

EAST BETHEL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

February 12, 2024

The East Bethel City Council met on February 12, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. for the regular City Council meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kevin Lewis Brian Mundle Bob DeRoche
Jim Smith

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tim Miller

ALSO PRESENT: Eric Larson, City Attorney
Aaron Berg, Community Development Director
Mike Jeziorski, Deputy City Administrator/Finance Director
Carrie Frost, Administrative Coordinator
Craig Jochum, City Engineer

1.0 Call to Order

The February 12, 2024, City Council meeting was called to order by Mayor Lewis at 7:00 p.m.

2.0 Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3.0 Adopt Agenda

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to adopt tonight's agenda. Smith stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

4.0 Presentations and Public Hearings

None.

5.0 Public Forum

James Lender, 19423 East Tri Oak Circle, read from the prepared statement stating for the past several years, the City has been trying to correct ordinance violations at 19414 Tri Oak Circle. This past December, he was informed by the City that all violations had been corrected. He noted he had a meeting with City's staff as recommended by the Council, but that meeting was not as productive as he had hoped.

Mr. Lender indicated his issue was the second driveway on the property line and his concern was the killing of trees on the property line. He noted it was also a nuisance as this second driveway was within ten feet of his home. He stated when he asked staff why second driveways were allowed, he was informed that the City Code did not address this.

Mr. Lender stated he had asked staff why off-road vehicles were allowed to be continually driven on a designated path within 50 feet of the property line and he was informed it was the City's opinion that this was a civil issue. He presented photographs/images that depicted his concerns.

Lewis acknowledged Mr. Lender's concerns, that Mr. Lender was not happy with his neighbor's behavior, and he was also not happy with the City's response.

Mr. Lender pointed out that there were also a number of detached structures on the property at one point as well as adding onto the deck, which he understood were also violations. He noted the City

has been working on this for quite a while with his neighbor to do something about it. Lewis stated no one on the Council was a part of the meeting Mr. Lender had with the staff and he asked Berg to make comment.

Berg stated Mr. Look, Mr. Lender, and himself met for over 45 minutes. He indicated he did not think there would be time at this meeting to address all of Mr. Lender's concerns but noted the City has been diligently working to come to some resolution to get the Code violations taken care of. He stated staff has done a significant amount of work and a lot of the items had been checked off the list. He noted the pictures Mr. Lender presented at this meeting were from 2020 and they were not current photographs of what the site looked like now. He stated he would be willing to provide the Council with an update of the progress made if they wanted.

Lewis asked if there was any means of resolving this short of people going into Court. Berg responded that the residents at 19419 had been through the Court system. He noted the resident at 19419 was convicted of the violations and was sentenced to probation.

Berg stated some of the described behavior might be more harassing or an annoyance in nature, which the City's Ordinance might address through disorderly conduct, but they don't necessarily address those issues and/or potential noise. He indicated if the neighbors were doing something intentionally to harass the other neighbor, that was an issue to be handled by the Sheriff's Department or through the Court system.

Mr. Lender stated with respect to harassment, he has been ignoring that and had not brought that up at any of the meetings. He noted his focus at the meetings was on the neighbor driving off road vehicles on property lines, which are not Ordinance violations and his concerns were also focused on the number of non-attached accessory structures in the yard and the burning of fires within 25 feet of combustible materials. He stated right now his neighbor's fire pit was inside their pergola, which used to be a gazebo and when he brought that up as an Ordinance violation, he was informed that if the pergola burned down that was their problem. He pointed out that if the pergola burned down, then the garage would burn down, and then his house would burn down also. He stated when he mentioned that, he was told that was what insurance was for.

Mr. Lender indicated that he has also had damage to his trees on his property due to his neighbor's vehicles driving too close to them many times a day. He stated he was not allowed to add a gazebo to his property, so why was had his neighbor put in multiple accessory structures on his property. He requested the City enforce its Ordinances.

DeRoche stated with respect to ATVs and dirt bikes, he had spoken with Berg about this and it was determined it was not against the Ordinance to drive an ATV up and down their own yard. He noted this could be done for two hours and then it had to stop or it became a nuisance. He indicated harassment was tough to prove. Mr. Linder replied he was not saying this was being done as harassment, but indicated the Ordinance stated off-road vehicles could not be driven on a designated path. He indicated his neighbor was driving on the second driveway 70 times a weekend.

Berg stated if the Council wanted, they could look at Code enforcement at a future Council meeting and he could provide updates on enforcement which would include 19419. He indicated individuals read the Code differently.

Lewis stated the Council has heard Mr. Lender's grievances and issues. He assured Mr. Lender that the City Administration is either watching this meeting or would be soon as he was out of town right now. He asked Look or Berg to follow up and get more information on this. He stated the City could

not get into personal disagreements between neighbors or they would get nothing else done. He indicated this might be a civil matter.

Mr. Lender noted he was trying to take a simplistic view of this. He indicated to have a fire pit close to combustible materials and in close proximity to the garage to him meant it was an outright Ordinance violation.

Mr. Lender stated he was also disappointed that when he talked about detached accessory structure, he was given a handout about accessory structures, which was different than what was on the City's website.

Lewis pointed out that they had spent 15 minutes on this issue so far, when normally the limit on each person was five minutes. He indicated they were not going to resolve this issue at this meeting and the Council understood Mr. Lender's issues but they needed to move onto the rest of the meeting.

Mr. Lender stated the reason he was before the Council was to highlight what he was told in the past versus what he was told at the meeting and that there was a disconnect. Lewis stated he wanted to talk to the people who led the meeting.

Mr. Lender stated it was up to the people who wrote the Ordinance to determine if the picture matched the Ordinance. He believed they did not.

Lewis thanked Mr. Lender for his comments. Mr. Lender stated he wanted to get this issue out and get it to the people who could be responsible for it.

Dean Ehling, 20701 Monroe Street, stated his concern was tax increment finding districts. He read from a prepared statement regarding his concerns that the East Bethel Village Apartments were not offering affordable housing as they had said they would when they received TIF financing from the City. He gave an example of a person who he was an advocate for who was disabled and on social security disability as his sole income and that person was told he did not qualify for affordable housing rates as he could not show proof that he had income that was at least 2½ times the amount of the rent. He outlined what other Minnesota cities TIF district requirements were including Bloomington, Victoria, Alexandria, and Minneapolis.

Mr. Ehling believed when a business was enjoying profits which had been enabled by a government financing tool, the business should embrace the spirit of the law and not just the letter of the law. He urged the Council to consider creating rent limits that reflected the affordable housing percentage 40 percent of income for the previously defined 28 units at both of the East Bethel Village Apartment buildings.

DeRoche asked when TIF Districts are created, who oversaw that to ensure they were not making money. Jeziorski responded he could follow up with Mr. Ehling by email or put him in touch with the City's financial advisor Ehlers. He requested Mr. Ehling send him an email to start the dialogue.

Lewis stated the City did not need to be giving TIF to people to build market rate rental properties. He noted if the business could not make it on the market, then maybe they shouldn't build.

Mr. Ehling stated when he was talking to the property manager at East Bethel II and inquired about reduced rates, he was informed that they did not have them and they were a market rate property.

Mundle stated it was his understanding that with TIF, the City could create a TIF District, but if the owner did not take advantage of TIF they did not have to use it. If they do not use TIF, they do not

get the benefits of TIF. He noted if they were able to rent out all of their apartments at market rate, then they do not get to use any of the TIF.

DeRoche asked if they were misleading when they came in and applied for TIF, or did they change in the middle. Mr. Ehling stated that was his big question on the compliance report.

Jeziorski requested Mr. Ehling forward him his questions and he will give them to Ehlers to get everything straightened out.

Tammy Gimpl, 22359 Bataan Street NE, read an email she received on February 1 from Look regarding communications the City had received from Ms. Christine Dahlman concerning Ms. Gimpl's kennel license and IUP.

Ms. Gimpl stated Look and Berg had requested a meeting with her to meet in person at her facility to go over the conditions of the IUP and to give clarity to both parties. She read her response to Look indicating his email was similar to two years ago when then Councilmembers Beck and Erkel, along with Planning Commissioner Smith, and a Sheriff's Deputy showed up at her residence to do an inspection.

Ms. Gimpl stated it disturbed her that Look wanted to address outstanding unresolved issues received from Christine Dahlman who had been harassing her for almost 6 years. She assumed Look was aware of this considering his past as an Anoka County Commissioner.

Ms. Gimpl indicated nobody in the City was even qualified to do an inspection of her facility. She noted the email from Look had said he wanted to see her facility in person, whether she liked it or not, is an inspection and made her wonder if Look was qualified to be the City Administrator.

Ms. Gimpl stated it was her understanding that Look was hired to help with government funding of the water/sewer and Highway 65, and not to harass a female small business owner. She acknowledge the Council would defend Look, but it disgusted her that Look was not even full-time and he was in communication with Christine Dahlman.

Lewis thanked Ms. Gimpl for her thoughts.

6.0 Consent Agenda

~~Item A: Approve Bills~~

Item B: Approve Meeting Minutes January 22, 2024 City Council Work Meeting

Item C: Approve Meeting Minutes, January 22, 2024 City Council Meeting

Item D: Public Works Seasonal Employees

Item E: Resolution 2024-14, Approve Temporary Liquor License: Wat Lao Xayabhoummaram

Item F: Resolution 2024-11, Amending Resolution 2022-42, Prairie Hills Final Plat/Developers Agreement

Item G: Resolution 2024-15, Approving Plans and Specifications & Direction to Solicit Bids for the 2024 Street Surface Improvement Project

Item H: 2024 SafeAssure Contract Renewal

Item I: Liaison Assignment for Fire Protection Council

Item J: Amendment to Personnel Policy

~~Item K: Carpet & Paint Replacement at City Hall~~

Item L: Resolution 2024-16, Approving Plans and Specifications & Direction to Solicit Bids for the 2024 Street Surface Improvement Project

Item M: Resolution 2024-17, Requesting Municipal State Aid Street Funds Advance for the 2024 Street Reconstruction Project

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to approve Consent Agenda as amended. DeRoche stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? DeRoche requested to pull Item K. Smith requested to pull Item A. To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

6.0 A Approve Bills

Smith inquired about the worker's compensation insurance premium. He asked if the City had looked into better rates. Jeziorski responded that historically the City has not shopped around for rates. He noted they insured most of the cities in the State. He explained how the charge was split among the various departments.

Smith asked if it would be a good idea for the City to shop around for rates in the future. Jeziorski responded he was not sure who underwrote workers compensation for cities. He noted the City did have two substantial claims in the last four years, so once those fall off the rates should go down.

Lewis understood a lot of Jeziorski's future time would be taken up by the audit, but he wanted to revisit this topic. He indicated he wanted to know if anyone else offered this insurance and what their rates would be. He acknowledged the audit was first priority but did want staff to look at this as soon as possible.

Smith inquired about the charge by Civic Plus. Jeziorski responded that was the service used when the City's Codes were updated.

Smith inquired about the street maintenance charge of \$3,055 to Acre Doors. Jeziorski responded that was for a broken door spring/cable replacement at the Public Works building, along with fixing other issues.

Smith stated I'll make a motion to approve Item A of the Consent Agenda. DeRoche stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

6.0 K Carpet and Paint Replacement at City Hall

DeRoche stated the carpet and paint replacement was long overdue in the City Hall. Lewis requested staff also look at the Senior Center and come up with ideas on how to warm it up and make it more user friendly.

DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to approve Item K of the Consent Agenda. Smith stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.0 New Business. Commission, Association, and Task Force Reports

7.0 A Planning Commission

7.0 A.1 Planning Commission Appointments

Lewis stated they had two candidates for the Planning Commission appointments. He asked which candidate they should appoint for the three-year term and which candidate should they appoint to the one-year term.

Mundle noted in looking at the resumes, it appeared Mr. Jorgensen had a lot more experience so he suggested the three-year term for him.

Smith suggested once they were on the Planning Commission that the Commission could make their own decision on this.

Lewis stated he would defer to Mundle's recommendation.

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to appoint Mr. Corey Jorgensen to the three-year term and Mr. Brian Downie to the one-year term to the Planning Commission. Smith stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.0 A.2 Septic Variance – 4310 Channel Ln NE

Berg stated on November 16, 2023, the City received an application from the owner of 4310 Channel Land NE, to allow the replacement of a non-compliant septic system at the address. The applicant had hired Lashinski Services, Inc. to repair the existing system servicing the property. Lashinski Services, Inc. discovered the location of the existing system is the only location on the .47-acre parcel for the system due to the lot shape, building placement, and shoreland setbacks. While creating the septic design to remove and replace the existing drainfield, Lashinski Services, Inc. discovered that it was situated in a City right-of-way.

Berg noted 4310 Channel Lane NE is located in the Oak Ridge Second Addition, which was originally approved and platted in July 1962 by the Village of East Bethel Council. City staff have researched the property records and discovered there was septic work completed in 1979, in which a drainfield was added to an existing system. City staff is unable to locate any license agreement or variances issued to permit the existing placement, nor any discussion in council minutes from 1962 or 1979.

Berg indicated the applicant has owned the property since September 1991, has no knowledge of any previous variance or license and is looking to fix the system in order to put the house on the market for a future sale.

Berg stated if a variance is approved, a Licensing and Use Agreement will be required to permit the use of the right-of-way in order to reconstruct the drainfield in its current location as it is 30 feet into the Right of Way and straddling the front property line.

Berg indicated the applicant is requesting a variance to reduce the front yard setback standard from 10 feet to 0 feet for the replacement of the septic drainfield and tanks. Berg noted the system current placement meets setback requirements of all neighboring wells.

Berg reviewed the three-factor test for practical difficulties, and indicated the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing at their January meeting and there were no public comments. After reviewing the material the Planning Commission by a 5-0 vote made a recommendation of approval to the City Council, on Resolution 2024-XX, granting a variance to a reduction of the standard allowing for the installation of a replacement septic system, at the front yard setback standard from 10 feet to 0 feet at 4310 Channel Lane NE with conditions.

Berg requested the City Council review the request, consider the Planning Commission's formal recommendation, and consider approving the variance as presented in Resolution 2024-12, with the following condition:

1. A License and Use Agreement with the City of East Bethel must be obtained prior to the issuance of a septic replacement permit.

DeRoche asked where the well would go. Berg pointed out it would be in the front right-hand corner of the lot by the house. He indicated it was currently in the basement of the home, but in order to sell the home it would need to be moved anyway. He stated the well company was requesting that

the septic be installed first so they can take their measurement to install the well in a location that is 50 feet from the septic system. However, knowing there may or may not be variance issues they do not know where the septic system would go until the Council took some action at tonight's meeting.

DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2024-12, A Resolution Granting a Variance for the Reduction in Setback from the Front Property Line from ten feet to zero feet for the Installation of a septic system drainfield on a property located at 4310 Channel Ln NE (PIN 25-33-23-33-0035) with the recommended condition. Smith stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion?

Mundle noted he was in favor of the motion and this has a very interesting and unique lot. He noted though that it appeared the septic would be right up by the road. Lewis noted the lot did not look like it does on the diagram.

Berg stated the Public Works Director did not know that existed on the maps. He indicated his hypothetical was that they needed front lot line measurements and in order to accomplish that, they made a unique little future cu-de-sac to gain more area for those three lots.

Mundle asked if there would be any frontage. DeRoche outlined what the City Council had done in 2012 with respect to the license and usage on Sylvan Street.

To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.0 A.3 Hidden Prairie Preliminary Plat

Berg stated on July 25, 2023, the Planning Commission reviewed a Concept Plan for the revised development plan for a previously approved Preliminary Plat for the Hidden Pines Rural Residential Subdivision. The developer acquired additional adjacent land and incorporated the additional acreage into the revised plan. A public hearing was held and a recommendation of approval was forwarded to the City Council on August 14, 2023. The City Council approved the proposed Concept Plan.

Berg indicated on January 5, 2024, a Preliminary Plat Application and supporting materials were delivered to the City. This plat is consistent with the approved concept plan. It consists of 17 buildable single family rural residential lots. Within the RR- Rural Residential zoning district the minimum lot size required is 2 acres, with a density not to exceed 1 unit per 2.5 acres. All lots within the proposed Hidden Prairie Subdivision meet the 2-acre minimum lot size and the 17 units fall below the density requirements. Additionally, each lot meets the required minimum 200-foot width at the right-of-way setback line.

Berg noted the development will be accessed off of East Bethel Boulevard/County Road 15; therefore, the Anoka County Highway Department is required to review the plan. They submitted a comment letter on January 9, 2024 with comments. The developer is required to satisfactorily address all comments prior to any grading of the site.

Berg stated the internal street will be constructed to City standards with no temporary cul-de-sacs permitted.

Berg noted the Public Works comments were addressed during the previously approved Preliminary Plat and they have provided no new comments.

Berg stated the new concept plan was placed on the August 8, 2023 Parks Commission meeting and they recommended Park Dedication Fees in lieu of park land. The Parks Plan does not support a park in this area of the City.

Berg indicated the City Engineer reviewed the Preliminary Plat and provided a comment letter on January 29, 2024. The developer will be required to satisfy all Preliminary Plat comments prior to filing a Final Plat application.

Berg stated on January 23, 2024, the Planning Commission Meeting held a public hearing. Two residents with adjacent property asked questions about surveys, ditches and the existing septic drainfield on the adjacent lot. The Developer was offered an opportunity to address the questions. At the conclusion of the discussion an additional condition was added to the resolution to address the neighboring septic drainfield. By a 5-0 vote, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat to the City Council.

Berg requested the City Council review the request, consider the Planning Commission's formal recommendation, and approval of the Preliminary Plat as presented in Resolution 2024-13.

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to approve Resolution No. 2024-13, A Resolution Approving the Preliminary Plat of "Hidden Prairie." DeRoche stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

7.0 A.4 Viking Meadows Preliminary Plat

Berg stated staff had reviewed the video from the last Council meeting and DeRoche had made a motion for this item to be presented on this agenda, which had been seconded on voted on.

Lewis stated this was already basically done.

Larson stated the Council could proceed.

Berg stated on November 8, 2023, a Preliminary Plat and PUD application from Capstone Homes, INC. for the redevelopment of Viking Meadows was received. The proposal shows the redevelopment of 155 acres of land which spans across the zoning classifications of Mixed Use and Single Family Residential. The proposal shows 95 acres of developable land will contain a proposed 242 lots. In addition, the proposal contains 60 acres of open space which also includes over 10 acres of park and recreation space.

- At the June 27, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting a Public Hearing was held and feedback was provided to the developer on a Concept Plan proposal.
- At the July 24, 2023 City Council Meeting the Concept Plan proposal was presented to the City Council for feedback.
- On August 22, 2023, a revised Concept Plan was presented to the Planning Commission and by a 6-1 vote, a recommendation of approval was forwarded to the City Council.
- On August 28, 2023, the revised Concept/PUD Plan was presented to the City Council along with the Planning Commission's Recommendation. The City Council unanimously voted to approve the Concept Plan by Resolution 2023-61.
- On November 28, 2023, the Preliminary Plat and PUD application was presented to the Planning Commission and by a 5-1 vote, a recommendation of approval was forwarded to the City Council. Only one (1) property owner spoke and was in support of the Preliminary Plat.
- On December 11, 2023, the Traffic Impact Study and Preliminary Plat/ PUD was presented to City Council. The item was tabled until Dec. 27th, 2023 meeting.

- On December 14, 2023 City Staff sent a 60-day extension to Capstone for additional time to conduct a Fiscal Impact Study and allow or an Addendum to the Traffic Impact Study to be completed.
- On January 8, 2024, the Preliminary Plat/ PUD was pulled from the City Council Agenda.
- On January 22, 2024, the TIS Addendum, Fiscal Impact results and Preliminary Plat/ PUD was presented to City Council. The Preliminary Plat was denied by a 3 – 2 vote however a motion was made to place it on the February 12, 2024 agenda for reconsideration.

Berg indicated staff have determined that the proposal, with the approval of a Homeowner's Association, is in compliance with 2040 comprehensive plan, zoning ordinance, and official zoning map. Additionally the proposed Preliminary Plat and PUD meets the intent of the criteria for granting a PUD based on ordinance Section 56.

Berg stated all comments from the City Engineer must be satisfied prior to the application of a Final Plat. Any and all ACHD Engineering comments must be satisfied prior to application of a Final Plat, including but not limited to a Plan Review, ROW Access Permit and County Ditch Review.

Berg indicated after the additional reviews of subsequent information along with the original request, City Council may consider the Planning Commission's formal recommendation, and consider approval of the Preliminary Plat and PUD as presented or provide staff a Findings of Fact for formal denial.

DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to approve Resolution No. 2024-04, Approving the Preliminary Plat of "Viking Meadows." Mundle stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion?

Larson stated he had seen the Capstone letter of February 9 addressed to Berg having to do with the homeowners association and ensuring compliance with what was set forth in the preliminary plat as well as the PUD. He asked if Capstone would be willing as a part of the Development Agreement to ensure that there was a declaration of court recording against the property to ensure compliance with the City's requirements for this particular development. Berg responded it was his understanding that these would be incorporated into the Development Agreement.

Lewis asked if this was different than covenants or was it a part of the covenants. Larson responded he wanted to make sure that these requirements were recorded against the property so they were not only binding contractually on the developer, but they were also binding the homeowner's association to the requirements. He noted that would ensure that it was not just the developer that was meeting those requirements and once the developer left that the requirements were not enforceable.

Larson stated it would be nice to hear that Capstone understands that this would be a declaration recorded against the property as well.

Matt Barker, Capstone, stated the document that was provided to Council was a reference and guideline as to how exactly they intended to put the HOA together and the details of how that would be put together in what they anticipate working through as they draft the Developer's Agreement. He believed how that was recorded and what the processes looked like would be defined as they get to the approval process for the Developer's Agreement.

Lewis noted the City Attorney was doing his due diligence to ensure that it was going to be recorded properly. Larson noted that the broad outlines were basically going to be in the declaration and the declaration was going to ensure that the agreements were in place. He indicated they were not going

to have these agreement recorded because they have to be living breathing documents that would continue through the life of that particular development and would change over time.

To the motion, all in favor say aye. **Mundle, DeRoche, and Lewis.** Lewis asked any opposed? **Smith.** That motion passes. **Motion passes 3-1.**

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to approve Resolution No. 2024-05, Approving the Planned Unit Development of "Viking Meadows." DeRoche stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion? To the motion, all in favor say aye. **Mundle, DeRoche, and Lewis.** Lewis asked any opposed? **Smith.** That motion passes. **Motion passes 3-1.**

Mr. Barker thanked the Council and staff. He indicated this had been a long process and he appreciated everyone's time and commitment. He stated he was grateful that they have given them the opportunity to move forward with their plan to develop. Lewis thanked Mr. Barker for their patience in allowing the Council to make sure this was a good decision and to ensure it would be a good development that would take care of the people who would buy in the development. He indicated he looked forward to a good working relationship.

7.0 B Economic Development Authority

None.

7.0 C Park Commission

None.

8.0 Department Reports

8.0 A Community Development

None.

8.0 B Engineer Report

None.

8.0 C City Attorney

None.

8.0 D Finance

None.

8.0 E Public Works

None.

8.0 F Fire Department

None.

8.0 G City Administrator Report

None.

9.0 – Other Items

9.0 A Staff Report

None.

9.0 B Council Reports

Mundle stated he had attended the Sunrise River Watershed District meeting where they reviewed the 2023 projects that were accomplished and took care of some housekeeping items.

Mundle noted currently the Council Work Meetings held were not being broadcasted and he believed for the best transparency for the citizens, they should be broadcasted. Lewis responded once Look got back, they would have a meeting of the minds and make a decision on this one way or the other.

Mundle stated if they could have that discussion before the next Work Meeting, it would be appreciated. He wished everyone a Happy Valentine's Day this week.

DeRoche reminded residents to stay off of the ice on the lakes as they were opening up again.

9.0 C Other

None.

10.0 Adjourn

DeRoche stated I'll make a motion to adjourn. Smith stated I'll second. To the motion, all in favor say aye. **All in favor.** Lewis asked any opposed? That motion passes. **Motion passes unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:22 PM.

Submitted by:

Kathy Altman

TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.