EAST BETHEL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

DECEMBER 3, 2014

The East Bethel City Council met on December 3, 2014, at 7:30 p.m. for the regular City Council meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Bob DeRoche	Ron Koller	Tim Harrington
	Tom Ronning		
MEMBER ABSENT:	Heidi Moegerle		
ALSO PRESENT:	Jack Davis, City Administrator		
	Mark Vierling, City Attorney		

1.0 Call to Order

The December 3, 2014, City Council meeting was called to order by Mayor DeRoche at 7:30 p.m.

2.0 Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

DeRoche, "Just a quick note folks. This is actually being, going out live. So now, the Council meetings, people can watch them at home live instead of having to wait until tomorrow.

3.0 Adopt Agenda

Harrington, "I'd like to make a motion to adopt tonight's agenda." Ronning, "Second." DeRoche, "Any discussion? All in favor?" **All in favor.** DeRoche, "Opposed? Hearing none, motion passes." **Motion passes unanimously.**

4.0 Presentation

4.0A. 2015 Budget – Public Comment Period

Davis presented the staff report, noting Minnesota Statute 275.065 requires cities to conduct a public comment period where residents are offered the opportunity to provide input to City Council on proposed budgets and tax levies. The State requires that each City announce the date, time, and place of the meeting where residents can provide City Council feedback on proposed budgets and levies. The date selected must be done at the meeting when the City Council adopts the preliminary budget and levy in September. This meeting date is also listed on the parcel-specific notices for proposed 2015 taxes that taxpayers received in November from Anoka County.

Council directed that December 3, 2014, as the regular meeting for this opportunity.

As part of this agenda item, Council will hear comments from residents and consider tax levies and budgets for 2015. Based on decisions of previous budget meetings and discussions and resident comments, staff recommends Council consider the public comment period open.

DeRoche, "I'll open it up for public comment. Anybody have any comments on the budget? I'll close it up then."

Davis, "At this time, staff recommends City Council approve Budget and Levy Resolution 2014-47 and with the approval of that, approve Levy Resolution 2014-48.

4.0A.

Ronning, "I'll move to approve Budget Resolution 2014-47, General Fund Budget and Levy Resolution…" Vierling, "One at a time please." Ronning, "One at a time, yeah."

2015 Budget – Public Comment Period

Koller, **"I'll second."** DeRoche, "Any discussion? Any questions about it? All in favor?" **All in favor.** DeRoche, "Opposed? Hearing none, motion passes." **Motion passes unanimously.**

Ronning, "Move to pass Resolution 2014-48, EDA Levy Resolution." Harrington, "I'll second." DeRoche, "Any discussion? A quick night. All in favor?" **All in favor.** DeRoche, "Opposed? Hearing none, that passes." **Motion passes unanimously.**

4.0B 553 Lakeshore Administrative Hearing

Davis presented the staff report, indicating the City Council is requested to conduct an Administrative Hearing under City Code, Chapter 2, Article X, Section 2-590, Administrative Appeal, for this issue. At this time, staff recommends that the hearing for this matter be opened.

DeRoche, "At this time, we'll open the public hearing on the 553 Lakeshore. Does anybody here want to speak? There's three parties, Ms. Heidi Moegerle, Gary Otremba, and Darlene Otremba, or Darlene Moegerle, isn't it?" Davis, "Yes." DeRoche, "Anybody here?" Ronning, "Anybody speak on their behalf?"

DeRoche, "In that case, I'll close the public hearing. Jack, do you want to just kind of go into a little bit of detail? I don't think we need to go through the whole thing." Davis, "Yes."

Davis presented the staff report, indicating Heidi Moegerle, Darlene Moegerle, and Gary Otremba, hereinafter referenced as "Owner", were directed by City staff to correct City Ordinance compliance issues relating to 553 Lakeshore Drive on June 11, 2014, and August 20, 2014. The required date for compliance for this matter was October 21, 2014. As a result of this directive, Ms. Moegerle, Darlene Moegerle, and Mr. Otremba requested the Planning Commission review this matter, not as a variance request, but as to a continuance of a non-conformity during the process of building demolition.

The Planning Commission considered this issue at their September 23, 2014, meeting and unanimously voted to uphold the decision of the City Attorney, City staff, and the directives in the letter of August 20, 2014.

While the "Owner" is claiming their appeal should be heard based on the section of the City Code that relates to decisions of the Building Official and Building Code issues, all decisions on this matter have been those of the City Administrator and the Planning Commission with the concurrence of the City Attorney.

The request by the "Owner" to appeal under Chapter 14, Article II, Section 14-23 does not apply in this situation as the Building Official never rendered any opinions or made any decisions on the zoning, legal and/or land use matters, or participated in the decision to deny any further building permits until the compliance issues were resolved. Therefore, the process for appeal is subject to City Code Chapter 2, Article X, Section 2-590, Administrative Appeals.

This appeal has been initiated by a written notice from the "Owner" dated November 10, 2014.

4.0B

The "Owner," purchased 553 Lakeshore Drive, PIN 36-33-23-21-0266 on February 11, 2013. At the time of the purchase, the property was a non-conforming lot of record and the

553 Lakeshore Administrative Hearing

structure was also non-conforming. Darlene Moegerle was added as an "Owner" on or about May 29 of 2014.

The "Owner" of the property applied for and received a demolition permit on February 21, 2013. The demolition permit indicated the work to be completed would be the removal of the entire portion of the structure used for habitation with only the garage portion of the structure to remain. Prior to the issuance of the demolition permit, the "Owners" met with Colleen Winter to discuss the use of this property. Ms. Winter provided a letter to the "Owners" that addressed the issue of lot combination and the use of 553 Lakeshore for storage use only. There were no objections filed by the "Owner" relative to this matter at the time of this discussion.

Periods of demolition of the inside of the structure occurred between February 21, 2013, and April 2014. The "Owner" requested an extension and modification of the demolition permit on April 21, 2014. This request was to modify the demolition permit to include only the removal of the 1940's cabin section of this structure. This request was granted based on the "Owner's" previous statements concerning the use of the property and on a pending amendment to City Code that proposed an increase in accessory structure size on lots less than 0.99 acres to 960 square feet. The removal of the "cabin only section" would meet this requirement once the requirements for the merging of the lots was completed and leave the remaining structure at 960 square feet.

The City requested a letter of intent from the "Owner" as to the demolition timetable at the time the permit was extended. The letter of intent submitted by the "Owner" provided notice, for the first time to the City, that the "Owner" intended to utilize the remaining portion of the structure in a manner that was inconsistent with previous statements as to the described use of the property. Previous statements by the "Owner" were consistent over a one and a half year period as to the use of the property and included:

- A statement at a City Council meeting on November 21, 2012, that stated the retaining wall and septic system would have to be removed and the property did not meet high water standards.
- The "Owner," at the Local Board of Appeals and Equalization meetings on April 17, 2013, and April 24, 2014, stated that the structure at 553 Lakeshore was uninhabitable and could only be used for "green space" and storage.
- E-mails submitted by the City Assessor and the County Assessor's Office include statements by the "Owner" that the building was uninhabitable and can only be used for storage. Based on these statements, the County Assessor determined it was appropriate to "link" or "chain" the two parcels together for tax calculation purposes.
- The "Owner" stated on their application for a demolition permit in 2013 that the habitable portion of the structure would be demolished and only the garage would remain.
- The "Owner" stated to Staff at a meeting and as recent as May 20, 2014, that while they objected to and would not combine the lots, they intended to use the garage for cold storage and the 1985 addition as garden and hobby storage.

On and after April 30, 2014, the "Owner" began in general terms to reverse their statement of the intended use of the property as a structure for storage to that of a principle structure for habitable use, first mentioned and specifically stated in an e-mail dated July 27, 2014. The "Owner" served notice that compliance with City Code that mandates the combination of contiguous/adjoining lots of common ownership of which one is non-conforming would not occur on April 30, 2014.

4.0B

553 Lakeshore Administrative Hearing

There was never any information provided by the "Owner" to the City at the time of issuance of extension of the demolition permit, that the demolition permit was part of a process of rehabilitation or renovation of the structure. The demolition on the structure that occurred between February 21, 2013, and April 21, 2014, was internal and consisted of the removal of and not limited to the kitchen, bathroom, plumbing, electrical, and inside wall coverings. The Minnesota State Building Code, under R306, requires the presence of working plumbing fixtures and a compliant sewage disposal system for a structure to be habitable. This property had neither at the completion of the demolition. The septic system for this property was deemed non-compliant on October 13, 2011.

In the case where these facilities do not or no longer functionally exist, the facility is deemed uninhabitable. As it is no longer habitable based on this definition, information provided by the "Owner" and by the voluntary demolition by the "Owner," it lost its status as a principal structure and any "grandfather" protection, it may have had, from requirements and regulations of City Code.

The interpretation was presented to the "Owner" in early May 2014 and reviewed personally with the "Owner" at a meeting on May 20, 2014. At the meeting, the City presented their interpretation of the land use issues and actions necessary for compliance with City Code. The "Owner" was notified of the City's position on this matter on June 11, 2014.

Subsequent correspondence and meetings on this matter continued through August 20, 2014, to attempt to resolve the issues in question. On August 20, 2014, the City sent an updated memo that stated the City's final position and options for appeal.

It is the opinion of the City Attorney, that even absent the facts of the change in use, that the parcel is non-conforming and must be merged due to the common ownership of the abutting properties, one of which is non-conforming. In addition, the DNR has provided an opinion to the Owner that outlines the requirements for lot merger and 553 Lakeshore satisfies no requirements for exemption from this requirement.

As well as the City Attorney's opinion relating to the combination of lots, it is also the City staff's position that the change in use, by creation and choice of the "Owner" with the demolition, has resulted in following:

- 553 Lakeshore has now become an uninhabitable structure with no principle structure on the lot; and, has lost its "grandfather" protection afforded by its prior non-conforming use and lot of record status and is now subject to all the requirements and regulations of the City Code.

Staff is requesting that Council consider the following in regard to their deliberation of the matter:

- The mere non-conformity of the parcel related to the conditions of adjacent ownership and lot size coupled with the demolition of the residence require the merging of the two properties; and
- The change in use created by the "Owner" through demolition removes the "grandfather" protection of the non-conformities and subjects the property to all other requirements of City Code; and
- There are no "hardships" unique to the property and that any "hardships" that may be presented for discussion by the "Owner" are by creation of the "Owner;" and

4.0B

553 Lakeshore Administrative Hearing

- Allowance of the use would be inconsistent with the Zoning Ordinance's requirements for Principal and Accessory Structures and, therefore, inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan; and
- The proposed use of the property as a continuation of a residential use that does meet setback, impervious surface, intersection visibility, septic system, minimum dimensional requirements, lot size, and square footage building footprint requirements would be an unreasonable action on the part of the City.

Council is requested to conduct this Administrative Appeal on this matter. Staff recommends that the Appeal be conducted under the normal process of a Public Hearing. Upon completion of the discussion, Council is requested to provide direction to Staff, based on Council findings and rulings, for the disposition of this matter for separate adoption at the next City Council meeting or another date to be arranged.

Vierling, "Council, we'd note for the record that this afternoon the City received a request from one of the three property "Owners," Ms. Moegerle, requesting a continuance so that the matter would not be heard tonight and be heard instead on the 17th of December. Her reasoning for that was that she was tired and was caring for a ill domesticated pet. So, for the record, I'd like the Council to address that in terms of whether or not by motion you want to allow the request for continuance or conclude the matter tonight."

Ronning, "Are any questions in order?" Vierling, "Sure." Ronning, "Has any reason been conveyed for one of the other property "Owners" to be unavailable? That you're aware of?" Vierling, "No."

DeRoche, "I would move to go forward." Ronning, "Hum?" **DeRoche, "I would move to go forward with this public hearing."** Harrington, "Yeah, we've spent too much time on this, too much tax payer money, too much staff time. We've got to move forward."

Koller, "I'll second." DeRoche, "Any discussion?" Ronning, "Could you be more clear with that motion?" Vierling, "So the motion would be to deny the request to continue to the 17th." **DeRoche, "Again, to deny the continuance request.**

DeRoche, "And for discussion purposes, again, this issue has gone on for approximately 22 months. It's been hundreds of e-mails, some not so good, to City staff. An unbelievable amount of staff time has been put into this. It's my understanding that, you know, the legal fees could be up over $8,000 for this. As far as I'm concerned, you know, if you're a Councilperson, you're expected to follow the ordinances and everything else like every other resident is. As a matter of fact, I think it's more so because you're 'under the microscope.' People are looking to you and you're supposed to be sitting up here enforcing everything and yet to just go on and on and on and on. The fact of the matter is, things have changed over different meetings that have come through here on this. Because someone changes their mind, I mean, it came up, went before the Planning Commission, which was right before us. And, all seven of them said, 'No.'

This needs to stop. I, myself, have talked to Jack and the City Attorney and said, 'Look, enough's enough.' How much time and money are we going to put into this thing? And, is it going to be, you know, extended to every other resident in the City? I mean, if you can imagine. Every resident in the City for every time they have a 'beef' on an ordinance, to come up and drag it out for 22 months. I think it's wrong.

4.0B
553
Lakeshore
Administra-
tive Hearing

I think there's been, unfortunately, a lot of people don't understand all the information that is behind this. 'Oh, are we picking on her?' No. I think anyone…if you're interested, go on the website and you can pull up any of the agenda materials, any of the minutes, both of the Local Board of Assessment Equalization hearings where she requested and stated to the County Assessor and the City Assessor that it was an uninhabitable building, they bought the property for $6,000, and they were going to tear it down and make it green space. Over that time, the last, since February of 2013, this thing has just gone on and on and on and on and it's caused a lot of problems. It's caused a lot of arguing up here. It's caused a lot of residents to question, 'Well, gee whiz, if a Councilperson doesn't have to follow the ordinances, why do I?' I think it's a travesty that it's gone this far and I think to go any further, I think is wrong. I think it just, it needs to end here."

Ronning, "In addition to what Bob says, we've 'lived' this thing for 22 months and it's been an on-going debate for the most part. But, so, others have the ability to know some of the things that were, we've been going through and thinking of, Jack, I hope it isn't unfair to ask you to go through some of the details of this effort."

Jack, "I kind of reviewed them and there was a timeline of the activities that were sent out earlier and this is an updated, but the process started on February the 18th of 2013. Ms. Winter sent a letter to the "Owners" that indicated some of the requirements that they would have to do as a result of their purchase of 553 Lakeshore. On February 21, 2013, they came in and applied for a demolition permit. The demolition permit clearly stated that they would tear down the house part, that it was not inhabitable, and leave only the garage.

They came in 14 months later through a period that they did the demolition and requested an extension of the permit. They requested the extension and a modification based on the fact that they only wanted to tear the 1940s cabin section down. Based on their comments as to their intended use and their previous statements that only occurred a few days before at the Local Board of Appeals and Equalization, and the fact that the requirements for accessory structures was going to be increased, we approved the modification extension of the demolition permit. At the time, this was still to be a demolition project. The final product was to be a storage facility.

We did request that they submit a timeline for their demolition activities upon the approval of the extension. Their timeline actually was more of a statement as to what they were going to do. At this time, they did indicate that it was not going to be used for storage but a principal structure.

Myself and Colleen Winter had two meetings with the "Owners" in May to discuss this issue. The last one in May, on May the 20th 2014, we thought that we were making some progress toward resolution with the exception that the "Owners" did say that they would not combine the lots. On June the 11th, we sent them a memo stating what issues they were in noncompliance, what the sections of the Code related to, and what they needed to do to bring these into compliance.

Between June the 11th and July the 28th of this year, there were several calls, many e-mails, and finally a meeting on July 28th in which the "Owners" requested some additions to the building that related more to improvements to it. We told them that at this time, that we couldn't permit that.

4.0B

On August the 13th we gave them our final position by telephone. On August the 20th we

553 Lakeshore Administrative Hearing

gave them written notice for the item required for Code compliance. On August the 29th there were some issues with an overhang that was a building issue. This was later resolved. This was the only building issue that was a part of this whole process.

At the time this first timeline was developed, which was probably back three months ago, there'd been approximately 80 to 90 e-mails involved between City staff, the "Owners," the City Attorney, numerous meetings, and there've subsequently been many, many more since that time. So, this has been a process that's involved quite a bit of time of City staff and the City Attorney since May of this year. So, that's kind of just a brief overview of the things we've gone through in dealing with this issue."

Ronning, "Thanks. I personally believe it's important for others to know what we're considering, at least. That gets onto a lot of it, I don't know about all, but thank you."

DeRoche, "I think we have to vote on whether we're going to go ahead or not." Ronning, "Pardon?" DeRoche, "And then a motion…" Vierling, "There's a motion on the table, as I understand it, to deny the request for the continuance." **Harrington, "I'll second.** DeRoche, "Seconded. Any more discussion on it? All in favor?" **All in favor.** DeRoche, "Opposed? Hearing none, now we'll move on to the other item." **Motion passes unanimously.**

Vierling, "A couple items for housekeeping on this one. We'd recommend also that the following action be taken by the Council, **that the Council would formally adopt a motion at this time formally closing the record on this matter relative to 553 Lakeshore and that the record include the City staff file as of this date, the City's ordinances, Minnesota Statutes, and the Anoka County property records as part of the file."** DeRoche, "I'm agreeable to that. **I move that we accept those terms." Koller, "I'll second."** DeRoche, "Any more discussion? All in favor?" **All in favor.** DeRoche, "Opposed? Hearing none, motion passes." **Motion passes unanimously.**

Vierling, "Then finally, we would recommend to the Council that you pass, by motion at least, by indication to the staff **that you want City staff to return to you on the 17th of December with a draft resolution incorporating findings of fact and directives relative to this matter that are consistent with the staff recommendations that have been made within the file and to the Planning Commission." Koller, "I'll make that motion. Harrington, "I'll second."** DeRoche, "Any additions? Any more comments? Any discussion at all? All in favor?" **All in favor.** DeRoche, "Opposed? Hearing none." **Motion passes unanimously.**

Vierling, "Thank you."

5.0 Public Forum

DeRoche, "There was a young couple that just came in. Do you want to speak at the Public Forum? Oh, you just came to watch? Okay."

Sharon Johnson, 20241 Highway 65, "I just will be very brief tonight. My purpose for coming tonight and Bruce's also, is just to say 'thank you' to the outgoing Councilmembers, both Bob and Heidi. You came in at a really, really difficult time for the City and I'm sure it has not been fun, at all. So, I just want to acknowledge publically that you've done a good job and it's been hard.

5.0

We have been working with the City since about March of 2013, so almost two years,

Public Forum

through the IUP process and then working with the City to recommend rezoning to the Met Council. You could have said, 'No' at any time. And this is with the rest of the Council also, but you didn't and we appreciate it. We hope that you will see some new things happening on the farm next year with new buildings and new things. It's been really important for your support so I just thank you for that."

DeRoche, "Thanks Sharon and Bruce. Go ahead."

Zach Lachinski, "Hi, I'm Zack Lachinski, an Eagle Scout candidate with the local Boy Scout Troop 733. I'd like to announce the start of my project, which is a coat and boot drive for Head Start in Coon Rapids. We have set up a donation location at Kid's Express in St. Francis and I'm also going to talk to the High School and see if I can get a location there. I'd like to ask permission to set up a donation box here at City Hall."

DeRoche, "Is that feasible, Jack?" Davis, "Yes. I spoke with Zach's father earlier and told him that we could work something out for that." DeRoche, "Yeah, City staff could use some stuff."

Lachinski, "And, I'd also like to announce that if anybody has any questions regarding my project or would like to set up a donation location at their place of business or home, they can contact me through the City or I have flyers starting to be put up places and stuff like that. So, thanks."

Ronning, "How many are in your effort? Are you doing this alone?" Lachinski, "It's anywhere, I've asked my Troop to help me and I've asked my family to help me. And, anybody that's interested is very welcome to set up a donation location for all these things. Because kids need them. Not everybody can provide themselves with coats and boots and stuff like that."

Ronning, "If somebody should express interest, would you mind if they contact Jack or somebody at the City Hall and communicate that? Rather than have them contact you at home?" Lachinski, "Absolutely. That's just fine."

DeRoche, "That would probably be better. You don't need to put your phone number out there." Lachinski, "Thanks a lot." DeRoche, "All right Zach, appreciate the effort." Ronning, "Thank you. Yeah, that's commendable. Thank you. There's a lot of homeless people that would…" DeRoche, "Anyone else? Last chance to talk. All right, we'll move on."

6.0 Consent Agenda

Item A Bills/Claims

Item B Meeting Minutes, November 19, 2014, City Council Meeting

Meeting minutes from the November 19, 2014, City Council Meeting are attached for your review and approval.

Item C Oak Grove Building Official and Inspection Contract

The City has provided Building Official and Inspection Services to Oak Grove for the previous two years. The proposed contract for 2015 is identical to the 2014 contract for both fees and service. The City charges 80% of the fee schedule and 100% of the plan review costs to fund the contract. The revenues for each year of the agreement have exceeded our costs for these services. A copy of the proposed Contract is attached.

6.0

Consent Agenda

Item D Final Payment Elevated Storage Tank No. 1

This item includes the Final Payment to Caldwell Tank, Inc. for the construction of Elevated Storage Tank No. 1. The original contract amount for this project was $1,072,000.00. The final contract amount is $1,050,217.86. Staff recommends final payment of $55,360.89. A summary of the Final Payment is as follows:

Total Contract Amount	$ 1,072,000.00
Final Contract Amount	$ 1,050,217.86
Less Previous Payments	$ 994,856.97
Total Payment	$ 55,360.89

Payment for this project will be financed from the bond proceeds. Funds, as noted above, are available and appropriate for this project.

Ronning, "Move to approve the Consent Agenda as written." Harrington, "I'll second." DeRoche, "Any discussion on it? All in favor?" **All in favor.** DeRoche, "Opposed? Hearing none, motion passes." **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.0 New Business

Commission, Association and Task Force Reports

7.0A Planning Commission

None.

7.0B Economic Development Authority

None.

7.0C Park Commission

7.0C.1 East Anoka County Regional Trail Master Plan, Resolution 2014-49

Davis presented the staff report, indicating at the August, 2014 Parks Commission meeting, the Parks Commission adopted, or recommended approval of the North Anoka County Trail Plan. This is a trail that would run along Lexington Avenue north to 185th and then east along Lexington into Columbus, into Linwood, reenter the City at 229th Avenue from Linwood and continue on to the Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve. The trail would be constructed as part of road reconstruction on County right-of-way, entirely by County funds. Once the trail would be completed, the City's obligation would be for some maintenance activities. The County would be responsible, though, for the major capital improvement-type maintenance such as repaving, things of that nature. The Parks Commission has recommended approval and staff recommends approval from Council for this project.

Harrington, "I'll make a motion to approve and endorse the East Anoka County Regional Trail Master Plan with the passage of Resolution 2014-49." Ronning, "Second."

7.0C.1

DeRoche, "Any discussion?" Koller, "Is there anything here about what the total cost will be?" Davis, "There is information on the cost. It's included in the Plan. Again, that will be part of the County's responsibilities. There are no major plans for any reconstruction of those routes currently. So really, any costs now are just pure speculation but they would be

East Anoka County Regional Trail Master Plan, Resolution 2014-49	part of the County's road reconstruction when that part of the project is done." Ronning, "What's the extent of City commitments in this document?" Davis, "We would have some minor maintenance responsibilities but those would be worked out through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) and are to be determined." Ronning, "Can we consider that as supposed to mean no major expenses on our part?" Davis, "That's correct. And again, those responsibilities have to be defined and have to be approved by both the City and Anoka County through a JPA." DeRoche, "Any more discussion? All in favor?" **All in favor.** DeRoche, "Opposed? Hearing none, motion passes." **Motion passes unanimously.**
7.0D Road Commission	None.
8.0 Department Reports	None.
8.0A Community Development	
8.0B Engineer	None.
8.0C City Attorney	None.
8.0D Finance	None.
8.0E Public Works	None.
8.0F Fire Department	None.
8.0G City Administrator	Davis, "We contacted Johnson Controls to do a preliminary energy audit for City buildings in hopes of trying to find some means of saving additional funds. Johnson Controls does a lot of this work and part of their incentive to do it is they like to sell you products or equipment to achieve your goals. After the completion of their inventory, they came back and told us we had no self-funding projects. There was nothing that they saw that they could do other than just the minor stuff like programmable thermostats, some light bulb changes. We still have a few T8 fluorescents. We need to change that over. No major things were identified so they said that we're doing a very good job with our energy cost management and there was nothing that they could do to help us. Since they're in the business of selling these services, that's a pretty good endorsement on management of our energy cost." Ronning, "Um, not really a report. I, you and I spoke about this once before and when they say there's no real value they can add, they're taking it, I believe they're taking into
8.0G	

City Administrator

consideration their cost. There might be some improvements we can make but they'd be independent improvements on our part." Davis, "That's correct. And, what they do is they sell you equipment upgrades and it's paid for through your energy savings. But, in this case, they could identify none in any facilities that we had."

Ronning, "And the added cost on their part would be significant, to say the least, I think." Davis, "That's correct."

9.0 Other

None.

9.0A Staff Reports

9.0B Council Report – Member Ronning

Ronning, "I don't have a report. Ate too much last week." DeRoche, "There you go."

Council Member Harrington

Harrington, "No, I have nothing at this time."

Council Member Koller

Koller, "Well, I talked with Jack before the meeting about the Ice Arena. We had some issues there that they need to be straightened out a little bit. One of the scoreboards reads upside down. And, it's extremely cold in there because apparently the furnaces are not working right or are not turned on. I got a few complaints about that and some other cleanliness issues. But, Jack will hopefully get all that taken care of.

We did have another house fire but the Fire Department was able to save it. It was, a detached garage started on fire and caught the house on fire. They limited it to one wall and part of the attic. So, that's better than the house fire a week ago where it was burned to the ground. That was because of a heat lamp that was used to keep a pet cage warm. It ended up burning the entire house down. So, people have to be a little more careful, I think, and I'm one of them because I have a heat lamp keeping my dogs warm. So, that's about it for me."

Council Member Moegerle

Member Moegerle was absent.

Mayor DeRoche

DeRoche, "Well, I guess first I'd like to thank the other fire departments that did mutual aid. I actually did listen to that call and that mutual aid with other fire departments and cities, that's quite remarkable how these departments can get together and work. I mean, they train together and for some cities to think they're going to do it on their own, it's not going to happen. I mean, they're, this fire came up at such a time of night, to be able to get enough East Bethel people to come out, you just can't do it. So, again, I'd like to thank the fire departments. I think Linwood was there, Oak Grove. If I'm missing somebody, I'm sorry. I know there were a couple more involved.

Other than that, an update on the Sandhill Crane area, the grant was all put together and I think it's about a million dollars. Jack? And, all the paperwork's been done, signatures are in resolutions. Now, for those that didn't know, that was a situation where they were going to come in and clear cut a bunch of Oak wilts down in the Sandhill Crane area. And,

Mayor

DeRoche through a lot of meetings, a lot of efforts of a lot of people, I know Jack and I went to three or four meetings, and Anoka County Parks, and the DNR, and the MPCA, and everybody kind of really pulled together to come up with something to save that. So, to everybody that helped out on that, thanks a lot because that would have been kind of a 'drag' for the City to loose all that nice clear cut stuff.

Other than that, people are out on the ice fishing. I don't think that ice is ever really safe. But, fire departments go out of their way. There was a call today where they got called out, not East Bethel, but another department got called out because there was a cat out on the ice. What are you going to do? They got compassion and it's kind of a shame that you have to go out and risk your life, but you got to do it I guess."

Other than that, Sharon, Bruce, thanks for your support. For the last couple months, I've had numerous conversations with a lot of people. A lot of stuff was said and thinking back, I'm very happy with everything that got done in the last four years. I don't think anybody has any kind of a clue, unless you were actually involved or at the meetings, to understand just, like Sharon said, when we came in, there was a lot going on. And, that got taken care of. Then some other things came up. It's taken a while and, you know, people's personal agendas get involved. Well, yeah, it has and it's caused some kind of not so fun issues. But in looking back, I wouldn't change a thing. I wouldn't change the way I handled the situations. I thought it was done with somewhat dignity and respect but yet, you know, there's got to be a certain amount of decorum up here. People need to understand that if an item's on the agenda, that's when it can be discussed. Other stuff cannot just be discussed. And, we can't talk about it outside of here so, you know, again, get involved. Stop by at the meetings."

9.0C Other None.

10.0 Adjourn **Koller, "Motion to adjourn." Harrington, "I'll second."** DeRoche, "All in favor?" **All in favor.** DeRoche, "Opposed? Hearing none, we're done." **Motion passes unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Submitted by:
Carla Wirth
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.