SHALL BE REQUIRED TO LIVE WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS AND ALL EMPLOYEES ARE REQUIRED TO LIVE WITHIN THE 8C SCHOOL DISTRICT WITHIN SIX MONTHS OF THE COMMENCEMENT OF EMPLOYMENT. EXISTING CITY EMPLOYEES WHO ARE PROMOTED TO DEPARTMENT HEAD POSITIONS SHALL ALSO BE REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS HEREOF WITHIN TWELVE MONTHS OF SAID PROMOTION. FAILURE TO COMPLY SHALL BE DEEMED A VOLUNTARY TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT.** No vote....

Councilor Justus verified that this resolution stated Department Heads would live within the city limits, and employees would live within 8C, excluding Oster and CH2. They weren't requiring all the new hires to come into the city; they were just requiring all new hires to come into 8C.

VOTE: Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Carter-yes; Palomo-yes; Justus-no; Capron-yes; Winebarger-out; Verini-yes. Motion carried 5/1/1.

New Draft NPDES Permit for Wastewater Discharge

Betsy Roberts, City Engineer, and Paul Woods, Woods Consulting, presented.

The City of Ontario's wastewater discharge permit, known as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System or NPDES permit, expired in 2008. NPDES permits were authorized for 5-year terms and permit holders were required to apply for renewal every 5 years. The City filed for renewal of the NPDES permit in 2007 and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality administratively extended the prior permit conditions every year since 2008.

DEQ recently completed a draft NPDES permit for the city's Wastewater Treatment Facility, the first since 2008. A draft of the permit was provided to the city on January 26, 2018, and comments on the draft permit would be due to DEQ by March 16, 2018. After receiving comments from the city, DEQ would provide public notice of the permit and allow 35 days for public comment. After the public comment period, DEQ would then take a final action on the permit.

Once the permit was issued by DEQ, the city or other third parties would have the right to appeal any conditions of the permit. Providing comments to DEQ as requested in advance of issuing the draft permit for public comment would not legally bind the city regarding a future decision to appeal or not appeal the permit once a final action was taken by DEQ. However, the pre-draft comments to DEQ from the permit holder typically provided arguments consistent with the issues raised on appeal.

In the event that the city appealed the final permit, the new permit essentially remained in affect during the appeal process, including the schedule of compliance deadlines. If the appeal was upheld, a new permit would be issued; if it was denied, the permit and original compliance deadlines remained as written.

The new NPDES permit would include for the first time new effluent limits for new pollutants. The most notable were the new final effluents limit for arsenic and hydrogen sulfide. According to DEQ staff, Ontario would be the first municipal Wastewater Treatment Facility in the State of Oregon to have a final effluent limit for arsenic at this low concentration. Identification and elimination of the sources of arsenic in wastewater required more study and investment in the elimination of arsenic from the wastewater collection system. However, even with these efforts further treatment would be needed and the city's current aerated lagoon treatment system did not have the capability of meeting the new final effluent limit. The city would need to undertake extensive study to determine how to comply with the limit and final compliance might exceed the affordability criteria for the community in achieving final compliance.

The draft permit provided a 15-year schedule of compliance to attain the final effluent limit for arsenic, but a number of interim tasks had to be completed in accordance with a set timeline. The schedule of compliance provided an opportunity for the city to comply with the final effluent limit for arsenic through a variance application once more data was collected in the future.

A point of contention between city staff and DEQ staff remained in the fact that the final effluent limit for arsenic imposed on the city would do nothing to achieve the final water quality standard for the Snake River without dramatic efforts to address other sources of arsenic. The city's wastewater flow was less than 0.1% of the total river flow in the Snake River and DEQ had no resources allocated for addressing non-point source pollution from arsenic. Without additional efforts to reduce other sources of arsenic, the city would be potentially spending millions of dollars without any measureable improvement in arsenic

concentrations in the Snake River. City staff requested that the schedule of compliance be tied to equal efforts to reduce arsenic from other sources.

In June 2010, the Environmental Protection Agency disapproved the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality's water quality criteria over concerns that the criteria were not sufficiently protective for people who consumed fish from waters within the state. DEQ revised the state's water quality criteria through rulemaking and published the new criteria in June 2011. EPA then approved the new criteria. A detailed information sheet produced by DEQ was attached for informational purposes.

There were numerous implications of the new water quality criteria that had impacted the draft NPDES permit for the city, including greater monitoring and reporting and study requirements. However, the greatest concern was the new pollutant limits for arsenic, copper and mercury. These pollutants were bio-accumulative toxins that aggregated in fish tissue. The pollutant with the greatest impact to the wastewater treatment process was arsenic. The new discharge criteria for arsenic was lower than the current drinking water standard and arsenic removal was not achievable with the current aerated lagoon treatment system.

In June 2016, DEQ notified the city that a new NPDES Permit was being drafted and it would include new limits as required by the new state water quality criteria. Immediately, staff engaged with DEQ in an effort to convey the concerns of the city and to have those concerns reflected in the issuance of the new NPDES permit.

The initial request from the city was to delay issuance of the new NPDES permit in order to allow the city time to undertake studies and assessments to determine if the city was able to comply with the final effluent limit for arsenic or if a variance was appropriate. After completion of the studies, the city would update the 2007 NPDES permit renewal application and a new NPDES permit would be issued with certainty as to how the city would achieve compliance with the final effluent limit for arsenic. DEQ rejected this request on the grounds that DEQ was under a court order to reduce the statewide backlog of NPDES permits.

The city inquired of DEQ staff as to the appropriateness of different variance options as a path to final compliance. The first inquiry was for use of an intake credit for water supply withdrawn from the Snake River and treated as drinking water. An intake credit was outlined in DEQ guidance as a potential method of compliance. The response to date has been that the intake credit would not apply to concentrations of arsenic water withdrawn from the Snake River (4-6ppm), but rather the credit would only apply to concentrations of arsenic introduced into the drinking water system (1-2ppm). The application of an intake credit in this manner does not provide a method of compliance for the final effluent limit for arsenic for the City. The second request was for a site-specific background condition and this too was rejected. The final inquiry was for a variance based on affordability criteria and DEQ acknowledged that this may be applicable depending on the results of future study and analysis.

City staff also inquired as to viability of achieving the water quality standard in the Snake River given the magnitude of non-point source contributions and flow modification of the river. Under the Clean Water Act, there was a provision to modify a water quality standard through a Use Attainability Study. DEQ's response to date was that DEQ was not pursuing a Use Attainability Study and efforts to do so would be borne by watershed stakeholders. The success of Use Attainability Studies in modifying water quality standards was extremely limited and expensive to undertake. DEQ also has indicated that there were no financial resources allocated to DEQ to develop a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) which was a plan to achieve the water quality standard through pollutant load allocations to point and non-point sources.

NPDES: A special permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that monitors discharge of certain pollutants.

TMDL: The maximum amount of pollutant that a body of water can receive while still meeting water quality standards.

NON-POINT SOURCE: A source of pollution that issues from widely distributed or pervasive environmental elements.

POINT SOURCE: A localized and stationary pollution source.

As background, regarding inorganic arsenic levels in system:

Location	Inorganic Arsenic Level (ug/l)
River (background)	3.8
Well Water (background)	4.6
WTP Effluent	1.5
Influent to WWTP (end of collection system)	3.9
WWTP Effluent	6

The proposed permit contained the following substantive changes from the 2004 permit:

Schedule A – The following changes to the effluent limits in Schedule A are described below:

Parameter	Limit type	Old Limit	New Limit	Comment
BOD5	Average Weekly	1150 lb/day	1100 lb/day	Updated calculations
TSS	Average Weekly	3600 lb/day	3300 lb/day	Updated calculations
pH		Between 6 and 10	Between 6 and 9	To reflect Basin Standard
Total Residual Chlorine	Daily Max	0.1 mg/l	0.02 mg/l	To reflect ambient concentrations
Total Residual Chlorine	Average monthly	0.04 mg/l	0.01 mg/l	To reflect ambient concentrations
Ammonia: Interim Limit	Daily Max		30.1 mg/l	Per compliance schedule
Ammonia: Interim Limit	Average monthly		11.7 mg/l	Per compliance schedule
Ammonia: Final Limit	Daily Max		9.8 mg/l	Per compliance schedule
Ammonia: Final Limit	Average monthly		5.5 mg/l	Per compliance schedule
Arsenic: Interim Limit	Daily Max		11.0 ug/l	New limit
Arsenic: Interim Limit	Average monthly		7.6 ug/l	New limit
Arsenic: Final Limit	Daily Max		2.5 ug/l	New limit
Arsenic: Final Limit	Average monthly		2.1 ug/l	New limit
Sulfide Hydrogen Sulfide: Interim Limit	Daily Max		160.3 mg/l	New limit
Sulfide Hydrogen Sulfide: Interim Limit	Average monthly		59.5 mg/l	New limit
Sulfide Hydrogen Sulfide: Final Limit	Daily Max		3.42 mg/l	New limit
Sulfide Hydrogen Sulfide: Final Limit	Average monthly		1.97 mg/l	New limit

In addition to the changes to the facility's effluent limits, the following changes were reflected in **Schedule A** of the permit.

- **Mixing Zone:** a regulatory mixing zone was granted to the facility.
- **Biosolids:** requirements for the facility to develop and submit a bio-solids management plan and land application plan to the department for review were included in the Schedule. Additionally, the Schedule included biosolids management requirements and pollutant limits.
- **Chlorine usage:** the schedule describes the chlorine based effluent disinfection system and the effluent limits.
- **Mercury Minimization Plan:** the schedule included a requirement for the permittee to conduct monitoring and then develop and implement a plan to identify sources of mercury, reduce the inputs into the collection system and quantify the improvements in effluent quality.

Schedule B – The following changes were reflected in Schedule B of the permit:

- **Electronic reporting:** the permittee is directed to submit various reporting data electronically
- **Effluent Monitoring:** the permit includes the direct requirement to monitor the effluent for a series of priority pollutants rather than relying upon application requirements
- **Ambient Monitoring:** the permit includes requirements for the permittee to perform ambient characterization monitoring
- **Mixing Zone:** the permittee will conduct a mixing zone study and submit a report to the department
- **Pre-treatment:** the permittee will conduct a Significant Industrial Users Survey as a general permit requirement and no-longer as part of a compliance schedule
- **Mercury Minimization:** the permittee will develop a mercury minimization program and submit to the department for approval. The permittee will monitor the mercury concentration in the effluent and report the mass loading rate of mercury to the receiving waterbody
- **Biosolids:** the permittee will conduct a Bio-solids depth and mapping survey to quantify sludge depths and determine level of treatment cell effectiveness. The permittee will conduct biosolids monitoring in support of the facilities approved biosolids monitoring plan
- **Analytical Limits:** the permittee is required to meet minimum analytical limits, where indicated, for all required monitoring
- **Temperature:** the permittee will monitor and report the effluent for temperature
- **Conventional parameters:** the permittee will monitor the concentration of alkalinity, hardness and total dissolved solids in the effluent and in the receiving waterbody upstream of the outfall
- **Copper and Aluminum:** Ambient, mixed and effluent data to support the development of site-specific water quality criteria and determination of reasonable potential.

Schedule C – The permittee will implement a series of tasks described in the Compliance Schedule to accomplish the following tasks:

- Ammonia: design and construct an in-stream diffuser as to meet effluent limits for ammonia
- pH: design and construct a pH treatment system to meet effluent limits for pH
- Arsenic: develop and implement an arsenic minimization program
- Arsenic and Hydrogen Sulfide: develop and implement a facility plan to address excess concentration of arsenic and hydrogen sulfide in the effluent

Schedule D – The following changes are reflected in Schedule D of the permit:

- I&I: the permittee is directed to develop and implement an Inflow Removal Program
- Mixing Zone: as described in Schedule B and C, the permittee will conduct a mixing zone study and submit a report to the department
- Emergency Response: the permittee is directed to develop and maintain an Emergency Response and Public Notification Plan
- Biosolids Management: the permittee is directed to develop and maintain a Biosolids Management Plan
- Land Application: the permittee is directed to develop and maintain a Land Application Plan
- Solids Transfers: the permittee is directed to manage transfers of wastewater solids according to the requirements described in the permit
- Hauled Waste: the permittee is directed to manage the acceptance of hauled wastes according to the requirements described in the permit
- Recycled Water Use Plan: the permittee is directed to update the plan and submit to DEQ for approval by the end of the second year of the permit term.

The new NPDES permit for the City of Ontario will require considerable investment in order to attain compliance. An estimate of additional costs above the current base condition is provided below:

NEW COSTS (ESTIMATED) IN FIRST PERMIT CYCLE	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5
PH CONTROL SYSTEM INSTALLATION AND OPERATION MIXING ZONE STUDY DIFFUSER	\$10,000	\$100,000 \$50,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
	\$5,000	\$50,000			\$50,000
POLLUTANT SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM (ARSENIC, I/I)			\$50,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
WATER QUALITY MONITORING	\$60,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
BIOSOLIDS MONITORING & MANAGEMENT PLAN	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$25,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
MERCURY MINIMIZATION PLAN	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
TOTAL	\$95,000	\$255,000	\$135,000	\$320,000	\$370,000
Total over 5-year Term \$1,175,000					

NEW COSTS (ESTIMATED) IN SECOND PERMIT CYCLE	YEAR 6	YEAR 7	YEAR 8	YEAR 9	YEAR 10
PH CONTROL	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
WATER QUALITY MONITORING	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
BIOSOLIDS MONITORING AND REPORTING	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
POLLUTANT SOURCE REDUCTION PROGRAM (ARSENIC)	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
FACILITY PLAN STUDY OUTLINE	\$25,000				
FACILITY PLAN (TECHNICAL & FINANCIAL ANALYSIS)		\$350,000	\$250,000		
FACILITY PLAN PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PARTICIPATION			\$50,000	\$50,000	
PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING TO SECURE FINANCING				\$100,000	\$100,000
OBTAIN FINANCING					\$125,000
DEBT SERVICE RESERVE FOR NEW DEBT FINANCING		\$100,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$500,000
TOTAL	\$340,000	\$765,000	\$865,000	\$765,000	\$1,040,000
Total over 5-year Term \$3,775,000					

Estimate for third 5-year period

The final compliance pathway for arsenic cannot be determined at this time but we know the three most likely pathways to compliance are as follows:

- Elimination of arsenic sources sufficient to obtain the limit without treatment;
- Additional wastewater storage infrastructure sufficient to eliminate discharge to the Snake River; or
- New wastewater treatment infrastructure to remove arsenic.

The costs for compliance could range from \$25-\$75 million in improvements that would need to be financed over as long a period as possible in order to keep rates below EPA's affordability criteria of 2% of Median Household Income. In the event the required improvements could not be implemented without exceeding the affordability criteria, the city would be eligible for a variance in complying with the water quality standard for arsenic.

The response to DEQ was due by March 16, 2018.

A final decision on whether to appeal any provision of the new NPDES permit would follow final action on the permit by DEQ.

CRUME moved, CARTER seconded, **THE CITY COUNCIL AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO PROVIDE WRITTEN COMMENTS TO THE OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (DEQ) OUTLINING THE CITY'S CONCERNS ON THE DRAFT NPDES PERMIT FOR THE CITY'S WASTEWATER TREATMENT OPERATIONS.** Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Carter-yes; Palomo-yes; Justus-yes; Capron-yes; Winebarger-out; Verini-yes. Motion carried 6/0/1.

OLD BUSINESS**Discussion of Resolution #2005-127: A Resolution Establishing Fees and Charges for Sewer Use Regulations, Sewer Service Rates and Charges, and Disposal of Septic Tank Sludge** **TABLED**

Adam Brown, City Attorney, stated this discussion item had been brought forward by Council Carter.

Councilor Carter asked to table this issue to the next Work Session. Council concurred.

Discussion of Service Load and Impacts on Service Delivery at City Hall

Adam Brown, City Manager, presented an oral report.

The irony of this item was that he hadn't had time to put together the presentation that said he didn't have time to do everything the Council wanted him to do. Staff had been extremely busy. He had spoken to several Councilors about the challenges being faced for covering the front desk. Staff interviewed a temp yesterday, and that individual would be starting next Tuesday, for about 20 hours a week. There had been great participation from other departments who had loaned personnel for a day, from three different departments. However, even with that, there was the challenge to keep up with the financial work that needed to be done for the city. The temp person would help a lot, but there were some big items coming up. Budget season felt like a full-time job by itself, on top of what else was going on, and was upon them currently. They were not fully staffed to make that happen, so that was going to be difficult. For the committees, they had established with good intention and they were of great value, but it would be difficult to handle between now and June, or whenever the adoption of the budget was complete, those being the Marijuana Ad Hoc Committee and the Diversity Advisory Committee. Staff was looking at things that maybe they didn't have to be involved with and trying to prioritize things to meet deadlines.

Mayor Verini stated they wanted to move the city forward but there wasn't enough personnel to put it all together. It was his understanding, following a conversation with Mr. Brown, that staff would like the Marijuana Ad Hoc Committee and the Diversity Advisory Committee placed on hold until there was enough personnel to manage things.

Mr. Brown stated it would be when the budget process was completed. There were some community volunteers with DAC that were offering some assistance in running that committee, but it would still require staff attendance and follow-through.

Mayor Verini asked, with the addition of a part-time front desk person, and possibly setting the MAHC and DAC to the side, temporarily, would staff have the ability of keeping the front desk open every day, or did they need to cut back there?

Mr. Brown stated he believed they could keep the front open every day. He was grateful for the Council allowing staff to try different things, to see what would work. Staff had attempted to not fill that position, but it wasn't working. It posed challenges if they were to close any additional hours because of appointments to meet staff, and the door would need to be unlocked. He would hate to reduce the hours more than they already had been. But, Council needed to be aware that there was a lot going on and staff had full plates, and they were attempting to get by without filling the position. If the Council was amendable to postponing the kick-off of those two committees, that would be very helpful.

Mayor Verini stated they needed to get a press release out; he noted that the reporter covering for the Argus had already departed.

Councilor Capron asked the dates of the budget meetings.

Mr. Brown stated the budget calendar had been set for mid to late April. They also needed to wait until after the election to see which budget would be approved. The budget would be adopted in June.

Councilor Capron verified the committees would be moving forward in late June or July.

Mayor Verini stated the suggestion was to postpone those two committees until June, after the budget process was finished, and authorize the hiring of a front desk person.

Mr. Brown stated there was no action needed on the personnel, as that was within his authority.

Council consensus to postpone the activation of the Marijuana Ad Hoc Committee and the Diversity Advisory Committee.

HAND-OUTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

(All items attached)

Agenda

Airport Committee: 02/26/2018

V&C Board: 03/01/2018

Planning Commission: 03/05/2018

Minutes

V&C Board: 02/01/2018

Planning Commission: 11/06/2017

Public Works Committee: 11/14/2017 and 01/09/2018

County Court: 02/07/2018

CORRESPONDENCE, COMMENTS, AND EX-OFFICIO REPORTS

Councilor Capron stated on the budget process, due to Kari's maternity leave, had Oster replaced her? Were they contractually obligated to replace her? Who had been doing the budget work?

Mr. Brown stated they had not, and it was behind. He would have to take a much more active role. He would review the contract to see the provisions.

Councilor Capron stated it was Lent, so Knights of Columbus Fish Fry down at Kirkpatrick Hall behind the Catholic Church. All you could eat fish, homemade macaroni and cheese, deep-fried mushrooms, French fries, homemade coleslaw, homemade clam chowder, and all the beer you could drink for \$10. Every Friday until Good Friday.

Councilor Crume commented to both Chiefs. Regarding his decision on the employee residency resolution, he totally heard their concerns and believed part of their concerns were correct. It would shorten up the candidate pool. However, he also believed, strongly, nothing ventured, nothing gained. Ontario would be a stronger community if more city employees who worked here, or were paid by the tax payers, lived and helped promote this community. He was willing to try something. Part of him felt he shouldn't tell someone where to live, but the city had suffered for several years because people didn't want to live here, and didn't, so it was an attempt to try something new.



Councilor Crume stated from the Airport Committee, one issue they'd be looking at, if someone built a hangar in a new area, there were multiple expenses for doing that. One was whether it needed water and sewer, and that had been a problem in the past. In some areas, they'd reached a solution; however, another issue had been a taxiway from the hangar to the runway. That was a huge expense to put down asphalt. That had created some problems for people to spend that type of money. And, the city hadn't had money to afford to build, either. An issue brought up was the original positioning that was in the CIP program to relocate the ag pilots down on the south end of the runway. That might not be the best idea because of the noise pollution area near several homes. A recommendation made by the committee was to look at other areas on the airport, like the northwest side. It was possible that a different area to locate the ag pilots and their operation area could be found. In that Master Plan, there was also plans for the extension of taxiways to move the airplanes in and out of that area. Possibly, the new area, that money could be used to utilize that area and/or to help other new hangars hook into those areas where it wasn't just gravel. There was some possibilities a new area could be looked at to where the Master Plan and FAA money could be used in a better way of tracking new hangars and new people to the area. None of that had been figured out – it was all in discussion.

Councilor Crume stated Mr. Brown had been working with TVCC and Silverhawk Aviation to get some things done, with regard to their hangar and where they were at with the city maybe purchasing hangars to lease out or sell.

Councilor Justus stated Citizens for a Better Ontario were meeting at 1475 NW 6th Avenue on March 1, at 6:00 p.m. Yes, they'd be talking sales tax. Don't come if you didn't support it.

Mayor Verini stated it was not a public meeting; it was private.

Councilor Justus stated Revitalize Ontario had a very successful mixer last Wednesday, and thanked everyone for their support.

Councilor Carter voiced her pleasure at the status of the Splash Pad. The ground breaking was great, even though very windy.

Councilor Palomo stated there were Girl Scout cookies on sale. Please stop buy their booth and give some support. Booths were everywhere, including Kinney & Keele, Wal mart, and Red Apple.

Mayor Verini asked for an update on Tom Frazier and the FBO situation.

Mr. Brown stated Mr. Frazier had assigned it to his attorney, who was working with the City Attorney. That building did fill a necessary hole in the aviation program coming to Ontario. It was one of many pieces that needed to fall into place. Staff had met with Silverhawk Aviation, representatives from TVCC, and the Airport Manager. He wasn't at liberty to reveal much, but they were moving fast. They had to have a presence at the Ontario Airport for two years before they could get established or accredited. They asked how quickly the city could supply water and sewer, and were told they'd have it before the building was even built. Also, staff had retooled the hangar build project to something that could compute out better financially. He could see why the city hadn't had any new hangars. Even though they were highly sought after, they were expensive to build and the return on them was extremely marginal. However, they wouldn't see the airport grow unless they had more hangars. He was doing the math on the issue, to see if they could make the financing work, and what the rents would need to be to make the finances work. They had switched to a project that would require much less infrastructure, and would be more bricks and mortar on pavement that was already there.

Mr. Brown stated staff met with BLM's upper management from Burns, along with local management, and they had big ideas for Ontario. Staff told them we'd do whatever was needed to make that happen.

Mr. Brown stated the park charette that evening had been fun. He thanked those who were able to attend. Wasn't a large attendance, but he'd talked to a lot of people. Most of his time was after hours, not on city time.

Councilor Carter stated with regard to the residency requirements and the incentive resolution they'd passed earlier, she'd just received a text asking if the Council would consider doing an impact study to see the effects on police and fire personnel. She'd be interested in pursuing that option.

Mr. Brown stated he didn't think it was a study that they could conduct; he believed, it would be something they needed to let play out a little and report back on regular intervals. There wouldn't be another retirement until next year, but there was also one person who could potentially go this year.

Mayor Verini stated this action was not set in stone; the resolution could be amended. If the Council and/or staff saw challenges, adjustments could be made.

Councilor Carter stated they'd always considered Ontario a border town, so they'd always allowed and had the whole "we're not a wall" thing, so were they going to now become that wall? They needed to be open-minded and positive about which direction this would take the city.

Mr. Brown stated if they wanted the full effect of officers present in the neighborhoods, maybe they needed to consider officers being able to take home cars. Visibility was one of the aspects. There were not currently enough cars for every officer to drive one home, but there might be enough for those who currently resided in Ontario. If they already lived in the city, it would be a very minimal expense. It was his understanding that officers shared vehicles (red team with a blue team member).

Chief Leighton stated he had two fire departments, and one was outside of the city limits. A large part of their funding came from people outside the limits. The SRCI contract came into play, too.

Chief Leighton suggested that for those committees that were being put on hold, the members should hear it before reading about it in the paper. He agreed with the public notice, but if he were a member, he'd appreciate notification.

Council agreed and Mayor Verini asked Mr. Brown to put something together.

Councilor Crume gave kudos to OPD for the two huge arrests that had been made recently. Two thumbs up!

ADJOURN

JUSTUS moved, CAPRON seconded, **THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED**. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Carter-yes; Palomo-yes; Justus-yes; Capron-yes; Winebarger-out; Verini-yes. Motion carried 6/0/1.

ACCEPTED:

Ronald Verini, Mayor

ATTEST

Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder