

A regular meeting of the Beaufort City Council was held on October 13, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. in the Beaufort Municipal Complex, 1901 Boundary Street. In attendance were Mayor Billy Keyserling, Council members Donnie Ann Beer, Gary B. Fordham, Mike Sutton, Mike McFee, and City Manager Scott Dadson. In accordance with the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, Section 30-4-80(d) as amended, all local media were duly notified of the time, date, place, and agenda of this meeting.

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Mayor called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

### **INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The invocation was given by Bishop Alden Hathaway, St. Helena Episcopal Church. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Mayor.

### **PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING NATIONAL AGING IN PLACE WEEK**

Councilwoman Beer moved and Councilman Sutton seconded approval of the proclamation. The motion was approved unanimously. Lynn Mulkey spoke on behalf of the organization and explained its purpose: to provide various services to people over age 65 so they may stay in their homes until the end of their lives. She invited the public to a program to obtain more information.

### **PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING OCTOBER AS NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH**

Councilwoman Beer moved and Councilman Sutton seconded approval of the proclamation. The motion was approved unanimously. Mayor Keyserling read the proclamation and presented it to a CODA representative who explained what the organization does.

### **PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING OCTOBER 23, 2009 AS BEAUFORT GARDEN CLUB DAY**

Councilwoman Beer moved and Councilman McFee seconded approval of the proclamation. The motion was approved unanimously. Mayor Keyserling read the proclamation and presented it to Janie Culley who accepted it and discussed some upcoming activities for the Garden Club.

### **MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular city council meeting of September 22, 2009, the special city council meeting of September 29, 2009, and the special city council meeting of October 6, 2009 were presented to council for review. Regarding a reference to his tenure in public service, Councilman Fordham said it should be 25 years, not 35, as was stated in the September 22 minutes. On motion by Councilwoman Beer, second by Councilman Fordham, council voted unanimously to approve the minutes as amended.

### **AMENDMENT TO FY 2010 BUDGET TO REFLECT TWO GRANTS AWARDED TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

Councilwoman Beer moved and Councilman Fordham seconded approval of the amendment on second reading. Ms. Hughes said it was the same as last time. One grant is for firearms and the

other is for cops. The budget is only being amended for the first year of the grant. The motion was approved unanimously.

### **APPROVAL AND ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE REVISING THE BOUNDARY STREET REDEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Councilwoman Beer moved and Councilman Fordham seconded approval of the ordinance on first reading. Mr. Dadson said the Redevelopment Plan was adopted in 2007. He explained the ordinance and said staff was requesting it be adopted on first reading. He made note of the statutory findings section. Councilman Sutton clarified that they were to look at it on first reading while the costs would come later. Mr. Dadson responded that the master amount of \$55 million is an amount to go up to. They're asking for council to read it, hold it, and then deal with it in terms of TIF 3. When the Boundary Street Master Plan was originally done, they had numbers, but now they have preliminary engineering and therefore "better" numbers which will affect TIF 1 and 2. Councilman Sutton asked if he could go to a TIF 3 proposal if this wasn't taken to a first reading. To make any changes in the future, they would have to get through this step first. Mr. Dadson said otherwise the current redevelopment ordinance will stand.

Mayor Keyserling asked Mr. Dadson about the \$22 million, predicated on the sales tax, and which is "tracking." Some money was to come from impact fees, which are not coming in. Mr. Dadson said impact fees are county-wide. Building activity has changed, so those numbers are lower. In Northern Beaufort County, they have less of an effect than in Southern Beaufort County. Mayor Keyserling said in the statutory findings, the \$38 million is being changed to \$55 million. He asked what percentage of the \$22 million is held now. Mr. Dadson answered "probably 20%." Mayor Keyserling said that the collections are based on the last two years of impact fees. Mr. Dadson said in Northern Beaufort County, in that particular district, the last 2-3 years, building activity and commercial activity has been heavier than in other areas. Impact fees are county-wide. Mayor Keyserling said he's "trying to see if we really have the \$22 million we thought we had." Mr. Dadson agreed. Mayor Keyserling said that in the statutory findings section, they're changing the \$38 million to \$55 million, which was \$45 million "when we set priorities." Mr. Dadson said the redevelopment commission met in February-March of this year, they changed those expectations, which doesn't mean that \$55 million is bonded; it just gives the "breadth and depth" to do other actions they may want to do.

Mayor Keyserling referred to the statutory findings section and read from it about "the equalized assessed valuation of the redevelopment project area" and asked Mr. Dadson what the estimate might be. Mayor Keyserling said the original plan was for 300 – 400,000 square feet of commercial, 500 condos/townhouses, 44 residential units, and 42,000 square feet general office, which has been exceeded. He asked if the numbers were correct. Mr. Dadson said they still needed to be refined. The people paying taxes within that district are paying that \$55 million public investment; the tax effect is not beyond that district. The upside value needs to be \$400 million (market value) to make those numbers. In that district, there are more 10% and 6% than 4%.

The motion was approved unanimously.

### **APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE TO CREATE A NEW TIF DISTRICT 3**

Councilwoman Beer moved and Councilman Fordham seconded approval of the ordinance on first reading. Mr. Cook said that at the Tuesday workshop, he was requested to explain TIFs, look at the two existing TIFs and set the groundwork for why TIF 3 was needed. TIF is an acronym standing for Tax Increment Financing. TIFs attract new investment, enhance the tax base, eliminate blight, and provide legal basis to issue tax increment bonds. The components of TIFs are the “base” and the “increment.” A TIF does not create new taxes. It does not make 4% property taxable for the schools’ operating costs, nor does it override Act 388. In the base, the city collects what it would receive under their millage rates for the base value of the property. The county and the schools collect their full millage rate on the base.

He explained Act 388, saying that schools are reimbursed by the State for money they no longer get from 4% property owners. With the current TIFs before the 4% tax relief, on the incremental portion, the city would receive the operating millage on 4% property. After Act 388, that went away. Bonds couldn’t be reduced. A shortfall would’ve triggered defaults on state bonds. They decided that the city and schools would be reimbursed by the State for the 4% they don’t receive.

Mayor Keyserling asked, in the event of a shortfall, if the State funds the whole thing. Mr. Cook said the formula is not a dollar-for-dollar off-set. Beaufort has a large tax millage compared to other counties. If the increment wasn’t growing in the TIF bonds beyond projections, the city could run short. This only affects TIFs already in existence when the State came in. TIFs created after 2006 are structured so the operating millage on 4% “is not in the flow.” The city gets the 4% to the original life of the two TIFs that are out there. 1% sales tax will continue if schools continue forward with the TIFs.

Ms. Rogers asked if they used the same formula as for the EFA. Mr. Cook said yes. Mayor Keyserling asked if they have an obligation to offset what their commitment was. If there is an EFA or anything else, he asked if they are “exempt now from making our TIF whole.” Mr. Cook said it would take a court case to fight that issue. Mr. Dadson said they haven’t fallen short yet. Mr. Cook said they have made out because the growth in the incremental growth value exceeds the actual TIF structure. That pumped up higher to offset the 4% net of what the State kicks back in off the 1 cent sales tax. To his knowledge, no one has challenged that.

Mr. Cook went on to explain “The life span of a TIF,” saying that because of the stimulus from investing the cash flow, there’s an increase. When the TIF terminates, the city, county and schools are all better off than they were at the beginning. Without the influx of cash, the growth is moderate. Properties eligible to be in a TIF are blighted or underdeveloped. They would remain thus but for this drive. Mr. Cook showed the various criteria in the definition of blight: age, excessive vacancies, etc. Just 5 of the 14 factors make properties eligible for a TIF.

Regarding Tax Increment Bonds, he said the city has no obligation to issue the bonds. Actual bonds issued are subject to debate still to come. “You can never issue more bonds than the amount you have declared as your maximum you will issue.” The initial debt must be issued within 10 years. Mayor Keyserling asked about maximum bond amount. Mr. Dadson said at the time of an extension, the original language of the TIF is used. Mr. Cook said on an extension, it stays at the original base amount: “You can go back and issue additional debt.” Ms. Hughes said she wanted everyone to be clear that a new issue or a re-issue maximum can only be 30 years

total. Mr. Cook said at the end of the designated period, when the TIF has run its course, any fund balance is redistributed to city, county and schools in proportion to their existing millage.

Mr. Cook said TIF 1, as of the last assessment, had \$2.8 million increment tax value and a \$1.8 million base taxable value. Total taxable value is \$4.6 million. He showed TIF 1's balance sheet. TIF 2 has a \$109 million taxable value; its base never changes, and incremental growth is \$7.2 million. He showed TIF 2's balance sheet. Mayor Keyserling asked about the \$3.7 for 2002 and 2004 bonds. Ms. Hughes said most was spent on acquisition of land, not as much on buildings. Money from TIFs is not currently being spent. TIF 2 is being used to accumulate money. TIF 1, since shelved, has been doing the same thing. TIF 1 terminates in 2012 unless it's extended. Mr. Cook showed what projected tax collections would be if it's extended. Mr. Dadson said it can't be pledged against anything. But on a yearly basis, things can be structured out. Mr. Cook said both TIFs are healthy, are not in jeopardy, and are doing as they were designed to.

Staff would like to extend the duration of TIF 1 for 15 years, restructure the two Waterfront Park obligations to shift them from general fund to the TIF 1 fund, shift responsibility of the Waterfront Park rehabilitation, repair, etc. from general fund to the TIF 1 fund, establishing a revenue stream to do so, and continue to reinvest in the core TIF 1 district. The general fund is indebted for \$4 million on Waterfront Park. The city's proposing to re-schedule the Waterfront Park debt; take the two notes they have now, extend their life (interest rates are lower) to make the life of the note correspond more to the life of the park. He showed the parties' contributions if they extend the life of TIF 1. Success depends directly on whether the county and schools will be with the city on this.

Ms. Rogers said debt is a result of Waterfront Park maintenance and she asked why they weren't subordinated. Mr. Cook said he couldn't say why they weren't subordinated or why they weren't classified as "junior bonds." If they had been, the life of the TIF would have been extended automatically. Neither of the two Waterfront Park leases have the proceeds from TIF revenues pledged against them. What's pledged against them is the franchise fee. He said he's pulled his own hair out over her question. Frankly, they're trying to fix something that shouldn't have happened in the first place. The two obligations on the TIF bonds would stay in place exactly as they are now. Ms. Hughes said the original TIF bonds cease as they were supposed to but what's being discussed is, in TIF 1, refinancing the Waterfront Park. In TIF 2 there would be no refinancing; they'd extend it and create additional new TIF bonds to do work in TIF 2.

Mr. Cook said the term "refinancing" has the connotation that the current obligation can't be repaid. The city is well-vested and it's not that they can't pay. They want to restructure because they should have in the first place. Ms. Bryan asked where the schools get their contribution. Mayor Keyserling said they're taxes the schools *forgo*, which are given to the city, not the school. Ms. Hughes said as a rule, one wouldn't expect money to be left-over. It was there specifically to do certain things, and the city will use the money as it was intended. But if for some reason it's not used, they're obliged to return the portions to the other parties.

Staff would like to extend the duration of TIF 2 (Gateway TIF) for 15 years. It will continue to accumulate proceeds for reinvestment pursuant to the redevelopment plan. If all players stay in at

extension, there should be a fund of \$38 million. If the city is the only partner, it will accumulate \$7.4 million; if the county stays in with the city, its \$17.6 million.

Councilman Sutton asked about, on the assessment, how the property values increase. Each year, there's an assessment based on the property value each year until it's reassessed. That's done in Beaufort County every 5 years. So after the TIF is passed, for 5 years, he asked if "X is the number, right?" Mr. Cook said 388 does point of sale, and also new builds coming in a year after they got their occupancy permit. Ms. Hughes said the key on the increment is new construction.

Regarding TIF 3, Mr. Cook said if an ordinance is created, it sets in motion the point in time that the base is settled and the increment begins to be measured. Nothing can be financed on it when it's passed; it's just to establish the base. They designate the maximum amount of tax increment bonds that it *may* issue. He then addressed how and when TIF debt will be used, saying that there's a 10-year window to issue the initial debt. Section 31.6-40 permits a city to be "smart" in tailoring the debt to its purpose, issuing debt in a series of varying rates and maturities. The 10-year window tries to jump start the increment. The ability to finance is entirely dependent on the growth in the increment and when that growth occurs. It triggers how and when the debt can be used. They are trying to capture some property that is in use but not yet on the tax rolls. Once the properties come on, unless they're sold under the point of sale, they'll grow forever at 15% maximum. They will be in the base. Mayor Keyserling asked if that means that under the current TIFs, properties aren't capped. Mr. Cook said they are capped. Mayor Keyserling provided an example to clarify his question. Mr. Cook said if they're already on the tax roll, they stay in the base. The point of sale doesn't move property from the base into the increment. Ms. Hughes said the base always stays the same. Mr. Cook said the only growth is a 15% increase every 5 years. Councilman McFee said the benefit of doing TIF 3 now is to capitalize on the jump start because the base will lower out next year, if they don't do it before December 31. Ms. Hughes said not only is it lower, there are some properties in that area that will be coming on the rolls January 1. Ms. Hughes said SC law, unlike other states, doesn't "retro" properties; they're brought on at the beginning of the next year. Mr. Dadson said that's the reason there is a 10-year window "before you have to actually do it and then how you structure the bonds from then on is based on that project." Mayor Keyserling said even though they would have the potential to go to \$60 million, by creating the TIFs they're not obligating themselves to debt but creating a vehicle through which they could get the debt over time. Mr. Dadson said they're also creating a revenue stream to pay the debt that is outside the 8% cap and is only paid for by the properties within that district. They don't have to issue the debt. Mayor Keyserling said a separate issue is whether this is the right time. Mr. Dadson said there are always business cycles. Things will go back up eventually.

Mr. Cook presented "key principles." He said cash is just a stimulus. Debt should be structured to correspond with the life of the property being built. All debt must be repaid by the time the TIF expires. They want to create an economic landscape that promotes point of sale revaluation. He showed the model staff advocates which builds up a cash flow to pay debt. Every time cash is put in, "you hope for an increase. You want to be out of debt in 30 years." If the TIFs aren't extended and the possibility of a third TIF isn't raised, it will be a long time before they will see the benefit of what they're trying to do.

Ms. Rogers asked about the boundaries for TIF 3. Mr. Dadson said the area outlined in red on the projected map was a defined part of the Boundary Street Master Plan area and Redevelopment district. It wouldn't encompass all of TIF 2. Mayor Keyserling asked about the General Fund. Taking all the increment within that district would mean that district won't generate any additional revenues for the general fund. Mr. Dadson said not in property tax but it will in other taxes.

Mayor Keyserling said he's concerned that TIF 2 may be based on inflated land values. He asked how much of the \$7.2 is new and how much costs more than it did. He asked how much has to do with property improvement and how much with the rising value of properties. Mr. Cook said as much as the 15% cap is a detriment to a rising market, it's a boon on a falling market. Mr. Dadson said there is more development and redevelopment in the district since the TIF was put into place. TIF 2 downside was that capitalization wasn't estimated high enough, but the taxable base was low enough. There's a substantial difference between the increment and the base. Mr. Cook said if TIF 3 were laid on top of TIF 2, the base would be \$10.9, but it's not. Mr. Dadson said it's not laid on top of it because the impetus for TIF 3 was carrying out the Boundary Street Master Plan. They concentrated just on that district. Property can be maximized in a different way. It reflects the form-based code more accurately.

Councilman Sutton asked about "the equalized assessed valuation of 2009 would be at 5.7," he asked where that number came from. Mr. Dadson said that number is a placeholder and will be redefined. Some of the language will change. Ms. Hughes said they took a quick look at what a TIF 3 would be, but it needs to be redefined. Mr. Dadson said it would be more accurate on the second reading. If the schools and county don't stay in, longer is better. There is a period of time after it's adopted to gauge and develop it. Another penny tax could help pay this, as could other bonds, etc. Bond counsel said a BID should also be adopted to complement the TIF. Re: the general fund, Mr. Dadson said the comp plan talks about planning, financing, and doing at a neighborhood level. This gives a model for what's appropriate in different neighborhoods. Southern Beaufort County supports the school system, impact fees, etc. and have supported the whole county for some time. This neighborhood's success are everyone's success.

Ms. Bryan asked if the TIF maps were on the web site, and Mr. Dadson said yes and explained how to find them. She asked about the property value inflation. Mr. Dadson said they're determined by the county assessor, and no one can go in to change it. The 4% owner is well-protected. 6% and 10% owners are not afforded as many protections. Mayor Keyserling said the value is what the market creates.

Councilman Sutton commented that a new TIF 3 will take the city to 2039 in that small overlay area. TIF 2 hasn't been extended to its maximum. Mr. Dadson said the motion is: staff recommending a first reading, a council workshop on October 20, 2009 with bond counsel, a public hearing December 8; staff has to develop cash flow models; and go talk to county and school districts.

Mayor Keyserling said that although the presentation's been on all 3, the motion's only setting TIF 3 in motion. Councilman Sutton said he's overwhelmed that the major highway through the city will eat up the largest piece of this. The 1 cent tax is only paying \$18 million. Mr. Dadson

said when TIF 1 and 2 were done, there were other plans before the Boundary Street Master Plan. This was 6-7 years ago. Also there were failed 1 cent referendums around then. There's been a maturing process about priorities. The Boundary Street Master Plan prioritizes it nicely.

Councilman McFee clarified that TIF 1 and 2 extensions are the more cost-effective and prudent way to approach future tools. TIF 3 is a future tool that expands capabilities in the Boundary Street Master Plan. Mayor Keyserling said his concern may not be about financing. Such a big investment is calling for more houses; "it's an awfully ambitious project." At one time real estate was cooking (1994 – 2004) and it flattened in 2007. He said he'll vote for it because it creates a framework if they do decide to go forward. The idea of doubling the size of Beaufort and spending that kind of money requires some serious thinking. But he trusts staff that this is just allowing us to continue to talk, not a commitment.

The motion was approved unanimously.

### **APPROVE AGREEMENT FOR PARKING FACILITIES MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT**

Councilwoman Beer moved and Councilman Fordham seconded approval of the agreement on first reading. Mr. Dadson said this presentation is also online. The agreement is between the city and the redevelopment commission. The redevelopment commission then works with Main Street Beaufort for marketing and management oversight. Main Street Beaufort works with a parking management company. Policing resources will be moved into their more appropriate position doing other downtown duties. The management company hires "ambassadors"; they will work with Main Street Beaufort so they are more of a walking kiosk than a "meter maid." The city will still control where one can and can't park, fees, etc. Council still retains all that authority. This plan gives the redevelopment commission a cash flow; they can use the profits to issue plans, etc to push redevelopment.

Mayor Keyserling asked if there's any reason not to restrict revenues generated to downtown issues. Mr. Dadson said they could designate that if they wanted to. Council needs to discuss where the area would be designated. The area, if it expands or contracts, is council's call by law and by agreement. The management company could come to council with requests.

Ms. Rogers asked why this is being removed from the purview of the police department. She also asked about the language relating to the termination of the agreement. Councilman Sutton said the reason for the changes is that many people have said that there needs to be a parking management plan for years. The system has failed for years because the responsibility was put with a single officer to issue tickets and do other jobs. One incentive is the number of eyes on the street watching parking in the downtown district. This is not about creating money for the city; it should be an enterprise fund and should stay downtown. He wants to help the redevelopment commission to be able to do what they need to do. Councilman McFee added that the city doesn't have the depth of expertise that outside contracting staff do to do the job efficiently. Staff knows its limitations, and he feels this is the best service for residents and guests. Councilwoman Beer said a professional company can do it better and then the police can protect the city better. Mayor Keyserling agreed and said that the city has taken risks and changed the way things are done. He feels there might be a better way and that way should be sought out.

Mr. Dadson pointed out #3 on the agreement and said it answers the mayor's question: The designated area will only be where it already is. Councilman Sutton said the agreement doesn't mention where the money will go. Mr. Dadson said the redevelopment commission is a part of the city, and the money will end up in their budget. Mr. Dadson asked Ms. Hughes if it would be pulled out into a designated fund. Ms. Hughes said the intent was to handle this money through the redevelopment commission. The city would come to council and create a budget for the redevelopment commission. Mayor Keyserling feels the money designated for this "should be plugged back in." Ms. Hughes said there will be options for that, though the budget council will have to approve.

Councilman Sutton asked Chamber of Commerce, Main Street Beaufort, and Redevelopment Commission members present if they had any apprehension about the agreement. He's concerned that it's not worth doing if they don't have a chance to use the money. Redevelopment Commission chair Mr. Pinkerton said if the money is generated downtown, it makes sense to reinvest it in that area. Councilman Sutton said it should be more like an enterprise fund; he wondered if that was enough of a zone. Knowing that the make-up of the redevelopment commission will change soon, he wondered if that is enough of a tool if it stays in the downtown area. Mr. Bellew said he has no reservations or concerns. Mayor Keyserling said there may be various funds. Mr. Bellew said they want to grow different revenue streams; this is just one piece. Main Street Beaufort's position is that everything stays as-is, but the parking company will maximize it. Ms. Rogers said she agrees with the concerns about fund commingling. She asked why council didn't establish a designated fund under the redevelopment commission. Mayor Keyserling said that's where it's headed. Ms. Hughes told Ms. Rogers that commingling is a no-no. She suggested to council that staff will meet with the redevelopment commission to formulate a budget that they will recommend to council. It will be a separate fund, and if it needs to be used downtown, it will be called the Downtown Redevelopment Commission Budget Item.

The motion was approved unanimously.

### **APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE TO CHANGE THE MAKEUP OF THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**

Councilwoman Beer moved and Councilman McFee seconded approval of the ordinance on first reading. Councilwoman Beer said she'd gotten a call asking why they wanted to do this, and she had told the caller that they needed to use the experience and knowledge of people expert in these areas that council doesn't have. Council has oversight, appoints and can remove the Redevelopment Commission members. Councilman Sutton said his concern was not to lock it in like other commissions are. He wants to ensure that the selected membership isn't closed to anyone outside the city limits; they should be chosen by merit.

Mayor Keyserling has issues with the ordinance as presented; the commission and staff had talked about amending the existing ordinance, but the current document only amended membership and terms. Mr. Dadson said attendance policy and quarterly reports to council can be added on the second reading. Mayor Keyserling asked if an appointment process needs to be in the ordinance. He has been thinking about it as another insurance policy. He thought appointments might need a super-majority vote of council. He wants to scrutinize them. Mr.

Dadson said in the old ordinance it was specific; this one is not. Council as a body has the ultimate say, currently in a majority vote. Mayor Keyserling said he'd like it to be super-majority (4 out of 5) approval on the second reading of the ordinance. Lastly, he asked if it needs to say the commission must present an annual budget. Mr. Dadson said they will; it's a normal administrative manner.

Ms. Bryan asked Councilman Sutton how much he'd like to expand the area from which to make appointments to the commission. He replied he was thinking of the whole county, not excluding part-time residents with the right expertise. Ms. Bryan said she feels that including the county is fine, but part-time residents maybe should be considered only if they own property. Councilwoman Beer said council appoints the commissioners and all that will be looked into. Also, there's an attendance policy, so it wouldn't work if commissioners were here only 8 months of the year. Ms. Bryan said owning property is a different level of investment than *living* here 8 months a year. Mr. Dadson said they're trying to capture talent.

Councilman Sutton made a motion to amend the ordinance to include: quarterly reports to council, attendance requirements, and a super-majority requirement for membership appointment. Councilwoman Beer seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous approval of the motion as amended.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Mayor Keyserling passed the gavel to Councilwoman Beer and was excused.

**REQUEST FOR STREET CLOSURE FROM FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH TO CONDUCT ANNUAL "KIRKIN' O' THE TARTANS SERVICE NOVEMBER 1, 2009**

Councilman Fordham moved and Councilman McFee seconded approval of the request. The motion was approved unanimously.

**REQUEST FOR STREET CLOSURE FROM DAWN VOSBURY-VANGUNDY FOR A PRIVATE BLOCK PARTY OCTOBER 31, 2009**

Councilman Fordham moved and Councilman Sutton seconded approval of the request. The motion was approved unanimously.

**REQUEST FOR STREET CLOSURE FROM SOUTHERN SCOOTERS TO PERFORM ANNUAL TOY RUN, DECEMBER 13, 2009**

Councilman Fordham moved and Councilman McFee seconded approval of the request. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mayor Keyserling returned and the gavel was returned to him.

**COUNCIL MEMBERS' REPORTS**

Councilwoman Beer said Fire Chief Rountree's wife died, and the city extends their condolences to him and his family.

Councilman Sutton said he's concerned about the inspections department since building codes are contracted out. He'd like a report on codes enforcement because there's a home where the exterior conditions are bad, and he wants the city to ensure there's a program in place. Mr. Dadson said public works, the business license office, and current building inspectors are coordinated to be "eyes on the street." People should call in if they see anything. They're trying to coordinate with various departments and do sweeps in the neighborhoods. Councilman McFee asked, if there's a complaint who a citizen should call. Mr. Dadson replied to call the City Manager's office. Councilman McFee asked if there are instructions on the website and Mr. Dadson said there are not, but there could be something added.

Ms. Bryan asked about the city working with neighborhood organizations. Mr. Dadson said they have been talking to and working with neighborhood associations for years. Councilwoman Beer said it had nothing to do with politics.

Councilman Sutton asked about animal control and an ordinance on tethering. The ordinance should still have some teeth, but there was an incident in a neighborhood where a cop told people they had to go to the county and because they don't do animal control. Councilman Sutton said he wants to ask the police department to deal with it by calling dispatch and getting them to get animal control. He wants it dealt with as a city, not to wait on animal control. Mr. Dadson said he'd ask.

Mayor Keyserling said *American Style* magazine named Beaufort the #12 small city for art destinations. Also, Beaufort is now the only place in the US to manufacture kazoo's.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before City Council, Councilman Fordham made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Councilwoman Beer. The motion was approved unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
SHIRLEY HUGHES, ACTING CITY CLERK