

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF VERNON

**RECORD OF A PUBLIC HEARING OF COUNCIL  
HELD MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2018 COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
3400 – 30 STREET, VERNON, B.C.**

---

PRESENT: Mayor Cumming

Councillors: K. Fehr, B. Quiring, K. Gares,  
S. Anderson, D. Nahal, A. Mund

Staff: W. Pearce, CAO  
P. Bridal, DCAO/Corporate Officer  
S. Blakely, Manager, Legislative Services  
C. Broderick, Manager, Current Planning  
K. Flick, Director, Community Infrastructure & Development  
E. Stranks, Manager, Engineering Dev. Services  
E. Morrison, Transportation Planner  
A. Watson, Manager, Transportation

Others: Members of the Public

---

Mayor Cumming called the Public Hearing to order at 5:32 p.m.

Mayor Cumming outlined the procedures to be followed.

Corporate Officer, Patti Bridal advised that Notice of the Public Hearing was published in the **Friday, November 30, 2018, and Wednesday, December 7, 2018** issues of the Morning Star Newspaper, as required by the *Local Government Act*.

Mayor Cumming called a first time for representation from the public in attendance with regard to:

**A. "7250 Hitchcock Road Rezoning Amendment Bylaw Number 5728, 2018"**

Administration provided a brief overview of the application.

Prior to the Public Hearing 29 written submission were received, as follows:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>
November 11, 2018	Barbara Van Sickle
November 14, 2018	David & Alison Hampton
November 15, 2018	David & Alison Hampton
November 18, 2018	Steve & Lee Crevier
November 19, 2018	Randy Savoie

November 20, 2018	Linda Kennedy
November 21, 2018	Donna Klym
November 21, 2018	Eric Clarke
November 21, 2018	Bruce & Linda Kline
November 22, 2018	Chris & Selena Russell
November 22, 2018	Jeff Moorehouse
November 23, 2018	Don Gibbs
November 23, 2018	Robin Barnes
November 23, 2018	Bev Bonner
November 23, 2018	Leanne Ruechel
November 23, 2018	Karen McKibbin
November 23, 2018	Bob Galloway
November 26, 2018	Leanne Ruechel
November 26, 218	Roman & Silvia Rotach
November 26, 2018	Mary Elton
November 26, 2018	Darrin Collie
November 26, 2018	Brian & Marian Kroeker
November 26, 2018	Leanne Ruechel
November 26, 2018	Philip and Barbara Levesque
November 26, 2018	Anne Thomson
December 7, 2018	David & Pascale Conly
December 7, 2018	Barbara Lee Burgess
December 10, 2018	Karen Siemens
December 10, 2018	Tania Heaton

Mayor Cumming called a first time for representation from the public in attendance with regard to:

**“7250 Hitchcock Road Rezoning Amendment Bylaw Number 5728, 2018”**

SPEAKER NAME	COMMENTS
Dustin and Ashlea Gudeit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owners of the subject property</li> <li>• Property was annexed into City of Vernon (COV)</li> <li>• Worked diligently within neighbourhood plan</li> <li>• Worked with staff and RDNO to examine best connection to existing services</li> <li>• Offsite traffic requirements – traffic impact study done including Silver Star Road – no concerns</li> <li>• Plan includes a variety of housing types to provide a diverse variety of product</li> <li>• Longtime residents</li> <li>• Strong team of professionals working on this product (listed)</li> <li>• Supports COV Official Community Plan (OCP) to enhance the area and putting in green space at top of area</li> <li>• Certified Wildlife Biologist completed study of area – is here to answer questions</li> <li>• Only required to do 5% park and elected to offer 20% of land for park</li> <li>• Development is designed for walking access so everyone can access park and trails</li> <li>• Hoping other developers in the area will all contribute to green spaces</li> <li>• Proud to say beginning large protected wildlife park at top of area for all to enjoy</li> <li>• Professional Team present to answer questions</li> </ul>
Darrin Collie, Dwell Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of Professional Development Team</li> <li>• Nov 8 conducted Public Info meeting at BX School 7:30 pm – 9:30 pm advertised twice with flyers also delivered</li> <li>• 64 participants</li> <li>• Full team present to answer questions</li> <li>• Received comments compiled from 24 households – submitted to Planning</li> <li>• Worked to comply with Foothills Neighbourhood Plan (FNHP)</li> <li>• Variety of housing types offered</li> <li>• Worked to allow for multi-family residential to east side of site</li> <li>• Also tried to look at different types of housing forms for seniors (elevators, etc.) to allow aging in place</li> <li>• Part of compliance is to work to guidelines (road standards)</li> <li>• Also allowed for 18% park designations as well as walkways, sidewalks and trail connections</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecology of site – worked to create dedicated park area in most sensitive areas</li> </ul>
<p>Brian Monaghan, Monaghan Engineering &amp; Consulting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of Development Team</li> <li>• A lot of the work was done through neighbourhood plan process</li> <li>• Fortunate property abuts 4 ROWs with servicing in them</li> <li>• Working with existing network – effort to create suitable preplan to create an affordable development</li> <li>• In developing the road network – preliminary discussions with COV and were advised previous developments had no accepted pre-plans</li> <li>• Obvious extensions with existing roads and with Hitchcock Road to be closed</li> <li>• Dealing with east side of property Taber Road is 8.5 m (local road) services with Nakiska being 12 m (collector road)</li> <li>• Some concerns from neighbours regarding traffic</li> <li>• As was stated earlier, traffic study indicates no concerns</li> <li>• With the comments about Nakiska, and Taber, Nakiska is the right road to have the multifamily development accessing</li> <li>• Taber Road is narrower width – parked cars slow the traffic down</li> <li>• Concern on Taber – winter – no room for snow storage</li> <li>• The COV has required signs in other areas of the city ‘no parking winter months’ – may need to deal with Taber in this manner</li> <li>• Those are the two main roads through</li> <li>• Silver Ridge Drive is the same as Taber – identical width</li> <li>• This deals with the east side of the site</li> <li>• The west side has some issues still to be resolved</li> <li>• The options require road options to offer access to the lands beyond</li> <li>• The west half of the site will require construction of reservoir and a booster station so fair amount of work</li> <li>• Sanitary and storm are readily available</li> </ul>
<p>Leanne Ruechel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lived in Vernon area 30 years</li> <li>• Worked in Capital District Parks on Island</li> <li>• Desire for more natural areas in Vernon and beyond</li> <li>• When Foothills NHP adopted did not live there so did not participate in public input</li> <li>• Has two young girls aged 2 &amp; 5 years old</li> <li>• Walks daily on nature pathway</li> <li>• This occurs on unofficial trails in Foothills and surrounding area</li> <li>• Values time spent with family outdoors</li> <li>• Having large expansive natural areas allows this time</li> <li>• Urges Council to create more green space in Vernon and</li> </ul>

	<p>preserve the spaces we currently have</p>
<p>Alison Csanyi</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The FNHP – on website – why this wasn't a controlled number document? It could change at any point</li> <li>• Buying home in Vernon has been excruciating</li> <li>• Huge problem with high density in foothills</li> <li>• Parking is a problem</li> <li>• Annexing this into the City without transit and only one street in/out is a problem – particularly if there is a fire</li> <li>• Would like to see impacts noted added</li> <li>• Would like a controlled engineered drawings for the Foothills Neighbourhood</li> </ul>
<p>Harold Bowes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speaking for many on Nakiska Drive</li> <li>• Only 4 homes when he moved there</li> <li>• Traffic a big concern</li> <li>• School meeting – count was done</li> <li>• Estimated an extra 480 vehicles on Nakiska based on two per residence</li> <li>• Traffic will be on Nakiska</li> <li>• It's wide – but lived there 20 years – by end of winter it's 1.5 lanes wide and people have to pull over to pass</li> <li>• If there's a fire or emergency – evacuation would be a task</li> <li>• Disagrees with Traffic Study seeing no problem</li> <li>• 29 years in RCMP with 25 years on Traffic – when you take that amount of traffic to Phoenix you've got 3 houses to Silver Star</li> <li>• There will be a backlog in morning and evening</li> <li>• Hitchcock Road development – should widen Hitchcock with access off of Silver Star Rd</li> <li>• People trying to get onto Silver Star Rd in the morning find it very difficult</li> <li>• Add on all the other activities – it's going to be a major problem</li> <li>• Now a lot of kids in neighbourhood – could be dangerous</li> <li>• Why not move it onto Hitchcock to try and spread it out – that's what he feels should happen</li> <li>• Add 480 cars to the road where you live and see impact</li> <li>• Counted 34 four-plexes along with other types of housing</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> 240 Units to be developed and using Nakiska?  <b>A. Admin:</b> Road layout and lot layouts are not confirmed. Multi-family 64 units and area east of no build area shows 35 units. There will be lands to north that may also eventually be developed</li> </ul>
<p>David Hampton</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lives adjacent to Eastside</li> <li>• Moved to area for peace and quiet</li> <li>• Concern is with HR2 Zoning designation</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lives in a farm house and now a high density housing development is being proposed right next door</li> <li>• Questions location due to highly sensitive area and ravine</li> <li>• Planning of high density – should be closer to main routes for transit access</li> <li>• Makes no sense to locate here</li> <li>• Concerns with his property and others – they all have wells and worried about health of water supply</li> <li>• Questions traffic flow – already concerns and high density will add to it</li> <li>• Original Plan was to put it across the street in light commercial area – makes more sense closer to transit etc.</li> </ul>
<p>Michael Murison</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliments Developers for attempts to include large park area</li> <li>• Background 25 years of Development Financing at Coast</li> <li>• Heard about traffic already – hopefully Council reads submissions and concerns</li> <li>• Intuitively seems impossible that adding this many units to existing problems cannot be ‘no problem’</li> <li>• Missed point there is already a problem and this will add to it</li> <li>• Seems only conclusion is that this is too soon – regional infrastructure needed</li> <li>• Personal rule – setting precedent – should be planned in greater detail with greater area in mind</li> <li>• Disrespectful to the residents and the other developers – plan should be done cooperatively on a larger scale, not piece meal</li> <li>• Won’t get a ‘do over’ at least for 100 years</li> <li>• Be very cautious as this is the first in a series of applications</li> </ul>
<p>Randy Schellenburg</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Used to live in Foothills – 7<sup>th</sup> house built</li> <li>• Used to enjoy going to top of hill to hike/ski</li> <li>• Thought view is incredible – needs to be a park one day</li> <li>• Lived there 10 years</li> <li>• Original build-out was supposed to be a fraction of what it is now</li> <li>• Plan was to have mostly parkland and riding trails</li> <li>• Development went on and on</li> <li>• Have to fight for parks in Vernon</li> <li>• Current parks plan is totally flawed as every ravine, etc. was counted as parkland – most communities don’t include in their parks tally</li> <li>• Vernon came up with number that makes it seem like there is lots of parkland</li> <li>• Completely wrong – only park in Foothills is tot lot and Whistler Place – gullies – don’t count – cannot be developed</li> <li>• Parks Plans says we can basically pave every square inch</li> </ul>

	<p>in Vernon with no new parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This development should be 50% park and all the rest above should all be park – it’s a travesty and a shame</li> <li>• Think about future generations</li> <li>• When park is built the COV won’t get tax revenue</li> <li>• His business pays \$19,000 in commercial tax and he expects parks and room to explore nature</li> <li>• Do we really need to build that close to such a beautiful area</li> <li>• Reconsider and put on hold</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> Topographic Map of area – Appears that the park set aside is all cliff? <b>A. Admin:</b> Reviewed topo map of area. Working to protect knoll area.</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> Is the way we count our park areas set by a Municipality? <b>A. Admin:</b> It is not typical to count natural areas as parkland. They do form part of natural space and parks network</li> </ul>
<p>Brian Kroeker</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lived there 5 years</li> <li>• Thanks to Developers but needs more work</li> <li>• Chose Foothills to live as it was outside the City of Vernon</li> <li>• Clearly not the City – wanted green space and views</li> <li>• The inclusion of high density is contrary to anything that makes sense – no transit or shopping near by</li> <li>• Bringing City into a rural area</li> <li>• Creating a traffic issue</li> <li>• 38.5 acres in question – needs unified plan for the entire area – another 4 development areas are up there</li> <li>• The nature of the land demands that</li> <li>• Their land backs off Silver Ridge Drive</li> <li>• Live on their deck and traffic is a concern already</li> <li>• Going up narrow road leading to Sun Ridge which is even more clogged leading to the new build area</li> <li>• Behooves us to have larger overall plan for the entire area</li> <li>• Look at original intent of the area – it’s for people who want to live in a rural neighbourhood</li> </ul>
<p>Linda Kennedy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lovely homes in her area and they are multi-family</li> <li>• Are there as they want to be outside the City of Vernon yet live in a property that is small and manageable</li> <li>• Please don’t think multi-family is ‘the poor and needy’</li> <li>• Doesn’t want 4 storey buildings, but multi-family is not for poor people</li> <li>• Let’s have a plan for the whole place</li> <li>• Let’s think of a park for the future, not today – let’s not be skimpy</li> </ul>
<p>Amandeep Singh</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moved there recently</li> <li>• Quiet, beautiful area</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The residents living there now paid for development through purchase of lots</li> <li>• This development takes advantage of the work that has already happened</li> <li>• Not balanced – you should put in the infrastructure if you want to develop land</li> <li>• Having a separate entrance is important</li> <li>• Has to work well for the residents – doesn't want property to depreciate due to development</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> Please speak to comprehensive plan suggestion – is that possible? <b>A. Admin:</b> Foothills NHP adopted in 2013. The FHNP does not have a transportation preplan for the entire area as cost would be huge. Each parcel can produce 200+ units. Infrastructure, roadworks, etc. things change – given the growth required – developing this for the entire area is not reasonable. The NHP will be updated over time. This site is the first – it is the logical sequence of development. Would not recommend undertaking due to size of land involved and should proceed lot by lot.</li> </ul>
Christine Rothwell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important – just moved there</li> <li>• Love area to walk in nature</li> <li>• Widening Silver Star Road due to traffic volumes</li> <li>• Don't have a reservoir for new housing</li> <li>• 200 new places need infrastructure – doesn't make sense – seems backwards</li> <li>• <b>Admin:</b> The existing reservoir has the necessary capacity for this area – not for the 'No Build Covenant Area'</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> How do you define infrastructure? <b>A. Speaker:</b> Cul de Sacs, no buses so must drive and cause traffic, Water Pressure and Water Restrictions already an issue – adding another 200 houses which will affect infrastructure</li> <li>• <b>Admin:</b> As condition of subdivision they are required to provide infrastructure</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> Infrastructure they need to tie into is at property line? <b>A. Admin:</b> Underground utilities are at a couple of different locations. Water would need to hook to existing system. Roads in area do touch property lines</li> </ul>
Barbara Levesque	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lives in Coldstream but owns adjacent property</li> <li>• In full support of the development</li> <li>• Parkland – a significant percentage set aside for parks is directly related to the rezoning</li> <li>• The amount dedicated on the subject property and on theirs is significant</li> <li>• The establishment of park is the result of requests and organizing of homeowners in area</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owned land since 1989</li> <li>• Over years – used by neighbours for hiking, riding</li> <li>• ATVs and dirt bikes have degraded their land</li> <li>• Persistent camping and fires on both properties</li> <li>• Had to speak with local teens parents' who encouraged use of this private property</li> <li>• Understands enthusiasm for parks – this is why they bought here</li> <li>• Wanted to put house on property and live there</li> <li>• Couldn't get water – RDNO would not provide</li> <li>• Had three dry wells on the property so could not live there</li> <li>• Then could see a line of suburban development making its way up the hill</li> <li>• It is not rural living in that area - its suburban homes on small lots</li> <li>• The land is not a park – it's never been a park – it's private property and people using it are trespassing</li> <li>• The land designated as park has not been purchased</li> <li>• No one has ever approached them to offer them money for the land yet everyone feels free to use it</li> <li>• Reminds Council that placing additional requirements on developers as people have been trespassing for 30 years is not right</li> <li>• You can't put just one house on a lot and guarantee the land behind will remain as pristine park – you can't do that</li> <li>• Cost of development is significant – dedicating park is very costly – it means a higher level of density is required on remainder in order to do so</li> <li>• The developer must be compensated</li> <li>• Agrees with development with higher density</li> </ul>
Tania Heaton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To her all areas are wildlife habitat</li> <li>• There should be protection for these sensitive areas</li> </ul>
Mark Piorecky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducted Wildlife Assessment for the project</li> <li>• This park area is the most sensitive area on the property</li> <li>• Examined in great detail</li> <li>• So much of area has been dramatically degraded through use by public</li> <li>• So much of the hillside was beautiful grassland and now infested with noxious weeds – can hardly be called grassland</li> </ul>
Donna Klym	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No problem with Development in general</li> <li>• Wonders about school buses in area – long walk for existing children – new houses even further away</li> <li>• Makes more sense to have alternative access directly onto Silver Star Road</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) done – has COV reviewed the traffic load? <b>A. Admin:</b> Yes – reviewed TIA and looked at additional traffic load – 80 vehicles at peak times – roads are built to accommodate. Estimate of TIA was done based on 230 Units – generated estimate of volume in a peak hour.</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> Any concerns with steep grade of roads in winter? <b>A. Admin:</b> Roads are built to COV standard. Signage used as needed</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> Is there a secondary route in or out? <b>A. Admin:</b> Foothills NHP shows Wildwood as possible secondary route in future also further to north there will be connections to Foothills Drive to the west</li> </ul>
Janet Bose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From information provided it was 227 Units</li> <li>• Everyone on her street has two vehicles so have to double to calculate number of vehicles</li> <li>• Already have piles of snow and winter is just starting</li> <li>• In winter there is nowhere to store snow and often times very narrow</li> <li>• Not sure why COV numbers are different than number of units proposed</li> <li>• The guidelines for OCP – why isn't it within guidelines instead of changing to HR-2 – other zones that are more fitting to the area</li> <li>• <b>Admin:</b> Typically transportation design looks at pm peak hour – the volume doesn't equate to total number of vehicles owned – average over the hour is taken – found to be .4 trips per lot in the peak hour and that is what was used. The smaller homes have lower trips per hour than a single family dwelling</li> </ul>
Michael Murison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In favour of density in area</li> <li>• Looks forward to tasteful and imaginative layouts for multi-family homes for aging in the area</li> <li>• Not opposed to multi-family</li> <li>• During NHP and OCP had discussions about the proposed park (circle) at top – told don't worry about it as it was just 'notional' – area needed to be much larger</li> <li>• Circle should always have been much larger – concept has now become gospel</li> <li>• Previous Council refused to deal with western bypass as they didn't want to sterilize properties – disagrees – should have a broad – long range plan for entire area</li> <li>• Lots of ways to compensate developers for park land</li> <li>• That area deserves to be a park not just small portion of it</li> <li>• A complete inventory is needed for that area</li> <li>• No chance for a 'do over'</li> <li>• Understands pressure on owners who want to move</li> </ul>

	<p>forward, but area needs larger plan – the Developer should be compensated for that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not fair to developer to move forward when they don't know what is going to happen in the area</li> <li>• Lots of tools to work with</li> <li>• Agrees this Developer has done his best – but if you cannot do anything with the land – should it be considered park?</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> Do we know how many of the properties will have the capacity for legal suites? <b>A. Admin:</b> Most of the zones in the COV allow legal suites. Single Family Dwellings can have a suite – not multi-family.</li> </ul>
<p>Darrin Collie</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide clarification regarding density</li> <li>• Referred to as a high density development</li> <li>• What they are providing is under 6% density</li> <li>• Multi-family sites are 19 - 20 sites – they are well under the maximum units</li> <li>• Number of units 64 mf, 107 sf, plus duplex units</li> <li>• 194 vehicles is count for new area (not trips)</li> <li>• <b>Q. Council:</b> Would it be possible to get an access road to Silver Star to Multi-family? <b>A. Admin</b> Grade is too much</li> </ul>
<p>Mark and Victoria Murke</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lived there 17 years</li> <li>• Daily hikes on Silver Star</li> <li>• Road is extremely busy year round</li> <li>• Moved there knowing they would eventually develop the land</li> <li>• Interested in how we will filter all the people out Phoenix and onto Silver Star Rd</li> <li>• Hitchcock Road – cannot get in there after 2pm due to ski traffic</li> <li>• Along with all the development at Silver Star with more to come – there is going to be a problem with accessing Silver Star from Phoenix Drive</li> </ul>
<p>Leanne Ruechel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please show map with roads</li> <li>• Does Hitchcock link to Silver Star Road? Yes</li> <li>• If that road links to Silver Star Road – how come Hitchcock Road is not being used to link traffic to Silver Star Rd?</li> <li>• <b>A. Admin:</b> Hitchcock Road has a difficult angle as it meets Silver Star Road – doesn't meet modern standard – very steep angled topography – not suitable without major redesign</li> <li>• Could be done on a gravel road though? What is grade?</li> <li>• <b>A. Admin:</b> The approach angle of Hitchcock would lead to difficulty with visibility – doesn't meet standards for road design. Nakiska Drive was designed to handle this traffic</li> <li>• There is potential connection to Wildwood in future</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phoenix Drive is 11% grade – doesn't know what grade Hitchcock Drive is - could never amend to make it safe for a left turn to Silver Star – no way to use it for access</li> <li>• Developers were required in past to put in roads and change infrastructure</li> </ul>
<p>Don Gibbs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter forwarded</li> <li>• Three main areas of concern</li> <li>• Storm water disposal – bylaw updated recently – good – would like to see developer come up with ideas to accomplish bylaw requirements</li> <li>• Concerned with interjurisdictional issues with Regional District – increased water flow could result in damage to properties</li> <li>• Environmentally sensitive area a concern – understands developer doesn't want to put aside land – need to think big picture as a society in regard to high conservation areas</li> <li>• When developer required to put aside more land they should receive credit to DCCs for that area – equal to the parkland</li> <li>• Collaborative approach needed for success of developer and conservation</li> <li>• Owns land in COV that is basically sterilized due to changes in bylaws over past 20 years</li> <li>• Have people that can't do a thing with their land – these developers at least can do something</li> <li>• For long term well-being of City compensate and conserve</li> <li>• Long term plan will be to Wildwood – seems reasonable but interjurisdictional issue – need to help developer get road through and put traffic circle at Wildwood</li> <li>• Need another access out of the subdivision</li> <li>• Suggestion of no build covenant due to water reservoir requirement – once available they will build – question at this stage is what will be park area</li> </ul>


Mayor Cumming called a second, third and final time for representation from the public. There being none, Mayor Cumming closed the Public Hearing for:

**“7250 Hitchcock Road Rezoning Amendment Bylaw Number 5728, 2018”**

**CLOSE:**

The Public Hearing closed at 7:47 pm.

**CERTIFIED CORRECT:**

  
 Victor Cumming  
 Mayor

  
 Patti Bridal  
 DCAO/Corporate Officer