EAST BETHEL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

MAY 6, 2015

The East Bethel City Council met on May 6, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. for the regular City Council meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Steve Voss	Ron Koller	Tim Harrington
	Brian Mundle	Tom Ronning	

ALSO PRESENT: Jack Davis, City Administrator
Mark Vierling, City Attorney

1.0 Call to Order

The May 6, 2015, City Council meeting was called to order by Mayor Voss at 7:00 p.m.

2.0 Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3.0 Adopt Agenda

Harrington stated I'll make a motion to adopt the agenda and under the Consent Agenda, I'd like to add line item K, Supplement Payment Summary. Vierling stated we would also note to Council that we're asking to **add an item for Closed Session, put it in 8.0D, relative to land acquisition on the Loch property. Harrington accepted this friendly amendment. Mundle stated I'll second.** Voss stated any discussion? All in favor say aye?" **All in favor. Motion passes unanimously.**

4.0 Public Forum

Voss asked is anyone here tonight for the Public Forum? Last chance? I'll right, we'll move on.

5.0 Consent Agenda

~~Item A Approve Bills~~

Item B April 22, 2015 City Council Work Meeting Minutes

Meeting minutes from the April 22, 2015 City Council Work Meeting are attached for your review.

Item C April 15, 2015 City Council Meeting Minutes

Meeting minutes from the April 15, 2015 City Council Meeting are attached for your review.

Item D April 15, 2015 Board of Appeals and Equalization Meeting Minutes

Meeting minutes from the April 15, 2015 Board of Appeals and Equalization Meeting are attached for your review.

Item E April 23, 2015 Town Hall Meeting Minutes

Meeting minutes from the April 23, 2015 Town Hall Meeting are attached for your review.

Item F Resolution 2015-26 Accepting Donation from the Coon Lake Beach Community Center

The City of East Bethel has received a donation of $ 2,000.00 from The Coon Lake Community Center for the East Bethel Fire Department Heart Safe Program.

Item G Resolution 2015-27 Declaring the 2004 F-550 Surplus Property

The 2004 Ford F-550 light duty truck has outlived its useful life as a dependable vehicle for the City's maintenance needs. With increases in repairs, the cost to maintain the vehicle has

5.0

Consent Agenda

exceeded its value. After 11 years of snow plowing parking lots and cul-de-sacs, pulling trailers, hauling material it has reached the end of its useful service life. This is a scheduled replacement and budgeted for in the Equipment Replacement Fund.

Staff recommends adoption of Resolution 2015-27, Declaring the 2004 Ford F-550 Surplus Property and directing the vehicle be traded in on a replacement vehicle or sold at auction.

Item H Resolution 2015-28 Declaring the 2003 F-150 Surplus Property

The 2003 Ford F-150 light duty pickup truck has outlived its useful life as a dependable vehicle for the City's maintenance needs. With increases in repairs, the cost to maintain the vehicle has exceeded its value. After 12 years of service, including use as a building inspection vehicle and a public works utility truck, it has reached the end of its useful service life. This is a scheduled replacement and budgeted for in the Equipment Replacement Fund and was originally planned for replacement in 2014 but has been pushed back to extend the service life.

Staff recommends adoption of Resolution 2015-28, Declaring the 2003 Ford F-150 Surplus Property and directing the vehicle be traded in on a replacement vehicle or sold at auction.

Item I Approve Purchase of Light Duty Truck with Dump Box and Snowplow

As part of the City's Equipment Replacement Program, the 2004 Ford F-550 light duty truck is scheduled for replacement in 2015. This is a regular replacement for this item. This piece of equipment has reached the stage in its service life where the maintenance costs are becoming excessive and are approaching the value of the truck. Due to higher maintenance costs, increased down time and lower productivity of this vehicle, City staff recommends that we replace the 2004 Ford F-550 light duty truck.

Staff has checked State contracts for light duty trucks with minimum specifications of a one-ton frame, diesel engine, dual rear wheels and the ability to have a dump box and hoist mounted. This is consistent with the vehicle that will be replaced. Staff has reviewed the three options for the cab and chassis on State contract from the three major truck manufactures and has determined that the Ford F-450 provides the best value and the lowest cost. The following information provides pricing data for the cab and chassis portion of the replacement program.

1.5 ton Light Duty Trucks – Cab and Chassis

Model	Dealer	Cost
2016 Ford F-450	Midway Ford	$41,055

Staff researched truck components on the State contract that included a 9-foot dump body with hoist and front snowplow. From a review of many different manufacturers, the quote provided by Aspen Equipment best fit the city's needs at the lowest price. The quote includes a 9-foot Henderson box with fold down sides, corrosion resistant bed material, strobe lights, and a Western snowplow.

Dump Body and Plow

Model	Dealer	Cost
Henderson and Western	Aspen Equipment	$21,203

Funds for this acquisition are provided for in the Equipment Replacement Fund. Funding was budgeted at $55,000 for replacement of the Ford F-550. The trade-in value of the 2004 Ford F-550 has been quoted at only $3,500 so staff will offer the truck up for auction on

5.0

Consent Agenda

MnBID. The total purchase price of the completed truck after the trade-in would be $62,258. All prices are directly from the State Contract for 2015-2016.

Staff recommends the purchase of the Ford F-450 from Midway Ford with box and plow equipment from Aspen Equipment for a total cost of $62,258. This equipment will meet our current needs and provide a reliable snowplow and light duty truck with a projected service life of 12 years.

Item J Approve Purchase of Light Duty Pickup Truck with Snowplow

As part of the City's Equipment Replacement Program, the 2003 Ford F-150 light duty pickup truck is scheduled for replacement in 2015 after originally scheduled for replacement in 2014. This is a regular replacement for this item. This piece of equipment has reached the stage in its service life where the maintenance costs are becoming excessive and are approaching the value of the truck. Due to higher maintenance costs, increased down time and lower productivity of this vehicle, City staff recommends that we replace the 2003 Ford F-150 light duty pickup truck.

Staff has checked State contracts for light duty pickup trucks and reviewed the options from the three major truck manufacturers and has determined that the Ford F-350 provides the best value and the lowest cost. The larger suspension, engine and towing capacity of the F-350 model makes the vehicle a much more useful piece of equipment for the Public Works Department with the ability to pull a heavy trailer and plow snow at an increased cost of only $2,700 over the F-150 option. Staff is also recommending the addition of a Western snowplow to help increase snowplow response times.

Model	Dealer	Cost
2016 F-350 Pickup Truck	Midway Ford	$28,801
Western Snowplow	Aspen Equipment	$ 5,947
	Total Cost	$34,748

Funds for this acquisition are provided for in the Equipment Replacement Fund. Funding was budgeted at $30,000 for replacement of the Ford F-150. The trade-in value of the 2003 Ford F-150 has been quoted at only $500 so staff will offer the truck for auction on MnBID. All prices are directly from the State Contract for 2015-2016.

Staff recommends the purchase of the Ford F-150 from Midway Ford with the snowplow from Aspen Equipment for a total cost of $34,748. This equipment will improve our current snowplowing service and provide a reliable light duty pickup truck with a projected service life of 12 years.

Item K Supplemental Payment Summary

Koller stated I will make a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Harrington stated I'll second. Ronning stated I want to **pull A**. Voss stated any discussion? All in favor say aye?" **All in favor.** Voss stated any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

5.0A Approve Bills

Ronning stated on the bills, we get itemized bills, there's 10, 15, whatever the number is, utilities, electric utilities, and gas utilities. Usually it's identified as 'Fire Station' or this building, that building. I'm kind of curious to have a breakout of what the power usage is on the utilities, our utilities, sewer, water. Davis stated we can certainly do that and generally they're listed as to Fire Department, Streets and Roads. Streets and Roads, for example, cover a variety of usages. It can cover everything from the traffic signals to the Public Works building to parks and things of that nature. So, we can definitely break them out to any degree you want them. Ronning stated put them in parentheses next to it, or something, maybe. Davis stated sure.

Voss asked aren't they listed under the Departments that they're charged to? Davis stated that's correct but they are not listed principally as to what use in that Department. For Streets and Roads, like I said, it could be traffic lights, it could be Public Works.

Ronning stated move to accept Consent Agenda A. Koller stated I'll second. Voss stated any discussion? All in favor say aye?" **All in favor.** Voss stated opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

6.0 New Business

Commission Association and Task Force Reports

6.0A Planning Commission 6.0A.1 April Report

Davis presented the staff report indicating at their April 28, 2015, Meeting the Planning Commission reviewed a proposal by Brown-Wilbert, the largest septic tank manufacturer and supplier in Minnesota, regarding an interest in relocating their headquarters from St Paul to a location in the Northern Metro area. They are interested in property at the southeast corner of 221st Avenue NE and Highway 65 as a potential site for their business. The site under consideration is zoned B-2, Central Business District, capped by a Business Overlay District. The purpose of the Overlay District in this zoning classification is to:

- To promote a planned environment for integrated residential, industrial, office, and commercial which features design continuity;
- Encourages orderly development of property;
- Encourages patterns of development in harmony with the objectives of the City's comprehensive plan;
- Encourages more attractive and enduring commercial and industrial districts; and
- Provides a uniform set of standards to be applied equally to all owners and developers in this district.

The Planning Commission will conduct a Public Hearing to consider a Conditional Use Permit for this business at their May 26, 2015 Meeting. This subject will be also be discussed at the May 18, 2015 EDA Meeting.

<u>Craft Breweries</u>

There was a discussion of potential ordinance changes or the drafting of a new ordinance that would address the permitting of craft breweries and local distilleries within the Commercial and Light Industrial zoned areas within the City. The City is currently working with a small brewer who is looking at locations in the City for their business operation. We currently do not have anything in our Code of Ordinances that addresses the particular needs of this type of business. Staff is in preparation of a proposed ordinance or ordinance change, whichever is appropriate, to address this matter.

<u>City Ordinance Chapter 10, Article 5</u>

The Planning Commission reviewed a request to amend the City Ordinance that regulates the raising and keeping of chickens. After discussion of the issue, the Planning Commission recommended to consider changing the current ordinance to allow a maximum of six chickens on

6.0A.1 Planning Commission April Report

lots of less than three acres with the provisions that no roosters be kept, proper enclosures be provided, and sanitation standards maintained. The proposed ordinance change will be submitted to the City Council on this matter at their May 20, 2015 Meeting for consideration.

Davis asked are there any questions about the items discussed by the Planning Commission?

Mundle asked the craft brewery, would that be open then to serve alcohol to some extent. Davis answered yes, it would be, that's correct. Mundle stated okay, not just producing and bottling and shipping away. Davis stated that's correct. That's why we have to look at doing an ordinance to accommodate this and probably also amending the section of our ordinance that pertains to our liquor laws.

Ronning asked what's a microbrewery? Davis stated a microbrewery is a brewery that produces a small amount of beer as compared to a large brewer like somebody that sells regionally. They may produce like a couple thousand gallons a year. They sell it mostly for local distribution.

Voss stated they're getting quite popular. There's a lot of them in the cities now. Davis agreed stating they are and they're popping up all over the place. We do have one person that's exploring East Bethel as a location for that. Voss stated good.

Harrington stated so it's a small brewery. What kind of square footage is he looking for? Davis stated it would probably be like about, maybe, 1,500 square feet. It's a very small operation. 2,000 square feet. It doesn't take much room. Voss stated I forget the size of the vats they use but it's not, a couple thousand gallons. Davis agreed, stating it's not huge and they would have a tasting room. They wouldn't actually sell their product for local consumption.

Voss asked they're not planning to have a taproom? Davis answered not at this time. Voss asked any other questions for Jack?

Davis stated one other item I'd like to mention is this proposal for this septic system site, there are some issues that they will have to address as far as access goes. So, they've been notified that they will need to contact the County to see what they can do for an intersection application. Currently, the point at which they wish to access this property may not be permissible because it's too close to 65, doesn't allow for stacking of traffic, and even with a turn lane there may be some right-of-way issues that they would have to address with Mn/DOT. So, we'll see how that progresses.

Voss asked did we not have those same discussions with the previous users a few years ago? Davis stated no because that was an existing entrance and their actual entrance is farther away. It's down past that concrete median. If you'll look at the aerial photograph of what the site is, their proposed entrance would be directly across from Dick Kable's driveway. If you'll recall, that concrete median there was shortened 60 feet to accommodate Dick's need to have a left turn in there. You can see where the right-of-way is at a 45-degree angle on that line. That's Mn/DOT right-of-way. So, the Mn/DOT right-of-way goes a little farther in toward the County right-of-way than it normally would on a straight line, off set from the road. So, they are going to be looking at those issues to see if that's going to be a consideration for them.

6.0A.1 Planning Commission April Report

Mundle stated well there'd be possibilities of having it to the east side with there being ponding there. Davis stated that may be a County requirement. If it is, it would be a very expensive entrance because there're wetland issues and ponds that would have to be dealt with.

Voss asked right now, that's a lot of record? Or, is this a split? Davis stated it is a lot of record. Voss stated so I don't think the County can deny an access though. Davis stated they may be able to, for that type of use, if there's going to be safety concerns. And, I've asked for a meeting with Jane Rose for some clarification on that.

Voss asked isn't that, the piece on the east side, what we looked at years ago for alignment of the frontage road? Davis answered it is but the frontage road entrance to there would have come actually east of Sandy Drive. In this area right here. (*Davis pointed to an area on a map.)* And, when that road is put in, if there's development of that property across the street, then we would require those roads to line up at that point. Voss asked any other comments or questions?

Informational; no action required.

6.0B Economic Development Authority

Davis presented the staff report indicating the Council is asked to consider the appointment of a City Councilperson as the City Liaison to the Business Retention and Expansion Task Force.

6.0B.1 BR&E Task Force Appointment

The East Bethel Economic Development Authority and Chamber of Commerce have partnered with the University of Minnesota to develop a Business Retention and Expansion Program to assist eligible businesses in the City.

The purposes of the program are to:

- Help existing business solve issues that directly impact their firms;
- Assist businesses in identifying and utilizing resources that designed to assist them to become more competitive;
- Develop plans to long-range and sustaining retention and expansion activities; and,
- Build community capacity and a stronger business environment to sustain growth and development.

A Leadership Team has been formed by the EDA and Chamber and they are seeking Task Force volunteers to assist in the development and implementation of the project goals. Anyone that would be willing to assist in this effort can call City Hall for contact information.

The Leadership Team has also requested that a City Councilperson be appointed as a Liaison to the group. This appointment would create a link between the Council and the program managers and provide a direct avenue of communication to the Council.

At this time, Council is requested to consider the appointment of a City Councilperson as City Liaison to the Business Retention and Expansion Leadership Team and Task Force.

Voss stated so we've talked about this briefly before. Is there any volunteers? Mundle stated Doug came to me and asked me if I would. Voss asked does that mean you're volunteering? Mundle stated I did volunteer, yes. Voss stated that's good. I didn't know what kind of power Doug had. Mundle stated if there's anybody else that would have an

interest. Voss stated hearing none, do we want to make a motion to appoint Brian?

6.0B.1 BR&E Task Force Appointment

Harrington stated I'll make a motion to appoint Brian as the City Council Liaison for the Business Retention and Expansion Leadership Team. Koller stated I'll second. Voss stated and you fully understand your responsibilities as Liaison? Mundle indicated in the affirmative. Voss stated okay, I don't want you to take on too much. Any discussion? Thank you Brian. All in favor say aye?" All in favor. Voss stated opposed? Hearing none that motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.** Voss stated I'm glad to see that moving forward.

6.0C Park Commission

None.

6.0D Road Commission

6.0D.1 Street Capital CIP 2016-2020

Davis presented the staff report indicating the Council is asked to consider approval of 2016-2020 Street Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

The Streets Capital Improvement Plan was developed by the Roads Commission and staff to prioritize street improvement projects over the next five years. The Roads Commission adopted the 2016-2020 Streets Capital Improvement Plan at their April 14, 2015 meeting.

The recommended street maintenance projects for 2016 are estimated to cost $870,900 and include the overlay of Rendova Street, Okinawa Street, Tippecanoe Street, 209th Avenue, Austin Street, and 204th Avenue.

For 2016, the Road Commission recommends that funds for an MSA project be approved for the construction of a service road that would link the Classic Commercial Park area to Viking Boulevard. Currently the commercial park only has one access location at 187th Avenue and Trunk Highway 65. The additional access would alleviate some of the stacking issues that occur at 187th Avenue, provide additional access for emergency vehicles, and open up additional property for development in the Municipal Services Area. The proposed route is currently designated as a MSA street and has been part of the City's Street Plan since 2005. The estimated cost of the project is $2.4 million and would be funded through MSA funds and a Highway Safety Improvement Grant. The City will also apply for a Cooperative Agreement Grant from Mn/DOT to offset the costs of this project.

Commitment to the Capital Improvement Plan requires the dedication of funding for 2016 only. Projects beyond 2016 are identified and prioritized by the Roads Commission to provide the Council with recommendations for 2017 through 2020 as part of the overall capital project planning for major street improvements. Commitment to projects beyond 2016 will be considered for approval as part of each year's subsequent budgets.

The estimated cost of the Street Capital Projects in 2016 is projected to be $870,900. This amount is available from dedicated sources in the Street Capital Fund. The estimated cost of the MSA Capital Projects in 2016 is $2.4 million. Funding for this portion is available through MSA funding, Highway Safety Improvement Grants, and a Mn/DOT Cooperative Agreement Grant.

The Road Commission and staff recommend approval of the 2016-2020 Streets Capital Improvement Plan.

Harrington stated I'll make a motion for approval of the 2016-2020 Streets Capital Improvement Plan. Ronning stated second. Voss stated any discussion?

6.0D.1 Street Capital CIP 2016-2020

Ronning stated yes, Jack, on that MSA, could you explain? MSA is Minnesota Street Assistance? Davis answered Municipal Street Aid. Ronning asked how much is there and are we pulling ahead from future funds? Davis stated we receive approximately $780,000 a year from that fund and $180,000 is designated for maintenance purposes, which is put in our General Fund budget, which goes into the Streets and Roads budget. The remainder, approximately $603,000, is dedicated to improving our MSA designated streets. Currently, we have approximately 24 miles, I believe, of MSA streets within the City. These are major arteries and thoroughfares. At the beginning of 2016, we should have approximately $800,000-some in that account. We'll get another transfer from Mn/DOT of $600,000 so we'll have $1.4 million in that account. We can advance fund projects from these monies up to, I believe, it's four times our annual allotment. This projection that we have does allow for three phases of our Street Improvement Program. Two other MSA projects, through 2020, if this is done in the way it's presented, we would be advance funding in 2020 so we couldn't do a project in 2021. We'd be caught up and in 2022 or 2023 we could continue with our MSA projects. We still could continue but we'd have to advance fund and borrow money against our future allocations. So, there are funds here. This won't involve any City levy portions of the budget. MSA funds are directly from Mn/DOT. The Highway Safety Improvement Grants would be a Federal/State grant that we could receive and the Cooperative Agreement Grant would be from Mn/DOT.

Ronning stated I think you've probably already answered, but what potential impact could you anticipate as far as East Bethel funds? Davis stated East Bethel funds aren't planned to be utilized at all in any of these projects. Ronning stated for a City of our size, this $2.4 million is kind of a 'spooky' number. That's, we'll be able to do that without? Davis stated that's correct. Of that $2.4 million, beginning in 2016, we would have $1.4 million in our MSA Fund. We've been told by Mn/DOT that we would qualify for a $500,000 Highway Safety Improvement Grant. We'd also apply for a $500,000 Mn/DOT Cooperative Agreement Grant to finish out the funding. So, we wouldn't be using any of our Street Capital Funds or any levied funds for this portion of the project. Ronning stated thank you.

Voss stated any other discussion? Hearing none, all in favor say aye?" **All in favor.** Voss stated opposed? Motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

6.0D.2 April 14, 2015 Minutes

Informational; no action required.

7.0 Department Reports

None.

7.0A Community Development

7.0B Engineer

None.

7.0C City Attorney

None.

7.0D Finance

None.

7.0E Public Works 7.0E.1 Amendment to Cemetery Policy

Davis presented the staff report indicating the Council is asked to consider approval of an amendment to the Cemetery Policy that would require cremation burials be placed inside a suitable vault.

The City of East Bethel Public Works Department maintains three cemeteries including the locating, marking, opening, and closing of the burial plots. One problem the staff consistently encounters is the locating of cremation burials without a vault. Many times the urns are too small to locate or are made of a material that breaks down or collapses. Two cremations are allowed on a single plot, so accurately locating the existing urns is a necessity before opening the plot for an additional cremation burial. By requiring the urns to be placed in an approved vault, they can be accurately located and not disturbed.

Most cemeteries in the metropolitan area require vaults for cremation burial. The cost for these vaults to the family ranges from $100 to $300 depending on the vault style.

Davis stated you have in your attachments our Cemetery Policy and under Burial Rules, under #3, we would add one line that states: *'Cremation burials require a vault constructed of cement, steel, or other suitable material, not degrade, and be able to withstand the weight of the soil.'*

Mundle stated make a motion to approve the amended Cemetery Policy. Harrington stated I'll second. Voss stated any discussion?

Ronning stated #3 addition, whose responsibility is that? Davis stated that would be the responsibility of the person who actually has the burial plot. Whenever a burial is done, we do the excavation, or we open the grave. I think if done through a funeral home, they would have to supply the vault before the burial could be completed. So, it would be the responsibility of the person who was having the funeral.

Ronning stated if somebody should ask, if they don't, what are the requirements of a vault other than cement, steel, or other suitable material? It's some kind of a structure, sounds like. Davis stated in all probability, I read that and it was a question I had. It should have been, and we can add this at your direction or come back the next time, there should have been a little bit more definition as to the specifications of that at least relating to a certain manufacturer or style. That can be added. If you want to table that, I can bring it back next time and give you some specifications that actually spell out what is required.

Voss asked couldn't we simply say 'commercially available' or 'commercially manufactured.' Davis stated we can do it either way or we can do it upon, all the major funeral homes have people they deal with that provide these products. Even the vaults that you have for a direct burial. We can add that type of language to further define what the type of vault should be.

Ronning stated for comparison, most cemeteries in the metropolitan area require vaults, range from $100 to $300. Would that get near this change in #3? Davis stated yes, and what we're talking about are the urns for cremation burials. All those have to be dug is 30 inches deep by 30 inches wide so it's a very small opening. These are not very large structures required. One of the problems that we had, when we have to locate them, is we use a probe and we don't want to disturb anything. A lot of times, the probe will go through the urn and you won't be able to discern the difference between that and the soil.

Ronning asked what was your, I don't know if it was a suggestion or a hint, sort of, table it

7.0E.1 Amendment to Cemetery Policy

for what information? Davis stated we can come up with more precise specifications or we can add a statement that says, 'what is commercially available and acceptable.' That's kind of vague but if you want more specs, we can certainly bring it back.

Voss stated well, the kind of 'double-edged sword' with being very specific is you're being very specific in making sure we're correct and standards don't change and everything else. Ronning stated people's final resting place is, you don't want to guess about it or wonder too much. Voss stated that is one of the purposes of the vaults.

Davis stated what we do is we rely upon the funeral homes to take care of all this and if we say there is a vault required for cremation burial, then they take care of that. They have access to all the products and can direct the family of the deceased as to what's available and what should be put in.

Ronning stated move to table for further information to be brought up when the information's available. Ronning asked would that be the next meeting? Davis responded yes. Ronning stated **until the next meeting. Koller stated I'll second.** Voss stated all in favor say aye?" **All in favor.** Voss stated opposed? **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.E.2 Coon Lake Invasive Species Treatment

Davis presented the staff report indicating the Council is asked to consider direction to participate in the Aquatic Invasive Species Control Program or approval to opt out of the Program.

At the Annual Meeting of the Coon Lake Improvement District in July of each year, members at the meeting vote to approve and fund the District's activities for the coming year. An annual fee is determined and will be charged to eligible District properties via collection of fees by the County on the following year tax statements. These fees are currently used to fund the cost of herbicide treatments in areas identified as moderate- to heavily-infested with Curly Leaf Pondweed or Eurasian Water Milfoil. This is determined by means of a delineation to locate and document sites to be re-inspected and/or approved by the Minnesota DNR for treatment by a State-licensed applicator contracted by the Coon Lake Improvement District. The chemicals normally used to control these are Endothall, Triclopyr, and 2-4-D.

Signatures for herbicide control of invasive species are not currently needed for Coon Lake as the Minnesota DNR has waived the signature requirement as allowed by State Statute. This is documented as an amendment to the Lake Vegetation Management Plan through April of 2015. The following, with the distribution of this letter, fulfills the requirement as stated in Subd. 3c. State Statute above.

Early season herbicide treatment for Curley Leaf Pond Weed is expected to take place from mid- to late-April depending on variables such as ice-out date, water temperature, approval of permit, and herbicide applicator availability. This will be done by using the chemical Aquathol K, at dosage rates of .75 – 2 parts per million. Nuisance control of Eurasian Water Milfoil should follow in mid-May to mid-late June and areas would be treated with a 2-4-D or Triclopyr herbicide and be applied at the rate of .75 – 2.5 parts per million depending on the applicator's recommendation.

It is the owner's right to request treatment not be done in front of their property. In this case, it is identified as an area that needs to be treated, but please be mindful that this is a collective effort funded by each owner and non-treated areas may diminish the quality of control and affect. The goal to reduce the quantity of control of Aquatic Invasive Species

7.E.2 Coon Lake Invasive Species Treatment

with each year's successful results. Should the City desire to Opt Out, they need to fill out the form "Request to be Excluded From Herbicide Treatments" and mail a copy to each of the recipients listed on the form. A decision to opt out would only include non-treatment of City frontage property and not that of the entire Lake. The City has participated in this program in the past.

Staff is seeking direction from Council as to the desire to participate in the Aquatic Invasive Species Control Program for Coon Lake.

Voss stated just so we're clear, it's only in front of the properties that the City owns. Davis stated that's what we're dealing with on our decision for treatment or to opt out. That's only for City owned properties. Most of the City owned property on Coon Lake is south of Lincoln Drive down to the Ham Lake corporate limits.

Voss stated there are four of them along East Front Boulevard right-of-way. Davis stated those are just small accesses. This is probably an area of about, maybe, 1,000 feet or so.

Koller stated I'm on the Sunrise River Watershed and we work on the same projects and the City funds the Watershed. So, are we 'fighting' with each other? Davis stated no, actually the funds for this come from the Coon Lake Improvement District and those funds are collected by tax levy by the County.

Voss stated all the waterfront riparian properties, they pay a tax on it. Mundle stated so we're not actually paying for the Program. We're just saying yes, we want the treatment or no we don't. Voss stated that's correct. We are selecting to participate in the treatment program or opt out of the treatment program. Everyone's in unless you opt out. Davis stated correct.

Koller stated I'll make a motion to stay in the Program. Mundle stated I'll second. Voss stated any discussion? Yeah, it's a good Program to stay in. Ronning stated one question, I'm sorry. If somebody opts out, are they taxed anyhow because they're on part of the property? Voss answered yup, that doesn't change. Anything else? All in favor say aye?" **All in favor.** Voss stated any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.0F Fire Department

None.

7.0G City Administrator

(At this point, Koller left the Council Chambers.)

7.0G.1 Ice Arena

Davis presented the staff report indicating the Council is asked to consider approval to select a Management Contractor for the East Bethel Ice Arena

The City of East Bethel managed and operated the City Ice Arena with City staff until 2006. From 2006 to 2008, the City contracted with the National Sports Center for management services for this facility. The National Sports Center declined to exercise their option to extend their contract at the end of the 2008 season. As a result, the City solicited other management proposals for operation of the facility and awarded a contract to Gibson Management Company, LLC for the work. Gibson Management has operated the Arena for the past seven years.

7.0G.1 Ice Arena Management Services Contract

The City Ice Arena operates as an Enterprise Fund. The Fund had a cash balance deficit of $134,835 in 2011 but currently has a positive cash balance of $134,254. City levies are not used to support the Arena; however, revenues from the cell tower on site were allocated to the Arena Fund prior to and through 2014. The goal of the City, at minimum, is to operate this facility with all costs paid through user fees.

Aside from the outsourcing of the management of the Arena to an independent contractor as we have done since 2006, the City could consider the following alternative options:

- Leasing the facility outright; or,
- Hiring a contract manager and operate the facility under the umbrella of the City.

The major issue with leasing is protecting the City's investment in the facility and establishing responsibilities for maintenance and use of the equipment and property. Directly contracting the management as a City function, while a consideration, could create a position and a role that has the potential to expand well beyond its anticipated purpose and produce an additional level of management and possible expense. Staff is of the opinion that contracting with an independent management company is the most efficient and economical means to operate the facility at this time.

A Request for Proposals for the Arena Management Contract was advertised in the *Anoka Union*, City Website, and with the League of Minnesota Cities. There were two submittals for the Management Services Contract. Those were:

Gibson Management, LLC – Rochester, Minnesota; and,
Victory Management – Isanti, Minnesota

The City Council received and reviewed presentations of the management proposals from these two firms at a Work Meeting on March 25, 2015. This matter was considered by City Council on April 15, 2015, but was tabled and additional discussions were conducted at a Work Meeting on April 22, 2015.

The City has budgeted $79,000 for this service for the 2016 Budget. Both of the proposals exceed this amount and it is recommended that the contractor selected be open to negotiation for their quote for services. Staff recommends that a contract award be provided for a term of not less than two nor more than three years.

Staff recommends that Council consider approval of a contractor to provide management services for the City Ice Arena and direct staff to negotiate a contract for these services with the selected contractor and present the negotiated contract for consideration of approval at the May 20, 2015, City Council Meeting.

Voss stated okay, we've had, this is the fourth meeting now on this subject. Davis responded yeah. Ronning stated well, we don't have a motion. Mr. Attorney, we don't have a motion to hold discussion under. Vierling stated it would be preferred procedurally that you have a motion and a second and then do discussion of it.

Voss stated I'll move that we contract for the Arena with Gibson Management. Mundle stated I'll second. Voss stated discussion? There's a pause. Ronning stated a pause that refreshes.

Ronning stated I went back and looked at the Management Contracts from 2010 through. 2010 was $85,898; 2011 was $86,398; 2012 was $90,000 with an actual of $80,556; 2013

7.0G.1 Ice Arena Management Services Contract

was $86,000 with an actual of $86,072. 2014 was $84,000 but I think reduced to $79,000 after the budget numbers were reviewed. Personally, I'm not worried about, I think we need to be conscious of costs. But, I don't think as long as we can get some 'wiggle room' someplace, we don't have to take the cheapest one. We're not required.

Voss stated well, it's a professional contract, right? Vierling explained a service contract so you're not required to do competitive bidding.

Ronning stated as far as the cost goes, I went through some of the expenses and just the numbers I have, budget and the actual, motor fuel is $2,500 budgeted 2012 and 2013. 2012 actual was $1,742. 2013 was $1,800. And, it reflects that way pretty much all the way through. Building repair $5,000 for 2012; $5,000 for 2013 and 2014. In 2012 was $2,898; 2013 was $2,049. Telephone goes the other direction. $1,300 for 2012 and 2013. I think that's what it was for 2014. But, the actual was $1,349 or $49 over for 2012. 2013 was $1,504 or $204 over. Electric utilities $33,000 for both 2012 and 2013. The numbers are 'eye openers' for what it cost to run that place. Electric utilities actual for 2012 was $31,103 and 2013 was $33,163, or $163 over. Gas utilities 2012 was $24,000, 2013 was $22,000. It's mid-$50,000 range to keep the doors open with lights and heat for the most part. The actual for 2012 was $14,652. The actual for 2013, with the $22,000 budget, was $16,537. It goes on like that but the point is that on most lines, I can say almost every one, but on most lines, the actual is less than the budget. Jack and Mike do a heck of a job putting a budget together for us to look at. So, it's well planned, very well planned. But, there's room to 'play' on our side too. Although, you have to come to some kind of a mid-point.

Voss stated I'm having a hard time. Overall, what's your point? Ronning stated I wouldn't go for the lower one just because it's lower. We have prior experience from that and it's been said in the past that last year, we went with a one-year agreement. What's the name of the other one? Not the St. Francis. Davis stated St. Francis Youth Hockey Association? Ronning stated that bigger outfit? Davis stated Rink Management. Ronning stated Rink Management, so we ended up going with a one-year agreement to see how things went. That's my recollection. And, they pulled, they said, 'We can't do it. The shortest we can go is two years.' I think. And then once it was too late they said, 'We can go a year.' But, don't be hung up on the lowest price.

Voss stated personally, for me, I'm not. That wasn't a driving decision on it. Ronning stated this is a motion to allow discussion. Voss stated no, this is a motion to approve Gibson Management. There is no motion to allow discussion. Ronning stated well, that's what it started with and came my way. My mistake. Voss asked anything else? Ronning replied no, thank you.

Mundle stated I'd recommend a two-year contract. Not a three year. Voss asked the current proposal is three years? Davis stated the current proposal they're operating under now is one year but on the award, we would recommend a minimum of two or a maximum of three. I don't think we want to go beyond three years with the contract and I don't think we want to be back here next year doing this either. Voss stated right and in discussion with both bidders, two years was acceptable. Correct? Davis stated that would be negotiated as part of the contract. They are both aware that is the proposal of the City.

Voss stated I'm accepting of the **two year as a point of negotiation for the contract, as a two-year contract**. Ronning stated a **friendly amendment**. Voss stated you're okay with

7.0G.1 Ice Arena Management Services Contract

it because you made the second? Mundle stated yeah, I'm okay with re-seconding. Voss stated any other discussion? Hearing none, all in favor say aye?" **Mundle and Voss-Aye; Harrington and Ronning -Nay (Koller absent) motion fails.**

Voss asked other motions? **Harrington stated I'll make a motion to offer Victory Management.** Ronning stated it's not necessary. Voss stated yes it is. This item is still on the table. Ronning asked is it? Voss answered yes. Ronning stated I thought once it failed it was. Vierling stated this particular motion that was offered failed. That doesn't mean that other motions can't be offered relative to other providers. Ronning stated okay. **Harrington repeated I'll make a motion to offer Victory Management a two-year contract. Ronning stated second.** Voss asked any discussion? All in favor say aye?" **Harrington and Ronning-Aye; Mundle and Voss -Nay (Koller absent) motion fails.**

Voss asked what's the current contract run to? Davis stated the current contract runs through July 31st of this year. Voss stated okay and with the way the current contract is written, it has to be renewed? Vierling stated it will be renewed. There's always opportunities, presumably, theoretically, to do it a month after that. Voss asked is there a continuation on the contract? Vierling answered no. That would have to be discussed with them. Voss stated so if nothing gets resolved by that time, we have no one to run it, theoretically. Vierling stated you have no contract.

Voss stated I'm open to suggestions. Ronning asked when would somebody like to bring it up again? That's probably a reasonable question. Mundle asked are you referring to bringing it to another Work Meeting? Ronning stated that was a second thought. Maybe have a little further discussion. Voss stated we've had about two and a half hours total. Ronning stated yes, I know.

Harrington stated I like Victory because she's a little more enthusiastic. We've had some problems with Gibson that people have complained. I think it's time maybe for a little change and some new 'blood' over at the Ice Arena. She's got a lot of good ideas. I think we should give her an opportunity.

Ronning stated you know, on that line, last year we had the three. The people that were going to come and present a proposal from St Francis Hockey Association didn't make it. And, the lady that spoke a couple meetings ago, just 'cold turkey,' went off the cuff, and all but one, it was four that was in favor of it and one was against. They did back out but the point, I guess, is that there was, the discussion revolves around the ice. Putting the ice in, caring for it and stuff and at that time, correct me if I'm wrong Tim, there was no question, no mention, no anything about the ice of the St. Francis Hockey group. There was no concern about being able to do it or have somebody to do it. So, to me, it's pretty much like Tim said. You're going to go for more of the same or you going to try to improve things. And, only the future tells if it's improved or more of the same. But this year that's concluded is, for the most part, more of the same, I think.

Voss stated on that point, that's one of the things we discussed at the Work Meeting was getting an understanding of what last Council, for this current contract, what some of the concerns were and the expectations on improvement and unless I'm mistaken, I think pretty much all those things were shown improvement. Maybe not to the extent that the Council was hoping for at the time. Ronning stated if they did, I'd like to know what they are.

Voss stated I'm saying it because you are the two that were involved and what I recall of that discussion. Ronning stated I don't know if this helps or not, when we had the Work

7.0G.1 Ice Arena Management Services Contract

Meeting, the first one when they were here, Gibson Management did a presentation, a nice presentation, but there was no talk of accomplishments. It was all, 'We're going to do this. We're going to do that.' I don't have my notes with me right now to recall what all the subjects were but, I asked the question, 'Was this future?' And, 'Well, what do you mean?' So, the language they're using is future, not that, it's the plans for the future and it was the same plans for the future the last time was. I really don't believe we got there. Voss stated okay, I'm just recalling differently from our last discussion, I guess.

Ronning stated this was the meeting you weren't able to attend. Voss stated I'm saying the last Work Meeting we had this discussion and my question was, 'What was Council's expectations a year ago?' That was part of the reason why to go to the one year. I remember asking that question.

Davis asked would there be any interest in a compromise in which one of the vendors would be responsible for the management of the ice part of the Arena and the other would be responsible for dry floor events? Mundle stated I'd be open to something like that.

Voss asked that's something we can do Mark? Vierling answered if it's capable of being negotiated out with the vendors. Ronning stated that would require new proposals, I would think. Voss asked would it? Vierling stated it certainly would require some degree of negotiation with the vendors in terms of what they are willing to do within those areas. Voss stated but we wouldn't have to go out for bid again, would we? Vierling answered no, you're not required to bid.

Voss stated so Jack, you're suggestion is to meet with both parties? Davis answered and to see if there's interest in pursuing it in that direction. If Council is so inclined to consider that as a compromise and if something can be worked out between both vendors and come back and present that at the next meeting as an alternative to having the one sole vendor that performs both functions. Voss stated I'm fine with that in the aspect of I don't think we're going to get too much further on this tonight. So, that's a new idea.

Ronning stated and to support Jack's idea, we should have some concurrence that that's what we'd like to see. Otherwise, there's no real incentive to change anything. You know what I mean? Voss stated my suggestion is let staff work with both parties and maybe that's not even an option for them? At least make a proposal. Ronning stated I agree.

Voss stated we've had three, now four meeting on this subject. Ronning stated I'm talking about something that pushes discussion and pushes to a conclusion. Voss stated I don't know what that means. Ronning stated it means that we concur that we support Jack's idea, not in a motion form, but just in support. Mundle stated I hear him saying give staff direction. Voss stated that's just direction to staff. We can do that. Mundle stated give staff direction to go and do something. Ronning stated and we're interested in doing that particular thing.

Voss asked you're okay with that Brian? Mundle asked with giving staff direction? Yeah, you want me to give the direction? Voss stated well, it's just a consensus. We'll send it back to staff and see what you can come up with.

Davis stated we'll contact the two parties involved and arrange a meeting with them individually as soon as possible and see if they're interested in exploring this. Voss stated okay and if it's ready for next Council and if not we'll wait until the June meeting. Would you like to come forward?

7.0G.1 Ice Arena Management Services Contract

Nicole Koller, 1865 297th Avenue, Isanti, stated I was contacted by the St. Francis, the place they're setting up, trying to get a rink going in St. Francis as well. And, St. Francis is kind of leaning both ways right now, they're on the border here. If they're going to make a push for St. Francis to build an Ice Arena, if they don't get the way they want.

Voss stated that's kind of a rude statement. I know it didn't come from them. N. Koller stated I don't mean to be rude. I was contacted not by the Hockey Association but I was contacted by a party looking to build the ice arena and they were looking for management services there as well. And, they were looking for is more like a feasibility and I just want to let everyone know because I feel it's kind of a, we've been at this for long enough and we've come to enough meetings and stuff and I kind of understand where everyone's at. I want the Ice Arena to succeed no matter which party. I just know they want change and their scheduling sometimes they end up, they've been taking over Isanti's rink because they can't get the hours they want here. And, I know that there's just been complications, scheduling issues. The current Zamboni driver text scheduling back and forth with some of the Hockey Association and they don't always get messages and things get mixed and there's not really a foundation.

Voss stated I think, a lot of this we've had discussion on in the past. Ronning stated yeah, and we should like to take that under advisement. With that, I would volunteer. Brian, would you be interested in meeting with the St. Francis group and let them speak for themselves? Voss asked with the Hockey Association? Ronning stated I think that's what it is. Voss asked have they not already been in front of Council?

N. Koller stated it's not the Hockey Association that's pushing for an ice arena. They're trying to make a community center that has two ice arenas in it. That's being, they're doing feasibility studies. From what I understand, they're looking for a management company or they're looking to maybe get a YMCA-style. They've just been asking for questions and stuff and I just want to let you guys aware. If we lose the Hockey Association, it makes no point in having a rink. Even if we have to team up together to make the thing successful, it would be worth it. You've got the Community Center. We've got heroin outbreaks left and right in Anoka County. How do you get rid of drug issues and stuff like that? You keep kids occupied, keep them involved. If you can find, even like a YMCA camp at the Ice Arena. It's something that's feasible.

Voss stated you're not going to find a bigger supporter of youth sports than I. I understand what you're saying.

N. Koller stated I just feel that even, there's a community organization called 'For Jake's Sake' in East Bethel from a former student of St. Francis High School that passed away from a heroin overdose. I'm thinking that if we can get that community center and get it involved, even ice, dry land, all these activities, if you can turn it more into a YMCA style where you're keeping kids involved, you have less chance of them having issues. I just wanted to let everyone know.

N. Koller stated I know we talked about it a few weeks ago, or probably a couple months ago now, but that St. Francis was interested and the Hockey Association said they wanted to stay with East Bethel if they could. They made that clear. Well, if, I mean, they want to be happy and they want to have their scheduling accurate, and they want everything to flow smoothly. If they're not happy, they're like the biggest customer for East Bethel. What's stopping them from going to a nice new rink?

7.0G.1 Ice Arena Management Services Contract

Voss stated the direction we've given now is for staff to meet with you and Mr. Gibson. Are you amenable to meeting with Mr. Davis? N. Koller responded yep. Voss stated good, okay, so let's take that step. I appreciate the information.

Mundle stated and let's wait. Ronning stated can I catch you later on that? We don't have to have a full discussion here. Mundle stated yeah, we can wait until later, after something is, if we can't reach something next time then maybe talk about. Yeah, we can talk about it later.

Harrington asked is there, ice arena at St. Francis, did things change over there? I heard one arena and a community center and now I hear two? Davis stated I don't know. I've heard all kinds of rumors and I don't know where they stand on that. The latest that I heard was that it's doubtful that was going forward but I don't think anything official has ever been announced by the city. I do know they were doing a feasibility study and that's official all that I know.

Ronning stated what it boils down to is money. Didn't they build a new Police Department, City Hall, and whatever all things there were for however many million dollars, 10, 12 or something? Davis stated they built a new Public Works building, Police Department. They also have some issues with water and sewer improvements that they have to address. So, again, I don't know what their finances are. Ronning stated yeah, how far they're willing to go out as far as that kind of expense.

Voss asked any other discussion on this? If not, we'll take a moment and go on to the next item.

(At this point, Koller returned to the Council dais.)

7.0G.2 Insurance Agent of Record

Davis presented the staff report indicating the Council is asked to consider approval of the insurance agent agreement for the City's workers compensation and property/general liability insurance.

The League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust is a cooperative, member-owned organization founded during 1980 that provides property, liability, workers' compensation and employee benefit needs to Minnesota cities. Members contribute premiums to a jointly owned fund rather than paying premiums to buy insurance from a private company. The funds are used to pay for members' claims, losses and expenses. The City of East Bethel utilizes the League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust as its insurance carrier. A condition for program participation is the requirement to retain a licensed insurance agent to perform the following functions:

- Assist the City in requesting League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust Contract Review Services for evaluating municipal agreements and City contracts for insurance concerns;
- Advise and assist the city with assembling the underwriting data, for the renewal rating process;
- Advise and assist the city on evaluation and selecting among coverage alternatives such as deductibles, limits, optional coverages, alternative coverage forms, etc.;
- Review coverage documents and invoices to assure coverage has been correctly issued and billed;
- Advise the City on potential gaps or overlaps in coverage; and,
- Assist the City in identifying risk exposures and developing appropriate strategies to address those issues.

7.0G.2 Insurance Agent of Record

The City's current contract for this service is with the Bearence Management Group. Their contract expires at the end of the year. At the March 18, 2015, Council Meeting, the Council directed staff to solicit proposals for an insurance agent to ensure that the City is receiving the best value for its investment. The City received three responses to their request for proposals, which are summarized below:

Vendor	Annual Cost
Northern Capital Insurance Group	$5,000
Gallagher Risk Management Services	$6,000
Bearence Management Group	$6,500

All the credentials and requirements of these groups appear to be very equal. They're all very reputable firms.

Bearence Management Group has provided the City with excellent service but submitted the highest cost proposal. Although continuity is important in these types of professional services, there is only a small scope of services provided and transitioning to a new agent should not pose any problems.

Staff recommends that Council consider approval of 2016 - 2018 Insurance Agreement with NCIG given that the transition to change to a new insurance agent is minimal, they provided the lowest cost proposal, and their reference check came back positive. City staff conducted an interview with NCIG on April 27, 2015, and has no reservations in the recommendation of their approval for our insurance agent of record.

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to approve Northern Capital Insurance Group. Ronning stated I'll second. Voss stated discussion?

Ronning asked is there a, kind of a history behind these? Who all do they service and what size are they? I don't know them from a number in a phone book. Voss asked do you know any of them? Ronning stated well, I went to school with Rick Gallagher but they were in the trash business at the time. That's when Wyatts were in the cement business. Voss stated I'm surprised. I didn't think you'd know any of them. Ronning stated I don't know this Rick there's probably more than one. Voss stated all right.

Davis stated I don't have it at my fingertips but all three of these firms have a fairly long list of city clients within the metro area. They're included in your report. Voss asked so it's an 'apples-to-apples?' Davis responded yes. And, this is one reason that we didn't select firms for interview because we felt the credentials were essentially the same and equal for all of them and it's such a low amount that we'd spend more time in an interview process and negotiation process than we'd gain in anything back in value. Voss stated yep, that's understood.

Voss stated is there any other discussion? All in favor to the motion say aye?" **All in favor.** Voss stated opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

8.0 Other

8.0A Staff Reports Seasonal Employee Opening

Davis stated City Council approved the hiring of two seasonal employees. One of the employees that we'd made the job offer to had found a better job. We re-advertised for that position and we're going to close those applications on Friday. They've been re-advertised now for two weeks. So, if anyone that's 18 or older is interested in a seasonal position with our Public Works crew, please submit your application to City Hall by close of business on Friday, May 8. Mundle asked what time is close of business? Davis responded 4 o'clock.

May 9, 2015 Craft Show Cancelled

Davis stated the craft show that was scheduled for the Arena for May 9th has been canceled. Apparently, many of the vendors that were going to be there decided also to participate in the Lions garage sale and decided that only one trip up here was going to be all they would do. So, due to lack of vendors, the craft show for May 9th at the Arena has been canceled.

8.0B Council Report – Member Harrington

Harrington stated I don't have anything for Council Reports but I just want to wish all the mothers out there Happy Mother's Day this Sunday.

Council Member Ronning

Ronning stated that was my report. I don't have anything.

Council Member Mundle

Mundle stated last Thursday had the second meeting of the Fire Fighter's Joint Powers. Where at the first meeting a budget had been approved, at this meeting, essentially, the big item they talked about was that they're probably going to have to approve making an amendment to that budget and approve something more because of unforeseen. This is their first year setting up the budget, some stuff did not go as they had planned, one of the employees that they were relying upon to conduct some services quit, so that is one of the causes. The Fire Chief would know more. I believe before the next meeting, the next meeting is probably about three months away, or at the October meeting, I believe a new budget would be proposed. I believe we would have that and be able to discuss that before I attend that next meeting.

Voss asked you realize all these cities make their budgets long before October? In fact, we send them to the County before then. Mundle stated yeah. Voss stated so no one's going to be able to adjust their budgets unless we know what it is. Right? Mundle stated Mark will have more information on this.

Davis stated Mark spoke to me about this and identified that too as a problem. He says that he doesn't anticipate that their budget request will vary much from what's projected. The current one is going to be, probably around $3,000 for this year. So, he says he has made that known to them that is an issue and they're going to have to change their dates in the future for completing their budget work.

Mundle stated yeah, and that was another discussion of how can we avoid this in the future to have a proper budget put together and approve it at the proper time. So, that was my update.

Council Member Koller

Koller stated I was at the Upper Rum River Watershed meeting last night. We worked on finishing up the budgets. We are getting estimates for an audit that BWSR's requiring. Our next year's budget was ratified by all cities except Ham Lake. I have no idea why. That's about it.

Mayor Voss

Voss stated we're going to start having budget meetings in June. Right? Davis stated we have the preliminary budget prepared. Staff has sent their request in. Mike and I went over all their line items this afternoon. We'll be meeting with them individually and we can have a budget meeting any time you want to after May 20th. Generally, the policy has been to submit the preliminary budget to Council the first week in July. One of the major items that we won't probably know definitely until the end of June is what the Sheriff's increase is going to be. Voss stated or decrease, sorry, they're not here.

Mayor Voss

Davis stated we sent them a notice today that we needed their information as soon as possible. But, generally, it's the middle of June to the end of June until they come up with whatever their costs are for the next year. Voss asked historically, they make a presentation to Council as well, right? Davis stated that's correct.

Voss stated the only thing I had is, just because I keep getting questions, yes the fire ban is still on. And, all this rain just missed us again so I don't know if we'll ever get rain here. But, I asked Mark, the other night and he said it's still on. I see it's still on, posted on the door, so until further notice, we still have a fire ban. Mundle stated yeah, that's for permits. Voss stated it's for permits for burning. You can still have campfires. Mundle stated yeah, recreational fires.

Ronning stated since you mention that, it might not hurt to mention the oak wilt, June 1st to July 15th, or something, on trimming. Voss stated until July 15th, right? Davis stated yeah, and it could start even earlier than that. To be on the safe side, you probably ought to look at the first to the middle of May. Ronning stated right now. Voss stated well, it's April 1st to July 15th, that's the dates. Davis stated okay.

8.0C Other

None.

9.0D Closed Session

Vierling stated for the members of the public and for the benefit of the record, we'll note that at the present time, the Council's been requested to go into Closed Session to meet with the City Administrator and the City Attorney with regard to matters of land acquisition authorized under Minnesota Statutes Chapter 117 and 595 also dealing with Chapter 13.D in Minnesota Statutes on closed meetings. We'll be discussing the acquisition of property located on what is right-of-way, Plat 3, Parcel 3, as filed in Anoka County. With that being said Mr. Mayor, I'd entertain a motion to close the meeting for the purposes indicated.

Move to Closed Session

Harrington stated I'll make a motion for Closed Session at 8:08 p.m. Mundle stated I'll second. Voss stated any discussion? All in favor say aye?" **All in favor.** Voss stated opposed? Hearing none motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Reconvene Open Session

Vierling stated that Council reviewed the issues, discussed options and gave direction to communicate offers in this matter. No specific motions were made.

Harrington made a motion to adjourn the meeting. **Mundle** seconded. Vote to adjourn was unanimous. Meeting adjourned at 8:58 PM

Submitted by:
Carla Wirth
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial Inc.