

## EAST BETHEL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

January 4, 2012

The East Bethel City Council met on January 4, 2012 at 7:30 PM for their regular meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Boyer                      Bob DeRoche                      Richard Lawrence  
Heidi Moegerle                      Steve Voss

ALSO PRESENT: Jack Davis, City Administrator  
Mark Vierling, City Attorney  
Craig Jochum, City Engineer

Call to Order    **The January 4, 2012 City Council meeting was called to order by Mayor Lawrence at 7:30 PM.**

Adopt Agenda    **Boyer made a motion to adopt the January 4, 2012 City Council Agenda with the following amendment: adding to the consent agenda Items: 6.0 A, 6.0 B, 6.0 C 1 & 2, 6.0 D, 7.0 A, 7.0 B 3, 7.0 C 1, 7.0 D, 7.0 E, 7.0 F. Voss seconded.** Boyer said this is everything but the resolutions, items 7.0 B 1 & 2. Lawrence asked is there any discussion on this? Moegerle said she has some comments. She said she talked to Vierling about the Adopt-A-Park program and there are some issues with the way that is written. Moegerle said that one needs to be pulled. DeRoche said pull it. Moegerle said she has a lot of notes on things that she thought needed to be discussed. She said also with regard to the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension Joint Powers Agreement she would like that pulled from the consent agenda. **Voss said he will withdraw his second.** Lawrence asked if Boyer wants to revise his motion? Boyer said he has no problem with pulling those items. **DeRoche seconded.** Lawrence asked if those are the only two items that Moegerle wants pulled. Moegerle said she wants Items 7.0 B 1 and 7.0 C.1 pulled. **All in favor, motion carries.**

Public Forum    Lawrence opened the Public Forum for any comments or concerns that were not listed on the agenda. There were no comments so the Public Forum was closed.

Consent Agenda    **Voss made motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended including: A) Approve Bills; B) Meeting Minutes, December 21, 2011, Regular Meeting; C) Resolution 2012-01 Designation Official Newspaper; D) Resolution 2012-02 Setting Meeting Dates; E) Resolution 2012-03 Establishing Bank Depositories; F) Set Local Board of Appeals and Equalization Meeting Date; G) Approve 2012 Residential Recycling Agreement with Anoka County; H) License for Use of Digital and Oblique Aerial Photographs; I) Approve Agreement with MPCA for Monitoring Well for Hidden Haven Park; J) Approve Submission of Grant Application for 189<sup>th</sup> Ave and Buchanan St; K) Resolution 2012-05 Accepting Donation from the Ham Lake Chamber of Commerce; 6.0 C.2 Resolution 2012-06 for Exploration of Possible ATV Trail; 7.0 B.3 City Engineer – Contract Addendum No. 7. Boyer seconded; all in favor, motion carries.**

Adopt-A-Park Program    Davis explained that city staff has been contacted by residents and organizations looking to volunteer in the community by helping to beautify our local parks. With the establishment of an Adopt-A-Park program, we can formally recognize these individuals and organizations, establish timeframes for suggested activities, and provide partnership opportunities for residents to perform volunteer beautification projects.

Residents would be able to adopt any of our parks on a first come basis and would be required to perform maintenance and beautification activities two times a season. In recognition, City staff could provide a sign in each park that states who has adopted the park along with recognition in the City Newsletter.

The Parks Commission unanimously voted to recommend the creation of an Adopt-A-Park program for Council approval. Staff also recommends the approval of this program.

**Voss made a motion to consider creation of the Adopt-A-Park program. Boyer seconded.** Moegerle said in definitions, seasons is defined as May through October. It is not defined as seasons such as spring, summer, winter and fall. She said and so they only have to perform maintenance twice in a season defined as May to October and that is a long period of time. Moegerle said it is part of spring, summer and fall and so she was thinking this should be a minimum of two times a year, May through October. She said then, under Plan 6 & 7, there are inspections to be made for “visible safety hazards” by the adopter and then it is specified they will be completed by June 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. She said she thinks this should also be done in regard of visually inspecting the trees in the parkland. Moegerle said and she also has a question as to whether those inspections should also be twice a year. She said along with the issue of the maintenance that is twice a year.

Boyer said correct me if he is wrong, but he doesn't think we are abrogating the city's responsibility to keep the parks in a safe and clean manner. Moegerle said but we put the onus upon the adopter to visually inspect them twice a year, as opposed to once. She said and notifying the city, that is the point. Voss asked should it be more, is that your point? Moegerle said it only says once a year. Voss said it says twice a year. He said actually it says bi-annually which is incorrect, it should be semi-annually. Moegerle said correct and she thinks the visible safety hazards should be checked twice a year also.

Moegerle said the next issue, is in regard to paragraphs 9 & 13. She said it talks about the adopter providing significant supervision to participants 18 years or younger on site in Adopt-A-Park activities. She said she discussed this with Vierling a little bit. Moegerle said what she doesn't understand is what “Adopt-A-Park Activities” might be. She asked are they being sponsored and put on by the adopter? Lawrence said he thinks this is clean-up activities and it should specify. Moegerle asked or is it special activities? She said and if it is just clean-up and inspection shouldn't we specify that in there. Lawrence said you could list it as activities of clean-up and park maintenance. Voss asked your concern is the type of activities? Moegerle said there could be liability for the city if the adopter thinks because they adopted the park they can put on their annual family reunion, and perhaps those types of activities. She asked are there liability issues? Voss said he is missing something. He thought this was all about cleaning up the park and getting citizen ownership and involvement on cleaning up the parks. Lawrence said he thinks on paragraph 9 where it says Park Adopt, instead of activities it should talk about maintenance and care. Voss said that is what Adopt-A-Park is though. Lawrence said that is what it is, but it has what activities which could mean they are playing ball. Voss said playing ball has nothing to do with Adopt-A-Park.

Boyer asked Vierling if he has issues with the program? Vierling said the language could be cleaned up. He said he expected that the intent of the rule or the policy was to allow the adopters to put out a workforce or bring in a group of kids if they wanted to help for purposes of cleaning up the parks. Vierling said his question on 13 was to some extent where you place the risk of injury or loss. In essence, on what he assumes is a volunteer, it

may have a very chilling effect on the program. He said he hasn't checked the city's policy but he knows the League of Minnesota Cities (LMC) has an affordable rider for volunteers, for parks, roads and things of that nature. It would eliminate the need for that item in number 13; some people may be intimidated by that in terms of being a volunteer under that scenario. **Boyer withdrew his motion.**

**Boyer made a motion to table the Adopt-A-Park program for two weeks after the City Attorney has chance to review this. Lawrence seconded.** Moegerle said and direction to staff to clarify the other issues. Boyer said yes, he is fine with that. DeRoche said he has something he would like clarification on. He read the following: *A park or trail, or portions thereof, can be adopted by an individual, business, or organization from the City of East Bethel as designated by the Park Commission.* DeRoche said he doesn't know if he likes the idea of the Park Commission designating who will be adopting the parks or trails. He said he thinks that should be a Council decision and how they can suspend it, that shouldn't be a Park Commission decision either. DeRoche said everybody in the city pays for the parks. Boyer said he thinks it should go through Park Commission and they can make a recommendation to Council, just like everything else does. Davis said that is the general procedure we follow on everything else. **All in favor, motion carries.**

Res. 2012-07  
Awarding Bid  
for Water  
Treatment  
Plant No. 7

Jochum explained that as directed staff received and opened bids for this project on December 28, 2011 at 10:00 a.m. at the City Hall. A total of eight bids were received. The bids are summarized on the resolution. The complete Bid Tabulation that summarizes all the bids is included as Attachment 2. The project included the Base Bid and four Alternate Bids. The bid components and range of bid prices are summarized in your packets.

1. Base Bid

The Base Bid includes all labor, equipment and material to complete the following:

- Site Grading.
- Excavate, backfill, and compact soil material for footing construction.
- Construct footings.
- Construct water treatment plant building and necessary components to provide a completed structure as shown in the plans.
- Install electrical and control components.
- Install Filter No. 1 and process piping.
- Install water and sewer utilities from Wells No. 3 and No. 4 and from the water tower.
- Install sewer and water services.
- Construct parking lot and access roads.

The Base Bid prices ranged from \$1,737,300.00 to \$1,989,080.00. Municipal Builders, Inc. (MBI) was the low bid at \$1,737,300. MBI is the low bidder based on the base bid and any combination of the base bid and alternate bids.

2. Alternate Bid No. 1

Alternate Bid No. 1 includes the installation of Filter No. 2 and all appurtenances. MBI's Alternate Bid No. 1 bid price was \$145,000.

3. Alternate Bid No. 2

Alternate Bid No. 2 was optional and allowed the contractor to substitute alternate metering pumps. None of the eight bidders placed a bid for Alternate Bid No. 2.

4. Alternate Bid No. 3

Alternate Bid No. 3 includes the construction of an irrigation system at the water treatment plant site. MBI's Alternate Bid No. 3 bid price was \$7,000.

5. Alternate Bid No. 4

Alternate Bid No. 4 includes the construction of a perimeter fence around the water treatment plant site. MBI's Alternate Bid No. 4 bid price was \$22,251.20.

As previously discussed, the low bid for this project was \$1,737,300, which is approximately 18 percent higher than the preliminary cost estimate. Construction of the plant access road, additional treatment equipment and increased building size based on the pilot study and correction of muck soils for the utilities and access road contributed to the higher than anticipated bid price.

The original budget for the water treatment plant was approximately \$6,374,000, which included the following:

\$5,790,000	Construction Cost
\$450,000	Construction Administration
<u>\$136,000</u>	MCES SAC Charges
\$6,376,000	

Assuming only the base bid is awarded for this project, the total cost would be \$1,880,700, which is summarized as follows:

\$1,737,300	Construction Cost
\$130,000	Engineering and Construction Administration
\$10,000	Testing Services
<u>\$3,400</u>	MCES SAC Charges
\$1,880,700	

Jochum said assuming all alternates are awarded the total would be \$2,540,954.20. Staff reviewed the utility funds remaining in the bond proceeds to date and we did confirm that \$6,376,000 is still in the fund, plus another about \$1,000,000 is still in the contingency fund. He said so right around \$7,400,000 to be expended.

Staff recommends that Council approve Resolution 2012-07 awarding the bid to Municipal Builders, Inc. Further, staff recommends that Council consider which alternates, if any, will be awarded. Jochum said we further recommend that all four alternates be awarded or alternates, 1, 3 and 4.

**Voss made a motion to adopt Resolution 2012-07 Awarding the Bid to Municipal Buildings Inc. including the base bid of \$1,737,300 and alternate #1 in the amount of \$145,000 for a total of \$1,882,300. Lawrence seconded.**

Moegerle asked why not included alternates 3 and 4? Voss said it is spending money we don't need to spend. He said it is in a location of the city we don't need nice green turf. Voss said \$7,000 is the cost to install it, not to maintain it.

Moegerle asked what about a perimeter fence? Voss asked why do we need a fence around the building? Jochum said it is a remote area. He said he was thinking for extra security. But that is why we did it as an alternate. Voss asked but everything is inside the building? Jochum said correct. Voss said and no one will get in the tower. Jochum said the tower would not be fenced. Voss asked so it is just putting a fence around a secured building? Jochum said it is around 1200 feet of fence.

DeRoche asked what is our liability on this if we don't put a fence up? Vierling said well usually the cities try to take a look at, (since it was prompted primarily by homeland security), "what is the vulnerability of the structure itself?" Because obviously you have your water operations and domestic service in there. He said he doesn't know if your projected service on fence included any type of electronics. Jochum said building doors do, but not the fencing. Voss asked is the fence just chain link, no barbed wire? Jochum said correct. Voss said he would argue you would have more liability with the fence, someone getting hurt climbing over. Vierling said you always have the issues of liability with a fence, and stormwater ponds. Engineers will argue that both ways. Voss said that he would agree with.

Jochum said that is one thing we may want to consider. He would suggest, we could easily fence just the south side which would include the infiltration pond. Boyer asked why don't we ask Homeland Security for the money for the fence? Because they will give it to us. Davis said we can do that, and there is one other consideration. We have to do a Wellhead Protection Program. Does this include fencing around the wellheads? Jochum said the base bid includes fencing the two well heads. He said this was at the request of the Department of Health. DeRoche asked so there is no way to monitor if someone was to pop one of those caps? Boyer said that is what he is saying. We could build a real fence. Voss said if the concern is the security on the outside of the building, \$22,000 can go a long way for motion detectors or whatever.

Boyer said he doesn't get dropping the irrigation. For \$7,000 we are going to have to maintain it anyways. He said we are not going to just have weeds grow in this place. DeRoche said what the heck, we have irrigation in the swamp. Moegerle said she can see having irrigation when it is a regularly traveled road and more visible to the public. She said she is more concerned about the fencing issue. The irrigation we can put in later. Voss said the fence is not going to protect anything. DeRoche said it will keep the honest guy, honest. Voss said but it is not going to stop the crooks, which is the intent of the fencing. He said it would be one thing if we had outside equipment. But, other than ponds, we don't have anything outside, right? Jochum said we do have a generator. Voss asked how big is it, no one is going to steal it. Jochum said yes, no one will steal it. Moegerle said she sees it both ways.

Moegerle asked if, at some later point, we say we want the fence, do we have to rebid it? Vierling said no, you can do it as a change order. Boyer said he would like to explore the Homeland Security grants. He said and if you start the project you are not eligible. Davis said we can do that and if those funds aren't available we can come back and consider this as a change order. DeRoche said he hasn't been to a water treatment plant that doesn't have

a fence around it and there must be a reason for it. He said go to Andover or Forest Lake, if he is not mistaken. Voss said Brooklyn Park just built a 20 million dollar building and it doesn't have a fence around it. Boyer asked is there a consensus that we defer the fencing and explore other financial options? **All in favor, motion carries.**

Resolution  
2012-08  
Ordering  
Improvements  
and  
Preparation of  
Plans and  
Specifications  
for the  
Jackson Street  
Reconstruction  
Project

Jochum explained that the Roads Capital Improvement Program (CIP) was approved at the July 6, 2011 City Council meeting. The CIP identified one project that staff is requesting preparation of plans and specifications. The project includes the reconstruction of Jackson Street from 181<sup>st</sup> Avenue to Viking Boulevard. A project location map is included as Attachment 1.

A draft set of construction plans was completed for this project in 2005. The plans need to be finalized and bid documents need to be prepared. The segment of this street north of 189<sup>th</sup> Avenue is also identified in the Master Plan to be serviced with municipal sewer and water. This item will also need to be reviewed.

The total estimated construction cost for this project is \$1,163,350. The cost estimate is included as Attachment 2. The total indirect costs remaining for this project are estimated to be \$149,755 as outlined in council agenda item 7.0 B.3.

Attached is Resolution 2012-08 authoring City staff to prepare Plans and Specifications for the Jackson Street Reconstruction Project. Assuming there are no major issues with right-of-way acquisition or wetland permitting, it is anticipated that staff will provide council with Plans and Specifications for consideration at the May 2, 2012 City Council meeting. At that time staff will request approval of Plans and Specifications along with approval to solicit bids for the project.

**Boyer made a motion to approve Resolution 2012-08 Ordering Improvements and Preparation of Plans and Specifications for the Jackson Street Reconstruction Project. Moegerle seconded.**

Voss said this was probably the fourth year that Jackson was deferred because of the thought that this might be torn up because of the utilities. He asked are we still thinking in that utilities will go in here in the future? Jochum said we were going to bring Council some options of where to put the utilities, in the street or otherwise. Voss asked if we don't put the utilities in, and we put the road in, because this is an MSA route, we can't tear it up for how long? Jochum said that doesn't matter, you can't use MSA funds on any of the utility work. Voss said he understands, but when you put down a MSA road isn't there a restriction on when you can open up the road again, or is he confusing this with another state. Jochum said no he doesn't think so. Voss said so if this goes down next year and a year or two from now we decide to put utilities down our option is to tear up the road and put utilities in or we can acquire right of way. Jochum said we are going to bring this back to Council to decide either we are putting in utilities or not.

Davis said what we are getting at is we will make a presentation whether utilities are warranted or not. He said there is really only one segment of Jackson that has the densities to serve sewer and that is from 189<sup>th</sup> north of Viking Blvd. Davis said everything south of there is only really one developable parcel. So it really wouldn't make any sense to have the extension down that far. He said we have looked at several different options and it could be provided without going in the street. Voss said he thought part of the reason we needed Jackson was to loop the water. Jochum said right, but there could be some looping options

through Our Saviour's instead of through Jackson. That is what we want to discuss.

Davis said that section is an urban section anyway. It currently has curb and gutter on it so there is room within the existing right-of-way to install a waterline. Jochum said that brings up a good point. Maybe part of discussion and decision is to bring the people in and ask what their thoughts are. Voss asked how pressing is it to reconstruct Jackson? Davis, said it is our fourth most major east/west street. Traffic count is approaching about 1,500 vehicles a day. He said the pavement is deteriorating. We just keep patching and patching. Davis said there is nothing to say it couldn't be put off another year, but it would be best to try to get to it as quickly as possible. He said what we would like to do is when we come back with the Plans and Specs is come back with some options for you. Davis said what we don't want to do is come back with a plan with this and then in two year say now we need sewer on this. Voss asked what about using 189<sup>th</sup> as a north/south, he can see 189<sup>th</sup> being less of an issue when it comes to utilities. He said can we break that into two bids, north and south 189<sup>th</sup> because what he doesn't want to do is rush the discussion over utilities on there. Voss said because we are also going to talk about cutting over to Buchanan at the same time. Davis said we could do that, but we would have to revise some of our other plans. **All in favor, motion carries.**

Bureau of  
Criminal  
Apprehension  
Joint Powers  
Agreement

Davis explained that the BCA e-charging system enables agencies, courts, and prosecutors to streamline reports, have greater and more efficient access to information and provide improved interfacing between the courts, prosecutors and law enforcement agencies. The advantages for this service for the prosecutor's are:

- The ability to look up DUI reports via the website instead of requesting through the agency;
- The ability to draft a criminal complaint, have the prosecutor sign it, the agency sign, the judge sign, and filed with court electronically, so that no actual paper is involved.

The advantages for the law enforcement agencies are:

- The arresting officer no longer completes the tri-carbon copies and paperwork for DUI's. They enter all their information on the website at the time of the arrest, which is then distributed to Department of Public Service, the prosecutors, and the courts simultaneously.
- The agencies no longer have to send an officer up to sign and an officer to bring the complaint to court. They can review and sign the complaint at their workstation via a finger print swipe.

The advantages for the courts are:

- The complaints (summons, warrants, and rush order for detentions) can be submitted via the website, and that allows them to file it and enter it into MNCIS automatically.
- There are other integrations between the information received from the e-charging system that helps to automate the court, so that they don't have to manually enter information.

The participating prosecutors pay an annual fee of \$120 to access this service. There is no direct cost to the City for this program.

Staff recommends approval of the Resolution 2012-09, the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension Joint Powers Agreement as attached and the Court Data Services Subscriber Amendment as attached to permit participation in the BCA eCharging program.

**Voss made a motion to adopt Resolution 2012-09 Approving the State of Minnesota Joint Powers Agreements with the City of East Bethel on Behalf of its City Attorney and our Police Department. Boyer seconded.**

Moegerle asked why does this include our police department which we do not have? We use Anoka County, because it says, “On behalf of our city attorney” (which is Mark Vierling and our police department) “enters into a joint agreement.” Vierling said you really don’t have a police department. You have a contract with Anoka County for policing services. He said the Anoka County Sheriff’s Department as well as the Anoka County Attorney will have a like agreement, just like this one that they will be signing. So you could really just strike that out. Vierling said this is a standard agreement that the BCA has out with all the communities they are servicing. He said he can tell you right now that the Anoka County Sheriff’s Department is not there today, but we expect they will be there in a couple months and you won’t have liability for Anoka County because they will have their own JPA with the BCA. Moegerle said so strike police department wherever it is written.

DeRoche asked he thought we went through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) when the County Attorney was in here and the Police Department was in here and we agreed to do at JPA with them to share information? Moegerle said she thinks that was to start the process that we were in favor of the information sharing to give information to the county so they would fund this. Voss said the Joint Law Enforcement Council has been talking about this for a while. DeRoche said he personally has problems with everything going electronic. Voss said he knows the deputies are going to love this. It is less paperwork and they are more on the road. Vierling said this is really a follow up from a pilot program that has been on-going for years and is fully engaged in Washington and Hennepin County presently. He said there are stringent audits that are in force with the BCA on accessing this data. Vierling said the BCA will come out to our office and other offices and do audits to make sure nothing has been accessed outside of what is authorized. He said and you have probably seen some newspaper reports where people have been fined, sanctioned and lost employment for going outside of this.

**Moegerle made an amendment to the motion to strike police department in the title and anywhere it is mentioned in the resolution.** Voss asked is that going to be a problem with the county. Vierling said no, you have a contract with the county and they will have their own JPA. Boyer said he thinks it is moot, but that is fine. Voss said he thinks it is also, and as he said before, he we have police department in our code. **DeRoche; nay, Boyer, Lawrence, Moegerle, Voss; aye, motion carries.**

Appoint  
Anoka County  
– Blaine  
Airport  
Advisory  
Commission  
Member

Davis said the City has become a member of the Anoka County-Blaine Airport Advisory Commission. Membership on the Commission enables the City to keep abreast of developments at the airport as they relate to economic development through access to general aviation facilities and as part of the overall transportation element. The Commission is advisory only and there are no dues or costs to the City to belong. Current municipal members on the Commission include Circle Pines, Blaine, Mounds View, Lexington, Lino Lakes and Anoka County. City Council may appoint one member and an alternate to the Commission.

Staff is seeking direction from City Council as to the appointment.

**Moegerle made a motion to recommend Ed Fiore to be appointed to the Anoka County-Blaine Airport Advisory Council. DeRoche seconded.** Moegerle said Ed Fiore

lives at Coon Lake Beach. He was on the Minneapolis Airport Commission (MAC), he was very active with it and is just very knowledgeable. Voss asked if this is an appointment, shouldn't we get an application, isn't there a civil process? Davis said since this is a non-voting thing (this is like the appointment of the TH65 Coalition members) and it is entirely up to you if you want to go through that process. Boyer said he is still representing the city. Voss said he thinks at least having some background. Boyer said yes, just having an application. Voss said he doesn't necessarily have to come to the meeting. Boyer said he certainly seems qualified. Moegerle asked as far as an alternate to the commission what are you suggesting? Davis said he would suggest that we appoint either a Council Member or staff as an alternate. Moegerle asked do they meet during the day? Davis said no, their meetings are in the evenings. He said it is quarterly. Davis said he would be willing to go to this, it is only four times a year.

**Boyer made a motion to appoint Jack Davis as the alternate to the Anoka County-Blaine Airport Advisory Commission. Lawrence seconded; all in favor, motion carries.**

Ady Voltedge  
Contract

Davis explained that at the December 21, 2011 meeting City Council selected Ady Voltedge as the consulting firm to conduct the marketing and branding plan for the City. The base proposal presented by Ady Voltedge proposed a Positioning and Branding and Marketing Plan study as indicated on Attachment #1 for a cost not to exceed \$31,005. In a follow up discussion with Janet Ady on December 22, 2011 and again on December 30, 2011, an alternate proposal was presented which provides City Council with additional options to expand the scope of the study. These alternative proposals were based on Ady Voltedge's analysis of our situation after the RFP solicitation and the interview of candidates for selection.

The two major options are the offerings of a Target Industry Analysis and an Economic Development Plan Review. The Target Industry Analysis would determine industries with the potential to be a match for location in East Bethel. The cost for this element would be \$15,510. The Economic Development Plan Review would focus on review of the City's Comprehensive Plan with emphasis on the transition from a diversified rural area to a rural growth center, the vision for a City Center and the apportionment of sewer land between land use categories. The cost for this element would be \$20,120 but the base proposal price would be reduced to \$28,125 due to duplicate work elements for each item. The total cost the addition of this alternative to the base proposal would be \$48,245. See Attachment #3 for additional details for these proposed components.

The addition of the Economic Development Plan Review would not only address the items listed above it would be an essential component of our Comprehensive Plan update. An added value of the Comprehensive Plan update, aside from its value as a development guide, is the eligibility for Met Council project funding. The Economic Development Plan Review would also allow the City to combine the best planning practices with economic development needs to produce a Comprehensive Plan that reflects unification of both of these concerns.

There is currently \$25,000 included in the professional service fees and \$22,488 in the EDA's contingency fund to cover this cost in the 2012 EDA budget. Should the option of approving the Economic Development Plan Review alternative be selected an additional \$757 would have to be charged within the EDA budget.

Selecting the Economic Development Plan Review option would increase the total cost of the contract to \$48,245. Selecting the base proposal would cost \$31,005.

Staff feels that the Target Industry Analysis, as proposed by Ady Voltedge, is premature at this point. However, it would be a useful asset, once we establish our basic marketing plan and branding position. Staff does feel that there is value in the Economic Development Plan Review and recommends that Council consider this option for contract approval in addition to the base proposal. This option was also presented to the EDA at a meeting tonight and the EDA also recommends that the Council approve this option. Voss said we can always add this option.

**Voss made a motion to approve the Ady Voltedge Contract including the base proposal and the Economic Development Plan Review option for a not to exceed \$48,245.**

**Moegerle seconded.** Moegerle said Ady explained this very well on the conference call. She said it makes sense to have this outside view of the comp plan. **Boyer; nay, DeRoche, Lawrence, Moegerle, Voss; aye, motion carries.**

Commission/  
Committee  
Assignment  
2012

Attached is worksheet with the Commission/Committee assignments for 2008-2011 and provisions for 2012. Staff is seeking direction on these assignments.

Boyer said he is willing to serve on the Cedar Creek committee, but is too busy to serve on anything else. Moegerle said she will serve on the Sandhill Crane. Lawrence said he will serve on the EDA. DeRoche said he will do Fire, Roads and Finance. Voss said it has been five years since he has been the fire liaison and he would like to be the liaison. DeRoche said the reason he thought he would do it is, it has taken a year to build the relationships and get to know everyone. Voss said the purpose to be the liaison and by rotating liaisons is you get an understanding of what other commission do. Moegerle said she thought the liaison was supposed to inform the Council about what is going on in some of these committees. Voss said it is the liaison to the commission. He said staff reports back to Council. Moegerle said but staff doesn't attend some of these things. Boyer said he doesn't like the rotating idea. Moegerle said she doesn't care for it either. Boyer said continuity is more important than rotating. Lawrence asked Voss if he wished to remain the police liaison. Voss said yes, unless someone else wants it, he is more than happy to rotate that through. Voss said he would like to suggest another Council Member be involved with the watersheds. Lawrence took the watersheds and Voss took the Park Commission. Boyer said he would stay on the finance committee.

**DeRoche made a motion to accept the Committee/Commission Assignments for 2012 as follows: Acting Mayor: Council Member Moegerle, Road Commission: Council Member DeRoche, Park Commission: Council Member Voss, Planning Commission: Council Member Moegerle, Watershed Management Organizations: Mayor Lawrence, Cedar Creek Committee: Council Member Boyer, Sandhill Crane Committee: Council Member Moegerle, Fire Department: Council Member DeRoche, Police Liaison: Council Member Voss, Booster Day Committee, Council Member Voss and Mayor Lawrence, Finance Committee, Council Member DeRoche and Council Member Boyer and EDA, Council Member Moegerle and Mayor Lawrence. Boyer seconded. Boyer, DeRoche, Lawrence and Moegerle, aye; Voss, nay; motion carries.**

Council  
Reports -

DeRoche said he got a call from Fire Chief DuCharme yesterday and he dropped some paperwork off. He said there were 521 calls for the fire department. Rescue and EMS was

DeRoche

306, hazardous conditions/no fire was 47, service calls were 25, good intent was 95, false alarm/false calls were 11. DeRoche said the fire department has a full training schedule coming up. He said they asked him if he was interested in refreshing his EMT, might be something to do, he has no desire to go all the way up to medic again. DeRoche said there have been a few grass fires, people thinking it is okay to burn but it hasn't really worked out to well. Boyer asked where are we for burning permits right now? Davis said there is no burning ban. He said there was actually one issued on Sunday from DNR, but then the snow came.

Council  
Reports –  
Boyer

Boyer said he had some discussions with Davis about the road conditions after the last snow, especially along on Durant and Wild Rice where we could have used a Zamboni. He said he thinks we have gotten to the bottom of that, but if anyone else is having issues with their city roads give him a call at 434-0637.

Council  
Reports –  
Moegerle

Moegerle said we had a couple conference calls with Janet Ady with regard to the EDA Commission. She said we also met tonight in special session and are going to have a meeting on February 11<sup>th</sup> to do some brainstorming, come up with projects and planning on what we want to accomplish in 2012. Moegerle said this will be a Saturday and she is really looking forward to setting a track of what we want to accomplish. She said out at the beach the road clearing was tremendous. On New Years Day at 12:30 a.m. they were out there. Moegerle said she is sure staff was disappointed to be out there, she was pleased to see them working.

Council  
Reports -  
Lawrence

Lawrence said wrapping up the last year a few things we have done in the city. He said we started this big city sewer and water project, quite an undertaking. Lawrence said we also have a new Connect Anoka County, bringing high speed fiber optic cable to our city. He said we had the East Bethel HRA, we prevailed on a court case against Anoka County and now we have moved on and started our own EDA. We have a city trails program, working with those trying to get those in good form. He said we are starting a new city website, it is still way under progress going to take a while to get that up and going. Lawrence said we are reevaluating the Castle Towers Water Treatment Facility. He said the next big thing going on is GRE he is sure we are going to hear from the people on Route A on that. Lawrence said we have our Oil Recycling Center up and running, we had a lot of issues there. He said we did a lot of work with our budget and taxes, we have them down overall 11.4%. Lawrence said we have a new cable company in the city, an upgrade we hope most people are enjoying. He said and the major event happening is hopefully we will be breaking ground on the traffic light on 221<sup>st</sup> and Hwy. 65 soon. Lawrence said we have been building outreach with surrounding municipal cities in efforts to approve our cities image with public and private agencies. He said we hired a firm through the EDA to get the city on track, to help us with our organization skills, to get more business in the city so people can come in the city and open more businesses. We have a new year coming and looking forward to many more challenges.

Adjourn

**Boyer made a motion to adjourn at 8:36 PM. Voss seconded; all in favor, motion carries.**

Attest:

Wendy Warren  
Deputy City Clerk