

EAST BETHEL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

June 10, 2024

The East Bethel City Council met on June 10, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. for the regular City Council meeting at City Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kevin Lewis Brian Mundle Bob DeRoche
Tim Miller Jim Smith

ALSO PRESENT: Matt Look, City Administrator
Eric Larson, City Attorney
Aaron Berg, Community Development Director

1.0 Call to Order

The June 10, 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 Linder, 19423 East Tri Oak Circle, requested information on public information that the City had with some Ordinance violations he had brought up in the past. He noted he had sent an email on March 16 to the City highlighting incorrect and previous statements made by Look. He stated he had not received any response. On May 1 and on May 9, he had called Carrie Frost to ask how he could access the public data and left a message on May 1, and when he called on May 9, he was told Ms. Frost was out of office until May 20. He noted he then sent an email to Ms. Frost with the form to access public data attached, but he did not receive a response. He stated he wanted to get access to that public information and that was the reason he was at the Council meeting.

Look asked what incorrect statements were made. Mr. Linder stated he had sent an email to the City on March 15 and the response he received from Look concerned discrepancies on how things were worded and why he could not put a gazebo on his property, but his neighbor could because his neighbor's property was larger than his. He indicated his neighbor's property was under 2 acres and the Ordinance said that could not be done on property under 2 acres. Mr. Linder stated the other inaccuracy was the reference made to the shed on his property saying it was a garage, but it was a shed. He indicated those were some of the replies he received that had misleading and inaccurate information. He indicated that he had made a request for access to public data to find out what previously had gone on between the City and the property next door and who in the City created and defined Ordinances. Look responded with respect to Mr. Linder second question, the Council creates and approves City Ordinances.

Mundle noted that was done with assistance from many various Commissions also. Look acknowledged staff and Commissions were involved, but the final approval was made by the Council.

Mr. Linder stated he had requested in the past to get a better definition of what the Ordinances were because in previous conversations with them, some of the words in the Ordinance that were presented to him were different than what they were on the City's website. He had asked why the property next door to him was allowed a gazebo when they already had 2 sheds on the property. He noted the response he received was a definition of a shed.

Look stated staff had responded to a lot of Mr. Linder concerns and had spent countless hours on this. He indicated a lot of the challenges they were having were definitional issues. He stated Mr. Linder was defining something different than how staff was defining something and so there was a feeling that there was a misapplication of the Ordinance because Mr. Linder felt that his definition was correct.

Look believed while there could be some interpretation on things and some ambiguities, he believed it somewhat rested with the City to define what the Ordinances were as the City had created the Ordinances.

Look noted that a lot of Mr. Lender's issues were civil issues and the City was not going to get involved in those. He indicated if Mr. Linder wanted to take his neighbor to Court on an issue, it was within his right to do so.

Mr. Linder stated he the City also had an Ordinance about second driveways not being allowed. He indicated the track Look had referred to was an access point from the public road that went down to the lake. He noted they have it ten feet from his home and they used it repeatedly on the weekend. He noted he had put up a motion camera and it captured them going back and forth 72 times in one weekend.

Lewis stated he had heard all of this before and asked how did they resolve it.

Mr. Lender's asked if it was normal practice for the City to change the wording of an Ordinance when they were talking to someone. He stated his neighbor had two sheds and a gazebo and now the gazebo all of a sudden got turned into a structure and the wording of garden shed got removed. Look responded that was true. Look stated Mr. Lender's neighbor had been sent a letter in December noting the issues that the City had with their property had been resolved.

Mr. Linder believed that was incorrect because some of the Ordinance violations were concerning fire pits closer to adjacent buildings and the Ordinance allowed the number of detached accessory structures.

Look stated Mr. Linder and the City had a disagreement, but the letter to Mr. Lender's neighbors was the official position of the City. He acknowledged Mr. Linder disagreed with that.

Linda Harvey stated this Ordinance specifically stated that it was not to be accessed from a public road, but their access point was from a public road.

Mr. Linder stated he was here to get public record information. Look stated they had received a request for some non-specific information, which staff was struggling to fill.

Mr. Linder stated he had requested information concerning City records with the property next door to his and it was specific, but it was the going back and forth between the City and the "stonewalling" that was being done. He had the feeling he was the messenger and was getting attacked for bringing out what was clear in the Ordinance.

Lewis stated the highest enforcement official in the City was the Building Official and the Building Official did not see it the way Mr. Linder was describing. He noted Mr. Linder had a different way of looking at what he called a gazebo. He indicated he had observed that people have an issue when Ordinances changed.

Larson stated the City had received a data practices request and the Council knew it was pending and that would be handled. He noted they were talking about Code enforcement and with Code enforcement, you would get different opinions, but the City had the discretion about interpretation and where and how it was going to enforce.

Larson indicated what the Council had was a differing opinion as far as how aggressive the City should be on enforcement. He stated the City had repeatedly been put on notice that they wanted more aggressive enforcement than what was done. He indicated what was done was that this neighbor was criminally prosecuted and went through the criminal probation system. He stated he did not know what more the City could do.

Larson acknowledged that Mr. Linder did not get everything he wanted, but he had stated if Mr. Linder needed anything else he needed to put it in writing and present it to the Council or the City Administrator. He stated Mr. Linder also had legal rights and if he wanted more enforcement under what his interpretation was of the City Code, he had the right to go to Court against his neighbor on his own.

Larson stated it was not up to Mr. Lender's discretion to seek more than that, but rather it was up to the City's discretion. He requested Mr. Linder respectfully understand that his judgment was different than the City's. He acknowledged Mr. Linder was upset and might disagree, but he had to respect the City's decision.

Mr. Linder stated he agreed with Larson and what he was looking for was history. Larson responded that had been addressed and he had Mr. Linder data practices request was made, which the City would address.

Mr. Linder asked what was the timeline for getting him the information he was requesting. Larson responded it would be three weeks, which was on the notice.

Linda Linder, 24299 Fillmore Circle, stated she had called the City several time previously about an issue she was having with the pond in her neighborhood. She noted the pond smelled terrible. She indicated she had moved to the neighborhood 8 years ago and at that time, it was a nice pond. She understood that there used to be a sewage plan in the neighborhood which had been closed. She noted once that was closed, it apparently stopped the flow of the water through the pond. She believed the flowage kept the algae from growing and now it was just a "big smelly algae mess."

DeRoche responded when they drained it, they hired someone to come in who dug for some farmer to put it on his field. Mundle noted she was not referring to this pond and this was not the retaining pond where the sediment had been removed.

Lewis believed there were around 154 ponds or bodies of water in the City and Ayshford's position was clear that if the City took responsibility for maintaining all of the ponds in the City, there would be no funds left to do anything else. He indicated it was the people who lived in the neighborhood's responsibility for the ponds.

Ms. Linder noted it kept getting worse and if she drove by with her window down, she could smell it right away. She stated she lived across from the pond and it was horrible to live with it smelling of

algae. Lewis expressed surprise with all of the rain this year that it would still smell. He asked staff for their thoughts.

Look stated staff would talk to Ayshford about what the options were. He noted the DNR probably regulated a lot of what they could do with ponds.

Ms. Linder noted the City mowed around the pond and some of the grass clipping went into the pond also. Lewis asked why the City would mow around the pond. Mundle believed part of the City's park land.

Berg stated if a pond was given to the City, there was usually a 10-footwide swatch or easement around the pond for pond maintenance. He indicated though that he was not the expert on ponds or water and the staff person who was the pond expert was not in attendance at the meeting.

Ms. Linder asked how the Councilmembers would like to life across from a "stinky old pond." She indicated she was going to have to move because the City wouldn't help with this situation. Lewis thanked Ms. Linder for bringing this to their attention and said staff would follow up on this.

6.0 Consent Agenda

Item A: Approve Bills

Item B: Approve Meeting Minutes May 29, 2024 City Council Meeting

Item C: Weather Warning Siren System Upgrade

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to approve Consent Agenda as amended. 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 New Business. Commission, Association, and Task Force Reports

7.0 A Planning Commission

7.0 A.1 Setback Variance: Septic Mound, 18116 Deerwood Ln NE

Berg stated on January 30, 2024, Blake Robinson purchased 18116 Deerwood Lane NE. At the time of the sale the septic system, which was installed in 1978, failed an inspection and was declared non-compliant. Berg reviewed Section 73-36, Compliance and Section 74-48 Compliance inspection.

Berg noted Boettcher Excavating and Septic was hired to replace the system. Due to the age of the existing system, the condition of the soils, and lack of available space on the property, it was noted that a variance would be necessary to install a replacement system.

Berg indicated on April 11, 2024, the City received an application from Mr. Robinson, for a variance to reduce the front yard setback standard from 10 feet to 2 feet for the placement of a Type III, raised pressure bed, septic box mound and a tank at 5 feet.

Berg stated the proposed septic design calls for soil corrections (removal of all existing material and replacement) with additional soils, approximately three feet above ground, contained within a landscape block retaining wall. The proposed placement requires the raised bed be placed two feet from the City Right of Way (ROW) in the front yard setback in order to achieve the required 20-foot setback from the residence basement/ foundation wall.

Berg noted this proposed placement of the raised pressure bed is completely on the property and not in the city ROW; however, due to the proximity of the City ROW the Public Works Manager was consulted. After a visual observation of the property, it is believed that if approved the placement would not interfere with maintenance operations or future street repairs. Berg stated the proposed system meets setback requirements for all wells.

Berg reviewed the three-factor test for practical difficulties:

With respect to the first factor, a test of reasonableness, Berg stated that means that the landowner would like to use the property in a practical way but cannot do so under the rules of the ordinance.

Berg noted in this case, septic systems are required for a home to be considered habitable. The approval of the variance would allow this property to continue to be used as a residential use.

With respect to the second factor, a test of uniqueness, Berg stated the issue for the variance is due to circumstances unique to the property and not caused by the landowner. The uniqueness generally relates to the physical characteristics of the particular property.

Berg indicated in this case, the property has limited space for a drain field due to the irregular shaped corner lot. A branch of Anoka County Ditch 28 runs through the property from the rear lot line to the front lot line dividing it into two land areas.

With respect to the third factor that a variance would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, Berg indicated this factor is used to consider whether the resulting structure or improvement will be out of scale, out of place, or otherwise inconsistent with the surrounding area. When applying this test to a setback reduction, the visual impact or use or improvement relative to the surrounding dwellings is the emphasis of assessment. For example, when thinking about the variance for an encroachment into a setback, the focus is how the particular building will look closer to a lot line and if that fits in with the character of the area.

Berg stated in this case, the property has an existing hedge running parallel to the front property line and in the City right-of-way. The proposed raised bed box mound will not exceed the height of the hedge.

Berg noted on May 28, 2024, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing which there was no public comment. After a review of the application material and hearing from the applicant the Planning Commission, by a 7-0 vote recommended approval of the variance to reduce the front yard setback standard of 10 feet to 2 feet, for the placement of a raised pressure bed septic box mound and a tank at 5 feet on a property at 18116 Deerwood Lane NE.

Berg recommended the City Council should review the request, consider the Planning Commission's formal recommendation, and approve the variance to reduce the front yard setback standard of 10 feet to 2 feet, for the placement of a raised pressure bed septic box mound and a tank at 5 feet on a property at 18116 Deerwood Ln NE or deny the CUPA as presented in Resolution 2024-40, with the following conditions:

1. A licensed septic designer must obtain all necessary building permits and complete all necessary inspections for the installation, as required by the Minnesota Septic Code.
2. A Monitor and Mitigation Plan must be submitted and approved.

Mundle stated I'll make a motion to adopt Resolution 2024-40, a variance request to reduce the front yard setback standard of 10 feet to 2 feet, for the placement of a raised pressure bed septic box mound and a tank at 5 feet on a property at 18116 Deerwood Lane NE, with conditions as detailed in the staff report. Smith stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion?

DeRoche asked how did the sale go through with a failed septic system. Berg explained the title company required the funds for a new septic system be put into escrow for the new owners to use to put in the new septic system. He explained the process the buyer was required to follow in order to

obtain their variance from the City. He noted the septic system was not built yet and could not be built until the variance was issued by the City.

DeRoche agreed the homeowner did not have any choice of where to put the septic system. Berg stated this was their only option, other than putting in a holding tank.

Smith noted he had looked at the property yesterday and there was no other choice for the septic system. He indicated the hedge was high enough to hide it also. He believed this would be fine.

DeRoche expressed concern if the hedge would die or would need to be removed. Berg responded the septic system was still on their property and the variance was just reducing the structural setback from 10 feet to 2 feet in one spot and 5 feet in another.

DeRoche asked if there were wetlands on that road. Berg responded there was a County ditch that ran through two of the properties on Deerwood.

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 Setback Variance: Mfd Homes Placement, 18164 Hwy 65 NE

Berg stated he was going to give a summary of the details, but there was a lot more information in his report, which was the official City record. Berg noted Cedar Wood Estates, formerly Village Green, was a 150 plus unit manufactured home park located in an R2 residential zoning district at the corner of Highway 65 and First Avenue Northeast. Continental Communities purchased the property in November of 2021. The City did not have any certificates of survey or official records of plats for the four large parcels that make up the manufactured home park.

Berg stated historical research done by himself and was outlined in his report to the Council and was in the Councilmember's packet. Berg summarized his research for the Council.

DeRoche noted he was struggling with the word expansion and what were they referring to. Larson explained they had a clear expansion with respect to two lots that had not had any structure on it since 2008 and as a result, for 16 years they had been vacant lots. He indicated they clearly had a nonconformity in at least two areas – one having to do with zoning and using the two lots as mobile home lots and the other having to do with placement. He indicated even if this were zoned B2, it would still constitute an expansion because the pad or lot locations do not fit the dimensions for a B2 mobile home park location. He stated the reason they would need to have a variance was because otherwise, if it was permitted the permit use was not an expansion, but these two were very clearly non-permitted use and necessitated a variance.

DeRoche noted each mobile home was supposed to have a fire extinguisher according to the City's Ordinance and there was supposed to be a written letter from the Fire Chief detailing if everything was confirming. Larson responded that those were licensing requirements, not zoning requirements, and therefore those would not be expansion issues.

Berg stated in addition to the expansion question, a nonconformity could not be changed to another non-conforming use and once a non-conforming use had been changed to a conforming use, it could not be later changed back to a non-conforming use. He indicated if they placed a 12-foot by 20-foot manufactured home on a lot and it met the conforming standards, and then removed it and tried to put up a 14x60 foot home there, they could not go backwards.

Berg noted there were some exceptions put into the Code in 1987 regarding existing manufactured home parks to include that other variances may be approved by the City Council if strict compliance

with provisions of the article would be an undue hardship upon the owner of the park. He noted there were numerous non-conforming obligations that existed in the park.

Berg stated that the City's failure to enforce prior zoning Ordinances did not give the landowner the right to continue any illegal conformity as illegal nonconformities did not have rights associated with legal conformities. He indicated the burden was on the landowner to establish that their property qualified for non-conforming rights and as of now, Continental Communities had not provided the City any documentation to establish that the park complied with existing requirements when they submitted their proposal.

Berg reviewed the three-factor test for a variance. He noted the Planning Commission held the public hearing in May, 2024 with no comments being received except from a representative from Continental Communities. After reviewing all of the information and a lengthy discussion, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend denial of the variance to the City Council.

Berg stated a representative from Continental Communities was in attendance and had handed him a zoning verification received by them at the time of purchase in 2021 which appeared to be signed by the City's zoning administrator at the time, but he was not sure who signed it. He noted the zoning verification said that 165 units would be permitted and this was a legal non-conforming use per the Zoning Ordinance. He noted it said the property met State minimum setbacks but did not meet City Ordinance that was adopted in 1987; and, that there were no variances or special permits for the property. He stated there was also a checkbox that this could be rebuilt in its current form but there should be no loss of square footage and the buildings would have to be the same footprint with drive throughs, if applicable. He indicated there did not appear to be on-site zoning violations, but it did state that they are complaint based. There were no building code violations; it does not appear to be outstanding Code violations; there were no Certificates of Occupancy at City Hall; and, the subject property was not subject to a site plan review approval process. He stated this was dated October 1, 2021.

DeRoche did not believe that zoning person had the authority to do this unless it had been authorized by the City Administrator at the time. Berg responded he did not know this information.

Berg stated Continental Communities had provided a permit change form from the MPCA so when they purchased the property, the permit for the wastewater treatment system was transferred to new ownership, but it did not talk a lot about the specifications.

Berg indicated Continental Communities had also provided him with an email from someone at the MPCA talking about the type of system that they had and all of the components that made up their system. He noted it did show there was a permit for their current system, but it did not say anything about inspections or compliance.

DeRoche asked if the City had anything on record from the City's Engineer regarding the design and specifications of the sewer system. Berg responded he did not ask for that because this was about the variances for the two individual lots and it was not about the septic system.

DeRoche asked if septic systems were inspected when old homes were taken out and new homes were put in. Berg responded they did not have a septic system, but rather a treatment plant. He noted the City had nothing in its Code that said the City had to verify that an above ground system was in compliance. He indicated the City's Code required that the City verify an in-ground system, but not above ground system.

Lewis asked why the others approved if they did not know if the septic system worked. Berg responded that none of the employees who worked with the City when those were placed were still with the City so he could not answer that. He noted that just because one City employee approved a violation of the Ordinance did not change the Ordinance and it was still the Ordinance.

Rusty Edmonds, Continental Communities area manager, questioned the lot sizes. Berg responded that the dimensions came off of his permit application. He noted the City did not know what was out there and there was nothing in the file, other than the permit and the drawings Continental Communities submitted. Mr. Edmonds responded that was obviously wrong and the drawing was done by the contractor.

Smith understood there was a smaller home on Lot 17 and then a permit was applied for and now an application for the permit was being done saying what size would fit there. He asked what did the permit say. Berg responded that all he had was a piece of graph paper with an indication that every block equaled two feet along with the footing placement. He indicated they did not know how big of a unit was going on the footing. He stated they did not know what the lot size was.

Smith asked could a permit be approved and then after the fact say the home is too big. Berg responded the two lots were vacant and when the applications came in the footings were approved. The manufactured homes were placed and the inspector went out there and said that was not going to work.

Mr. Edmonds indicated that was not the first inspection though because they dig the holes for the concrete for each pier and those had to be inspected. After that inspection he noted the home's skirting was placed and it was inspected again along with the electrical connections and sewer connection. He stated then there was the occupancy inspection. He noted they go through four to five inspections from the time they apply for occupancy. He explained the six-foot common rule for the footings.

Smith stated the City's Building Official should have known this was a lot bigger home that was being put in, but the building inspector approved it. Mr. Edmonds acknowledged it had been approved by the City's building inspector.

Mr. Edmonds assured the City that going forward he would find out what size home was on the site and get a variance prior to ever starting. Smith indicated that was a concern because the City's Building Official should know this and yet it had been approved when it probably should not have been approved.

Mr. Edmonds acknowledged these two were not compliant, but aesthetically they were in line with the rest of the homes on the block. He noted there were homes on every block that were closer also. He indicated they tried to stay in line with everything else. He stated going forward, a variance would be requested for every vacancy because they have no idea when the home was pulled off as they had no way of knowing what size the home was so they would need to rely on the City for guidance. He stated he was asking for a one-time variance for these two homes.

Smith stated he had looked at the park yesterday and the distance between the homes were all different so he did not know how they would have gotten approval. Berg requested Smith look through his historical document to give him some indication as to why things have been approved and not tackled. He indicated this was very convoluted and sometimes people did not want to do all of the research to determine things so they just got approved.

Smith stated the park looked a lot better to him than staff had indicated and the improvements that had been made were impressive. He believed the City's Building Official should have been aware of what size home was being placed on the footings. He stated this stuff needs to be avoided.

Look asked prior to the ordering of the new home, was Mr. Edmonds aware of the setback the City had. Mr. Edmonds responded he had called the City and received information, but apparently the information he received was not good information.

Look asked Mr. Edmonds if he had ordered the house based on the information he had been given. Mr. Edmonds responded he had.

Look stated he found that hard to believe, but he did not know what information was given to Mr. Edmonds. However, it appeared to him that a home that was placed in close proximity to another was a potential fire hazard. Mr. Edmonds responded if they looked at what existed before, the home actually exceeded that distance on both sides.

Lewis stated they had been discussing this for a while, and he still didn't know if the waste treatment system "was up to snuff," especially with respect to a State license. He indicated he did not care if it was above or below ground. Look responded the City had to get these permits and inspections done in Whispering Aspens when there was a trailer home and there are regular inspections that are done and regular documentation that was required.

Lewis stated in Continental Communities, according to the online story, has something like 25 or 26 different sites, so it was not like they were new to the business. Mundle noted there were 31 sites.

Mr. Edmonds stated the operator at the facility had to do a monthly report with the Rural Water Association, and for the sewer with MPCA to ensure compliance. He indicated everything was measured and tested.

Look asked for any documentation Continental Communities had with respect to those reports/inspections. Mr. Edmonds responded he could get the City that information.

Larson asked what was the date on the application for the variance. Lewis responded it was April 6, 2024.

Mundle asked how long the City had to act on this. Berg responded that typically the City had 60 days, but it could be extended by sending an applicant letter extending it 60 more days to obtain further information.

Larson noted the other option was the applicant could take what appeared to be a high risk and force the decision now or they could agree to a 60-day extension.

Berg noted going forward, the City may require an actual site plan by a certified land survey company to make sure that they did not have this problem going forward.

Smith stated I'll make a motion to table for further information. DeRoche stated I'll second. Lewis asked any discussion?

Smith stated he wanted to see the application and other documents for the ones that had been recently approved.

Lewis stated he would be voting against the motion because he believed the Planning Commission had done a good job of going through all of this and had thoroughly covered everything.

Larson stated it was important that if it were going to be tabled, that the application indicate they would waive the 60-day notice and that they affirm the 60-day extension. He indicated without that,

he would recommend not tabling this. He asked Mr. Edmonds if he agreed to waive the 60-day notice requirement. Mr. Edmonds agreed.

To the motion, all in favor say aye. **DeRoche, Miller, and Smith.** Lewis asked any opposed? **Mundle and Lewis.** That motion passes. **Motion passes 3-2.**

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

Look stated they were now fully staffed with seasonal employees.

Look reported that the City had some long-standing enforcement cases that would be going to Court soon and he would update the Council on the progress of those.

Look commented on his conversation with the County with respect to the Sandhill Parkway auxiliary lane and whether it would be needed in the event of a grade separated interchange. He noted the County Engineer said if the City needed an extension on this, they could process that through and he did not see that as a problem. Look indicated he would keep the Council updated on this, but they had plenty of time to look into this.

Look updated the Council on the Open House for the ditch abandonment. He noted the majority of fear from the people in attendance was if the County abandoned the ditch, that their properties would flood out. He noted there was a statutory requirement that developers could not flood other properties and they had to keep their runoff on their property.

DeRoche asked why would the County "steal authority" over it. Berg responded they would vacate the easements and give it to the landowner with the condition that the water runoff contained on that site would eventually reach their spot, which was currently their spot and reconnected to the property.

Look noted there were very specific ditch laws that applied to touching ditches at all. He indicated maintaining ditches was a major problem and the County was probably pleaded to abandon it and get it off of their books from a maintenance standpoint.

Look updated the Council on Midco Broadband and the County grant. He indicated he had spoken with the County about this and informed the County that he believed the bar was set a little high for the grants. He hoped in the City's case that they would be a little more generous in their grants to cover some of the costs in the City. He believed Midco had submitted the grant and he sent a letter in support of the grant to the County.

9.0 – Other Items

9.0 A Staff Report

None.

9.0 B Council Reports

Smith asked who was in the Fire Department. He indicated there were a lot of email addresses on the emails going out and he believed there were people on that email list that were no longer with the City or had anything to do with the City. He requested that list be cleaned up. Look responded he would look into it.

Mundle gave an update on the Sunrise River WMO nothing they were getting a \$75,000 grant from the Lower St. Croix Metro Watershed Based Implementation Funding which will fund two Sunrise River WMO projects.

Miller gave an update on Maynard Peterson Park which now included a zip line. He stated there was also a couple of shade structures at Booster West along with another shade structure and a concrete corn hole game coming to Coon Lake Beach.

10.0 Adjourn

Mundle 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 8:47 PM.

Submitted by:

Kathy Altman

TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.