

lobby for this on your behalf. If we didn't have a sharing technique we would have a situation where we would actually charge a fee to the rest of the Twin Cities area for providing the aquifer here in Anoka County.

Kathy Tingelstad with Intergovernmental Relations at Anoka County explained that just about all of the twenty-one communities in Anoka County and the school districts have passed resolutions supporting fiscal disparities. There was an article in the paper that said the Mall of America is flourishing in a weak economy. They have over \$1,000,000 in annual sales and their revenues were up 9% from the year before. Part of the reason they are doing so well is they have the airport next to them and good roads; things we don't have in the northern part of the metro area. When the airport was built, and they were trying to figure out where it would be located, it was understood communities closer to it would have an advantage for commercial/industrial business growth. Former State Representative Charles Weaver had the foresight to put a program into place to which helps to equalize the metro area. Metro area has a disparity of 3 to 1. Without this program it would be 10 to 1.

One of the handouts you received is a letter we sent to a local legislator explaining how the program works in terms of a typical \$200,000 home in East Bethel. How it gets paid out is to the City, County and School District. In East Bethel it was \$132 on \$200,000 home. School District it was \$120. County it was \$36. If program were eliminated, for this home the property taxes would have to be raised about \$288 to cover the fiscal disparities payouts.

Program was set up for the funding would go to the local government to make up for the lack of commercial/industrial property taxes. To protect natural resources. There is a three minute YouTube presentation put together by Anoka County that gives a basic overview of what the program is.

We collected all those resolutions that were passed; we took them down to the legislature. There was a study that was done and we presented it to the House and Senate Tax Committees in the middle of February. The legislature is where they would go with it and it looks like there will be no action on fiscal disparities this year. This is good for our whole message; don't make any changes this year. It is an integral part of the property tax system. We understand that the legislature is doing some property tax reform, but we want to make sure they look at this appropriately. If they make changes to this, we need to know all the unintended consequences before any decisions are made. We will continue to keep you updated. For East Bethel over the past ten years, the dollar impact is \$600,000 a year. For many of the communities that would be hard to replace.

Westerberg, in closing, pointed out that this program is unique. Around the country you won't find anything like this. There are twenty-three cities and townships in Anoka County. Twenty of them are recipients and receive money from the program. Three are payers, Blaine, Fridley and Columbus Township pay in. We want to make some tweaks to the system and he thinks the number one tweak you are going to see is they are going to want to put some inflation adjustments on it, to allow for inflation. Some tweaks might be okay. One he is kind of favors is adding an accountability factor to it. Great programs helps us offset a lot of our costs, like social programs. But should we be doing something to help commercial development with some of these dollars? Because that is how you take a City of Blaine, who was a receiver and now they are a contributor. Help our cities become more independent. Critically important to evaluate how the money is being spent. Imperative to do everything we can to keep fiscal disparities.

Res. 2012-17
Authorizing
Issuance and
Sale of
General
Obligation
Bonds 2012A
for the
Refunding of
the 2005A GO
Public Safety
Bonds

Davis explained that at the February 15, 2012 City Council meeting, Council directed that Springsted, Inc. proceed with the presentation of potential refunding of the 2005A G.O. Public Safety Bonds.

At the conclusion of the presentation, staff will be direction from City Council regarding adoption of Resolution 2012-17, A Resolution Authorizing and Directing the Sale and Issuance of G.O. Public Safety Refunding Bonds 2012 Series A.

Kathy Aho, President of Springsted, Inc. explained that, since she was here last, she believes you received a report, which had information about the proposed transactions and she has a little bit of more information and some review of those recommendations.

Since there are some new Council Members since the last transaction, she thought we should go over who the primary participants are in a bond issuance and what the general steps are. Primary participant is the City. In any transaction you identify the need, or the opportunity. Establish policy directives.

What we do is help you develop a finance plan, prepare the issue for market, and assist with closing and post-issuance compliance.

The bond counsel, is the legal firm that has the last word on legal authority and tax-exemption. Final is the underwriter, and they have been selected, in your case, through a competitive process. They buy the bonds; make money by purchasing them and reselling them to an investor. Set through a bid process.

How an issue goes to market. City decides whether it wants to proceed or not. Springsted then works with staff to prepare an official statement. This has information on your community, on your market value and fiscal disparities. It will have information about your operations. It will have information about debt, population, wealth. It will contain your financial statement. That information will be available to investors. Part of that information will be a notice of the sale. We will put out a notice that the sale is going to occur. That would appear on several national online sites and on national publications. In between that point of time, when the financial statement has been issued and the notice of sale has been issued, we would meet with staff and the rating agency to secure a bond rating.

On the date of sale itself, we will receive bids in our office in the morning. We check them for compliance. Do refunding analysis on the most favorable bid. Then we would bring those results to review. After an award, our office works with staff and the purchasing underwriter so the purchase is closed. The documentation is completed and funds are deposited with an escrow agent. The issue we are looking at is 2005A Public Safety Bonds, public obligation bonds. They mature now through 2026. Interest rate is up to 4.3%. They are callable in April, 2014. At that point you can pay those bonds off in their entirety. They are supported 100% by property taxes. They can be refunded by a "crossover refunding bond".

We have prepared the final numbers. The interest rates didn't change at all. What happens with these transactions is when we were here before we had a feasibility, indication to us if there is a potential for a savings in the transaction. When we get closer to the sale, we go ahead and verify with the providers what the costs would be. Projected present value savings, did make a change in cost of issuance. Percent of net value savings. This transaction is at

8%.

One of the questions that was identified for us was an interest in talking about the timing. Advantages are debt service savings. They would start with the 2013 levy for collection in 2014. Interest rates are at a historically low level. Disadvantages are issues can only be advance refunded and a crossover funding once on a tax exempt basis. If the market was right and you wanted to come back and do additional refunding on these bonds, you would have to wait until the call date on the bonds. The other disadvantage is we are projecting a rate of 1.79% and going to reinvest to 2014 and the rates are really low. So you are going to accrue what you call negative arbitrage. We are estimating that at \$34,000. The question is do you do it now or wait until later. Savings in a refunding is only generated in callable bonds. Time itself is your friend.

DeRoche asked, "What is negative arbitrage?" Aho explained arbitrage itself refers to a difference in interest rates. Negative arbitrage implies that you have a cost at one level and you are borrowing money at 1.79% so you will be paying that out. You are holding that money for a while, but the most you can invest that for is .1% so there is an additional cost to you. You have to cover the 1.79% but you are only earning .1%. It is a real cost, and it is estimated at this time to be \$34,000. The way it is covered is within the size of the bond transaction. The total cost you are paying now, compared to what you would be paying later, that is the savings.

DeRoche wonders why do this now? What is the advantage? Aho explained that between now and 2014, time is helping you, burning off that negative arbitrage. If you shorten the time, you are going to have less negative arbitrage. After 2014, now your bonds are callable and you are going to start paying down principal. So you will have less principal to save money on and less time to save it. Between now and February 2014 is the best time to do it. Primary answer is where do you think interest rates are going to go. If they stay the same, you will be \$34,000 ahead. Every month that goes by, you would be saving about \$1,600. If the interest rates went up .1% you would pay \$10,000 in interest cost. In this case, a moment of .1% could happen at any time. We will let you determine what the risk is of waiting versus taking what you have today. What do you think the interest rates will be doing between now and February 2014? DeRoche explained unfortunately it is not his money; it is everybody on the other side of this desk's money. And if it is a crap shoot, does he like to gamble with other people's money, not really. Boyer explained unfortunately, it is really are you willing to bet \$10,000 to win \$1,600.

Moegerle explained but the feds have said they are not going to raise the rates until 2014, she thinks this is way premature. Heard they are going to give the new president eight months before they raise the rates, so we have time. DeRoche wonders what we are really saving, is it crucial that we do it at this point. Should we wait and see. We don't need to wait two years, but he is not sure of the urgency, here for information. Aho explained that between now and February 2014 time in and of itself is working to your benefit. You should do this when you are comfortable in doing it. We would call this a good refunding. If you hit the call date and at some future date the interest rates were lower yet, even though you expended some of the time and paid down some of the principal, you would have similar results. If she could tell you where interest rates are going, she would tell you when to sell the bonds. DeRoche's other concern is this is a one time deal. Aho explained that it is, until the next call date which is 2021 for the bonds maturing in 2022 and later.

DeRoche asked for an explanation of crossover refunding Aho explained that crossover refunding was developed to make certain refunding transactions more efficient. That is the one we have selected here. There are callable bonds that mature in 2013/2014 and do not generate any savings for you, so we don't refund those. By doing a crossover refunding, up until 2014 the City will continue making the payments on the existing bond issue. The escrow account is going to pay on the new bond issue. Because the interest rate on the new bond issue is going to be so much lower than the old bond issue, we have reduced the negative arbitrage considerably. Savings aren't realized until the call date. Levy at that point is when you see the reduction.

Boyer explained while he appreciates the concern about what the fed does, in the greater scheme of theme of things it doesn't matter what the fed does. Money is like water, it will flow to the lowest point, or in this case the highest point, where it receives the biggest return. Whether it continues, don't think anyone up here is qualified to predict, otherwise we would be bond traders and not sitting here. To him it is kind of hard to say he doesn't want to save \$125,000. Moegerle explained but we are going to spend \$40,000 to save \$132,000. That is like you loaning her \$40 and in thirteen years you are going to get \$131 back. Your first payment isn't going to be for two years and you aren't going to get your \$40 for another four years. It takes six years to get back your investment cost. The total we are going to save at most is \$13,000 a year in interest savings, which is approximately \$3 per household on average. That is slightly more than a cup of coffee we are going to be saving per household a year in interest. If we were saving \$141,000 tomorrow and every year after, she would be with you. The return just isn't significant enough and she doesn't see the rush to do this.

Boyer said to quote his wife, "Three bucks is three bucks." Moegerle asked, "Where has she gone wrong in that rationale. She is here to hear what others have to say." Boyer said, "There is no guarantee that you are going to save the money six months from now. The entire opportunity might disappear depending on what happens in the market. You are betting \$10,000 to win \$1,600. Does make sense to save \$130,000." DeRoche said, "It is easy to put things in short term. This thing isn't short term." Lawrence asked, "About the term crossover bonds, is that because we have two bonds running at the same time? And one is maturing in two years?" Aho explained the crossover term refers to you are paying on the bonds at the same time and then on the sale date you crossover and begin paying on the new bonds. That is what the terminology is referring to. There are other ways this could be structured to have the savings the total term of the debt. Way we do that is to defer principal.

Lawrence made a motion to adopt Resolution 2012-17 Authorizing Issuance and Sale of General Obligation Bonds 2012A for the Refunding of the 2005A GO Public Safety Bonds. Boyer seconded. DeRoche asked, "Have we price-compared with other places? How do we do that? We do that for other services, have we done that for this service?" Davis explained that Springsted is the current City bond counsel. Just like the City has a City Attorney and City Engineer. Generally cities rely on the current bond counsel. There are other firms that do this, but not a large number of them. This is kind of a specialized activity. To do price comparison is pretty difficult. He did send out some information regarding costs in your update, but sometimes this is not apples to apples comparison. It is a matter of professional services, difficult to do cost comparisons. **DeRoche, nay; Boyer, aye; Lawrence, aye; Moegerle, nay; motion fails.** Lawrence directed staff to review this and see what the issue is.

Public Forum Lawrence opened the Public Forum for any comments or concerns that were not listed on the

agenda

Rachel Ward explained she is representing Congresswomen Michele Bachmann's office. She wanted to give a brief update on what their office does and what is going on in Washington, D.C. with the Congresswomen. We have offices in Woodbury and Waite Park, Minnesota. We help our constituents with federal agencies, such as: social security, veteran's benefits, immigration, foreclosure cases. Services in conjunction with our Washington, D.C. office are Washington, D.C. Tours and flag requests. If there is a special event going on, special retirement, don't hesitate to contact us. Also, we do outreach events, let us know about it (such as a new building going up) and we will come out.

Legislatively, in Congress we are not expecting too much to happen. Might be funding for surface transportation reauthorization. That would be directed to MnDOT and then they would work with counties and cities on where to send that. Also the Congresswomen will be looking at Regulatory Issues. If there are regulations that you know about that the City is dealing with that is coming from the federal government or if you know of a business owner that is dealing with something, we want to know about. We also want you to know that the Congresswomen is taking her committee assignment to national security very seriously.

Kevin Tauer, Chief Financial Officer (CFO) of Lambert Yards, we own the property on the corner of 221st Avenue and Highway 65 NE, about seven acres. We bought the property in 2004 and ran it as a lumber yard and closed it in September of 2007. We have been trying to sell the property since June of last year with no success, it's placed with Counselor Realty. They have run into a problem with the zoning (some of course is the economy and the market). Have had interest in the property, but because it is zoned B-2 and the interest has been from industrial, there is a mismatch. We have had storage facilities, a landscaping company, and a large contractor who wants to use it as a base for business. We talk to the City and they tell us this is not industrial now, this is B-2, strip malls and such. We have been struggling with this and the City Planner suggested he bring this to the Council. The price has been dropped significantly. We ask Council to support or at least consider a Comp Plan amendment for the land use for our property.

Lawrence explained that we are right in the middle of a sewer and water project and your land is not directly involved in that at this time, but it could be accessible to this property very quickly. Also, there will be a stoplight at this intersection soon. We are trying to run a forcemain right in front of your property line, to go up to Castle Towers. Davis commented that this will be an agenda item on the next council meeting. Moegerle explained that with that forcemain being there, the highest and best use of that property may be one that would require more water and sewer connections. A win-win for both your sale of the property, as well as our needs for getting customers for the sewer and water project. Davis explained the whole complexion of that intersection will change in the short term. Tauer commented that if Council were to agree with him on the land use change, it would still have to go to Met Council. Davis agreed. It also requires a 4/5 vote of the Council. Tauer explained that he respectfully disagrees, that by putting sewer and water in there, it will quicken the pace to see the kind of business he needs to buy the property. He hasn't had anyone come forward and ask if it has sewer and water and "when would this be completed?" Davis explained that conceptually there would be no water up there for quite a while. Hook up to sewer with a pump station would exist in late 2013. Would have to be a fairly large business. Moegerle explained that, on the other hand, we are real interested in working with our residents and businesses. Things can change.

Lowell Friday of 18215 Greenbrook Drive NE, his Interim Use Permit (IUP) is coming up for either extension or renewal. Information he has says May 5th, but he understands it is the 18th. He has way less horses, 27. He has a recent vet check, all checked out okay. The IUP was renewed last year for a year. Would like the same thing, basically what he is looking for. Vierling explained that the process is to file an application with the City and then go through the public hearing process. They can't give you any preliminary comment on this; they have to have the hearing. Davis explained this needs to be done during regular business hours so you can pay the fee with it.

There were no more comments so the Public Forum was closed.

Consent
Agenda

Moegerle made motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended including: A) Approve Bills; B) Meeting Minutes, February 15, 2012, Regular Meeting; C) Approve 2:00 AM License for Route 65 Pub & Grub; D) Approve Advertisement and Hire for Two Seasonal Public Works Employees; E) Approve Galveston-Houston Buying Consortium Contract; F) Approve Pay Estimate #10, S.R. Weidema, Phase 1, Project 1, Utility Improvements. DeRoche seconded; all in favor, motion carries.

Tobacco Free
Park Policy

Davis explained that staff has been contacted by the Tobacco-Free Youth Recreation Program with information about helping the City of East Bethel establish a tobacco-free policy for its parks during youth activities. The Park Commission expressed an interest in drafting a policy that would prohibit tobacco use in City parks in areas where youth would be present and during youth activities. These areas would include playgrounds, athletic fields, concession stands, bathrooms, and during any youth sporting events or other functions. Under the proposed draft of the policy, smoking would still be allowed in other areas of the parks.

If implemented, the policy would rely on volunteer compliance and be supported by free informational signs in the parks, public outreach through the City newsletter and support from youth athletic organizations. Anyone using tobacco products in prohibited areas would be asked to either refrain from using those products or remove themselves from the area.

The attached Policy Makers Guide provides information that the Park Commission and many other City and County officials have used to help support and implement this program. Also included is a list of neighboring communities in the metro area with tobacco-free policies and a few example policies from other communities.

The Park Commission recommends adoption of the attached tobacco-free park policy.

Moegerle made a motion to table the Tobacco-Free Park Policy. DeRoche seconded. Boyer commented on enforcement of this policy. Who would enforce this? Moegerle explained that this is bullying non-smokers. You are governing; parents should be governing this, not government. DeRoche explained that he understands other cities may do this, but he doesn't know if it is his place to tell someone where they can and can't smoke when they are paying taxes, but yet they are putting down the junk food. And there is a bunch of other things going on in the parks. He doesn't smoke, but he doesn't care if someone else does. Being a coach for as many years as he was, he never had an issue with a parent doing this. Dealing with enforcement, is it a good idea for someone to be running around out there that doesn't represent the City telling someone that they can't smoke, you can't do this or that, when they aren't authorized to do that?

DeRoche would think that any parent, if you went up to them and asked to put it out because there are kids around, would do it. Moegerle would much rather see zero tolerance for littering. She appreciates that cigarettes are not good for the environment and if you throw them in the dirt, it is not a good thing. If littering is the issue, have a littering ordinance. Boyer wants to point out we have fought vandalism in the parks for years and years and years and haven't been able to stop that. Certainly costs a lot more money than picking up cigarette butts. Realize it is not the entire issue here. Lawrence had talked to people he ran across that were smokers or non-smokers or chewers. He asked them about having this policy. They all agreed that it was a good idea that youth are being impacted by people that smoke around them. If it keeps the youth from smoking, it is a good idea. DeRoche doesn't understand how someone smoking in the park is going to make kids want to smoke. He would think it would stem from the home. Lawrence explained that all this ordinance says, "If someone is at a softball function there is no smoking in the stands." DeRoche commented that "You ask them to put it out." Boyer explained that this is like legislating common sense. You all know how successful we are at that, why we have a book of ordinances.

All in favor, motion carries.

Res. 2012-18
 Revoking
 Municipal
 State Aid
 Streets and
 Res. 2012-19
 Establishing
 Municipal
 State Aid
 Streets

Jochum explained that as directed by Council, staff is submitting an application to the MnDOT State Aid office to add several street segments to the Municipal State Aid System that are south of Coon Lake as shown on Attachment 6. In order to add these street segments to the system, a number of existing streets have to be removed from the system. The table below summarizes the street segments that staff recommends to be added and revoked from the system. The streets recommended for removal from the system are shown on Attachments 3 through 5.

Street	Segment	Length (Miles)
Roads Added to the MSAS:		
Longfellow Drive	Laurel Road to Lexington Avenue	0.34
Laurel Road	Longfellow Drive to Lakeshore Drive	0.53
Lakeshore Drive	Lincoln Drive to Laurel Road	0.80
Lincoln Drive	Lakeshore Drive to Laurel Road	0.56
Johnson Street	Sims Road to 221 st Avenue	1.13
Total Miles Added		3.36
Roads Revoked from the MSAS:		
Ulysses Street	181 st Avenue to 187 th Lane	0.80
Ulysses Street	229 th Avenue to 233 rd Avenue	0.51
233 rd Avenue	Ulysses Street to Trunk Highway 65	0.14
Sims Road	Trunk Highway 65 to Davenport Street	0.17
Buchanan Street	213 th Avenue to 221 st Avenue	0.99
Baltimore Street	237 th Avenue to 241 st Avenue	0.51
Total Miles Revoked		3.12
Current Excess Mileage		0.26
Net Mileage Revoked		3.38

Staff recommends that Council adopt Resolution 2012-18 Revoking Municipal State Aid Streets and Resolution 2012-19 Establishing New Municipal State Aid Streets

Boyer made a motion to adopt Resolution 2012-18 Revoking Municipal State Aid Streets. Moegerle seconded. DeRoche commented what happens to these roads when we take them off the lists. They become City streets and we take care of them. Jochum explained you can't rebuild them or build them with state aid money. **All in favor, motion carries.**

Boyer made a motion to adopt Resolution 2012-19 Establishing New Municipal State Aid Streets. DeRoche seconded; all in favor, motion carries.

Res. 2012-20
Establishing
Parking
Restrictions on
County Road
74

Jochum said as you are aware, Anoka County plans to upgrade the intersection of County Road 74 and Trunk Highway 65. Both the east and west legs of the intersection will also be upgraded. The County has applied for and received Federal Funds for this improvement. The State requires that parking be restricted along this segment, as part of the plan approval process. The County's policy is to require that the municipality in which the roadway is located submit a No Parking Resolution. The attached No Parking Resolution will restrict parking in the area, as described on the resolution.

Staff recommends that Council adopt Resolution 2012-20 as required by the County and the State for final approval of the plans for the upgrade of the County Road 74 and Trunk Highway 65 intersection.

Moegerle made a motion to adopt Resolution 2012-20 Establishing Parking Restrictions on County Road 74. Boyer seconded. Vierling commented this is no parking anytime, correct. Moegerle, "Correct." DeRoche wondered "Is this permanent or just during construction?" Jochum said, "This is permanent." DeRoche asked what about during Booster Days. Jochum said this is to Sandy Drive. DeRoche wondered why the City has to do this. Jochum explained so the City can patrol it. DeRoche commented that if a resident has a function and wants their friends to park on the road, what happens. Davis explained they would have to get permission to park there anyways. Part of the requirements for this process, for the project. Jochum explained Anoka County is not requiring this, the state is. If the road was wide enough for parking, you wouldn't need the resolution. **DeRoche, nay; Boyer, Lawrence, Moegerle, aye; motion carries.**

Change Order
#1, Municipal
Builders, Inc.,
Water
Treatment
Plant #1

Jochum explained that City staff, City consultants and the General Contractor and Subcontractors for the Water Treatment Plant met to discuss the design submittals and operations of the Water Treatment Plant, Municipal Wells and Water Tower. The purpose of the meeting was to ensure that the design submittals were complete, review any potential overlap of equipment and controls and to discuss potential cost savings. Change Order No. 1 includes the proposed additions and deletions from the contract. The net change order cost is a \$10,423 decrease in the contract amount. A summary of the changes are as follows:

A. Contract Additions:

1. System pressure relief valve	\$5,580.00
2. Door switch alarm system for the Water Tower	\$2,055.00
3. Mezzanine handrail	\$3,898.00
4. Delete overhead door and install masonry knockout	<u>\$1,394.00</u>
Total Added	\$12,927.00

DeRoche made a motion to adopt Ordinance 35, Second Series, Amending Chapter 18, Article IV, Regulating the Sale of Tobacco. Moegerle seconded. Moegerle explained that she asked for this one to come first. One of the issues is we, as a City, do not have a hearing ordinance. In our tobacco ordinance we talk about our hearing, appeals, hearing officer, can we address that. There are a few types that need to be corrected. But one of the ways that the tobacco ordinance differs from the alcohol ordinance is that it only talks about three violations in two years. Alcohol talks about four violations in two years. Historically is that an issue? Boyer explained that historically we have had way more tobacco violations than alcohol. Moegerle commented, "So should we add another violation, and do this correctly?" Boyer commented that you probably remember the old Tom Thumb and they had their tobacco license suspended for three months. Moegerle explained, "It doesn't provide for what happens after third violation. Do we want to table this and provide for that?" Boyer wonders do we want to table both of the ordinances then. Boyer explained, call me old fashioned, but he felt three alcohol violations are more serious than three tobacco violations. The volume of it is one difference. DeRoche commented that we should just make the changes and adopt this. Moegerle commented there are some other typos. **All in favor, motion carries.**

Ord. 34,
Second Series,
Amending
Chapter 6,
Alcoholic
Beverages

Davis explained that per Council direction, staff was instructed to review Section 6-93 of the above ordinance, and recommend changes to Council that would provide additional clarification and discretion in the administration of penalties and fines under the ordinance.

This proposed Ordinance amendment would amend Section 6-93 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of East Bethel as submitted in the attachments and remain consistent with Council directives. At this time, there remain several items in the ordinance that need clarification. The primary area of concern involves the keeping the Responsible Beverage Service training consistent throughout the proposed changes and considering any changes to Section 6-94. The amendments to this ordinance should also be crafted to reflect the amendments to Tobacco Ordinance as there are similar parallels between the two.

Staff recommends City Council discuss the proposed amendments to Chapter 6, Article IV, Section 6-93 of the City Code and other changes as presented in the draft attachments.

Moegerle explained, "That this ordinance doesn't have part of how the hearing goes, like it does in the tobacco. Do we think they should be parallel?" Boyer thinks they should be parallel and he thinks there should be at least three penalties. Moegerle explained, "And the Responsible Beverage Training is before for the first violation and then for the second, third and fourth it is after and she doesn't know what the incentive is. To remediate the situation?" Boyer thinks it was more of a reminder. Moegerle, "If we're talking about making them parallel, the red line is sort of in proportion." Vierling explained that there are a couple things in this draft that trouble him. 6-93A is deleted. Moegerle explained that was an oversight. Vierling explained that he is fine with structure of steps of violations. Genesis of his concern was that we were pursuing clerks for two violations and at least this draft has it down to one. Moegerle explained we changed first violation to permissive instead of mandatory and second as well. Boyer commented that one thing that troubles him in re-reading this, we don't outline when we would revoke their license. Would like to see that outlined at what point we would do that. What if we have a chronic offender? Vierling suggest you have that at any step.

DeRoche made a motion to table Ordinance 34, Second Series, Amending Chapter 6,

Alcoholic Beverages. Moegerle seconded; all in favor, motion carries.

- Council Reports – DeRoche explained that we hosted the Local Government Officials meeting. Alexandria House gave a presentation. MnDOT talked about doing MnPASS lanes. There were several questions. He went to Linwood with the City Administrator and had a meeting. There is an article in the Forest Lake Times about it. Appreciate that the Public Works Department came out and cleaned the streets at Coon Lake Beach, got a lot of ice up. They did a nice job.
- Council Reports - Boyer explained it is supposed to be 55 degrees and sunny on Saturday and Sunday. Heard a lot of people talking about taking bikes out. Be careful.
- Council Reports – Moegerle explained in the past three weeks had two meetings with Great River Energy. Precursor to meeting with Linwood. Appreciate that DeRoche stood in for her. Understand that meeting went well, we are making progress. At the last Council meeting, the Building Official indicated we would be getting some tables on code enforcement issues, with corrections. By e-mail. Can we get that information on building permits? DeRoche agreed, we were supposed to get three or four things he was going to write up something quick. Tables and graphs. Moegerle explained talking about Coon Lake Beach; someone was putting up a lost pet sign on a stop sign, not a good use of the stop sign. Also, had a meeting with Ady Voldedge. Talked about the stakeholders and positive information about their view of the future. Got another meeting with them on Monday.
- Council Reports – Lawrence been hustling and bustling with a lot of things around the City. Granted an extension with S.R. Weidema for water and sewer. Was in their contract and were entitled to that extension because of the warm weather. Going well, they are moving right along. Local Government Official meeting, the City Administrator did a good presentation. And there was good food at Hidden Haven.
- Adjourn **Boyer made a motion to adjourn at 9:20PM. DeRoche seconded; all in favor, motion carries.**

Attest:

Wendy Warren
Deputy City Clerk