

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
JULY 9, 2019, 6:00 PM
Park Rapids City Hall Council Chambers
Park Rapids, Minnesota**

1. CALL TO ORDER: The July 9th, 2019, Regular Meeting of the Park Rapids City Council was called to order at 6:09 p.m. by Mayor Ryan Leckner, and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. ROLL CALL: Present: Mayor Ryan Leckner, Councilmembers Tom Conway, Liz Stone, and Robert Wills. Absent: Councilmember Erika Randall. Staff Present: Administrator John McKinney, Liquor Store Manager Scott Olson, Public Facilities Superintendent Chris Fieldsend, Planner Andrew Mack, Treasurer Angela Brumbaugh, Fire Chief Terry Long, Police Sergeant Rob Gilmore, Police Officer Kelli LeClaire, and Clerk Margie Vik. Others Present: Nancy Newman, Sue Tomte, Ryan Mathisrud, Jon Olson, Chris Anderson, Tim Larsen, Ben Koppelman, Kevin Brauer, and Robin Fish from the Enterprise.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: A motion was made by Stone, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda with the following changes:

- 6. FINANCE:** 6.1. Additional Information for Payables.
Add to CONSENT: 7.5. Resolution Accepting the Resignation of Rapids Spirits Part Time Liquor Store Clerk Mark Juberian. (and) 7.6. Approve Advertising and Interviewing for a Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerk.
9. PLANNING: 9.5. Revised Resolution.
10. GENERAL BUSINESS: 10.3.A. Revised Document.

4. PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:00:

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to open the public hearing at 6:10 p.m.

4.1. Colorado Health Facilities Authority/St Joseph's Hospital Bond Issue: McKinney stated this is an item that we had on the agenda before but it had to be re-advertised because the location of the public hearing was misstated in the notice. Ben Koppelman is here from St. Joseph's Hospital if you have any questions. We have done this in the past. We need to adopt a resolution to allow bonds to be issued.

Stone questioned can you explain how this works? Koppelman stated the corporation that we are with is called Catholic Health Initiatives and they are merging with another organization, a large Catholic system called Dignity Health. They have formed a

new organization by the name of CommonSpirit Health. They are taking the two organizations and combining them along with some additional debt that they are financing with this as well. It's a formality that needs to occur in order for this to move forward by the cities where the hospitals are located.

Brumbaugh stated this bond doesn't go against the city. It doesn't affect anything that we do regarding our levies. If we were doing more than \$10 million in bonds, then it would be different, but we are not.

Mayor Leckner requested public comments. There were none.

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to close the public hearing at 6:12 p.m.

A. Resolution of the City Council of the City of Park Rapids, Minnesota, Concerning Revenue Bonds (Commonspirit Health) Series 2019 to be Issued by the Colorado Health Facilities Authority: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Stone, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2019-132 A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Park Rapids, Minnesota, Concerning Revenue Bonds (Commonspirit Health) Series 2019 to be Issued by the Colorado Health Facilities Authority.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

5.1. City Council Workshop Minutes- June 25, 2019: A motion was made by Stone, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to approve the June 25th, 2019, City Council Workshop minutes as presented.

5.2. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes-June 25, 2019: A motion was made by Wills, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to approve the June 25th, 2019, City Council Regular Meeting minutes as presented.

6. FINANCE:

6.1. Payables & Prepaids: A motion was made by Stone, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to approve the payables in the amount of \$182,989.11, and the prepaids in the amount of \$226,994.99, for a total of \$409,984.10.

7. CONSENT AGENDA: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve the following consent agenda items:

- 7.1. **Resolution #2019-133 Approve Minnesota Lawful Gambling LG220 Application for Exempt Permit on October 25, 2019, for the Antique Tractor and Engine Club Inc.**
- 7.2. **Resolution #2019-134 Approve Minnesota Lawful Gambling LG220 Application for Exempt Permit on August 9, 2020, for the Antique Tractor and Engine Club Inc.**
- 7.3. **Approve Golf Cart/Class 2 ATV Licenses to Operate on City Streets in 2019 for Bruce Johnson-ATV.**
- 7.4. **Resolution #2019-135 Setting Public Hearing on the Proposed Vacation of a Public Right of Way Located Adjacent to the Industrial Park Second Addition in the City of Park Rapids Pursuant to Minnesota Statute 412.851.**
- 7.5. **Resolution #2019-136 Accepting the Resignation of Rapids Spirits Part Time Liquor Store Clerk Mark Juberian.**
- 7.6. **Approve Advertising and Interviewing for a Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerk.**

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

8. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS: Sue Tomte stated I'm here representing the citizens of Park Rapids and how much we loved everything that happened on the weekend of the Fourth. Special thanks to our police department who did an awesome job of keeping everybody safe and making it easy to do everything that needed to be done in our community this past weekend. I heard several things from lots of other people regarding how easy it is to work with our local police. Cynthia Jones and I chaired the fireworks show, which we pulled off.

Cynthia Jones stated the fireworks show that we have right now can't get any bigger because the park isn't big enough. There was some debris in yards. With the wind direction this year was a problem. Heartland Park is big enough for the fireworks that we have now. If we want anything bigger it has to go to a different location. The community band is happy where it is. The spectators were happy. Sergeant Gilmore was with us Friday night at Second Street Stage. We filled the whole second block. We never dreamed that it would get that big. You couldn't find a parking space anywhere downtown on Friday night. That's a wonderful problem to have.

Tomte stated of the people that were there, there were twenty-seven different states, and forty-four different counties throughout Minnesota. It was an unofficial survey but it is very telling of who shows up in a three-hour period in Park Rapids in the summer.

9. PLANNING:

9.1. Resolution Adopting the Ninth Amendment to the Future Land Use Map to the 2008 Park Rapids Comprehensive Plan: Andrew Mack stated this request is to change the future land use map from single family to multi-family for property located on East River Drive owned by Kevin Brauer. The property contains three parcels which contains 3.3 acres of land. The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing. They did hear some comments questioning what the future land use would be. There were some concerns expressed regarding the future construction plans and they were addressed by the applicant. They were satisfied with that. Given that the Planning Commission did send forward a recommendation of approval of this request for an amendment to the 2008 Comprehensive Plan for the city's future land use map.

Conway questioned what were the concerns? Mack stated the question was whether or not the future construction would involve section 8 housing, or low to moderate income housing. That is not the plan for the site. The original conversation that we had regarding the construction plan had to do with multi-story owner occupied condos. That plan has been revised. He is now intending to construction twin homes with an association, all owner occupied.

A motion was made by Stone, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2019-137 Adopting the Ninth Amendment to the Future Land Use Map to the 2008 Park Rapids Comprehensive Plan.

9.2. First Reading- Ordinance to Rezone Land to R-3 in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.52.01900, 32.52.02100, 32.52.02200: Mack stated this request is for the rezoning of three parcels from R-1 to R-3 to create the zoning change that would permit the future platting and development of the land area on the 3.3 acres. The Planning Commission did recommend approval. I would also recommend approving the first reading of the ordinance rezoning the property from R-1 to R-3.

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve the first reading of the Ordinance to Rezone Land to R-3 in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.52.01900, 32.52.02100, 32.52.02200.

9.3. First Reading- Ordinance Amending the City of Park Rapids Code of Ordinances, Chapter 36 Fee Schedule, Section 36.07 Dog, Cat and Other Animal Fees, and Chapter 90 Animals, Section 90.040 General Prohibitions: Mack stated this is a first reading for an amendment to the city code regarding the fee schedule and creation of allowing backyard poultry within the community. This subject has been talked about over the past year. It was also an initiative that came out of Action Park Rapids discussions. This will create an amendment to the animal section of the city code. This is not a change to the zoning. It will be an exception from the prohibition of all farm animals in the community. This is only for the keeping of poultry in the yard. There is a sample application form in the packet. There was extensive discussion and review by the Planning Commission, as well as our discussion at the joint worksession back in April. The public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission. They are recommending that you approve the amendment to the city code creating the permitted opportunity for the keeping of backyard poultry up to no more than twelve birds. No roosters, no noise, must

be kept clean, must look decent, and there will be setbacks away from the neighbors. With those provisions staff is recommending approval.

Stone questioned when you say allowing domestic poultry keeping on single- and two-family residential dwelling properties, would the two family be a duplex? Mack stated that is correct. It still could be owner occupied. We have some dwellings in town that are connected but they are on separate parcels. You would define that use as a two-family dwelling because they are attached. I do not recommend that we take it anywhere else, so no commercial, or apartments. They are already permitted on ag lands. Nothing more than those two uses.

Stone questioned when I was looking at the application it asks for the name of the applicant, but if the property owner is different than the applicant, and the property owner doesn't sign the form, then the applicant couldn't get a permit? Mack stated that is correct. We wanted to make sure since we have a disproportionate number of rental properties in the community that we'd have the right for the renter to get a permit but not without permission from the landowner.

Conway questioned do we have a definition for domestic poultry? Mack stated in the city code, yes. It's also defined in Minnesota Statutes. Conway stated I want to make sure we're not allowing a dozen emus in backyards.

Wills questioned who deals with regulating this? Mack stated this would be handled by the planning department. Complaints could come in; the police might be involved also. We have a collaborative relationship with planning and police on enforcement for things that are pertaining to land use, weeds, noise, those types of things.

Stone stated I'm hesitant about the two-family dwelling option. If I was a duplex owner and my neighbor who was attached to me had poultry it might make it difficult for me to sell my half. Mack stated we could change that. The Planning Commission created a sub-committee consisting of citizens from the community. They did report to the Planning Commission at the public hearing. This concern didn't come up there. Stone was part of the sub-committee and is part of the Planning Commission. If the Council wishes to modify that you can change it to exclusive single family. Conway stated what if the second person doesn't want chickens in the backyard. Wills stated there could be complications with two.

Leckner questioned can we accept the first reading noting that we want that changed? McKinney stated you can amend it now, or send it back to the Planning Commission for their comments, and not read it at all tonight. But you can move it forward by deleting that section right now. Mack stated the subject could be revisited later on if we have objections from duplex owners if they want the same rights. Typically, it would be single family that would want this.

A motion was made by Stone, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve the first reading of the Ordinance Amending the City of Park Rapids Code of Ordinances, Chapter 36 Fee Schedule, Section 36.07 Dog, Cat and Other Animal Fees, and Chapter 90 Animals, Section 90.040 General Prohibitions, with the amendment to change item (A) from: A one-time permit may be issued to occupants which allow domestic poultry keeping on single and two-family residential dwelling properties, to, A one-time permit may be issued to occupants which allow domestic poultry keeping on single residential dwelling properties.

9.4. First Reading- Ordinance Amending the City of Park Rapids Code of Ordinances, Chapter 151 Zoning, Section 151.065 (B-1) Highway Business District, Section 151.066 (B-2) General Business District, Section 151.067 (I-1) Light Industry District, and Section 151.068 (I-2) Heavy Industry District: Mack stated this deals with maximum building height. During the joint worksession with the Planning Commission in April the direction that staff received was to work with the fire chief to come up with a determined height level for commercial and industrial districts based upon our ability to provide fire and rescue services. The reason we don't currently have that in the code is an oversight. This is a simple fix. That number is a maximum height of sixty-five feet. We are recommending approval of this city code change.

A motion was made by Wills, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to approve the first reading of the Ordinance Amending the City of Park Rapids Code of Ordinances, Chapter 151 Zoning, Section 151.065 (B-1) Highway Business District, Section 151.066 (B-2) General Business District, Section 151.067 (I-1) Light Industry District, and Section 151.068 (I-2) Heavy Industry District.

9.5. Resolution by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Park Rapids, Minnesota, Approving the Sale of City-Owned Real Property in Park Rapids, Minnesota: Mack stated this is a request for the approval of a purchase agreement for the sale of city owned industrial land, which contains three parcels consisting of 7.71 acres, for sale to Enbridge Energy. The proposed sale price is \$72,474.00, or \$9,400.00 an acre. That price per acre was determined by an independent third-party appraiser mutually hired by the city administrator and the purchaser. That appraisal amount came in right on par with where the city's assessor valued the property. This is a nontaxable city property, but it still has a valuation on the tax rolls. The proposal is to acquire this for the construction of a light industrial facility, a warehouse pipe management facility for their company. This purchase agreement was drafted initially by Enbridge. It's gone through extensive review between the city attorney and Enbridge attorneys. We've addressed every possible situation as to the sale of this land. The sale was originally proposed to close on August 1st, 2019, but we are recommending that the closing date be modified to September 1st, 2019. The reason is the land area between the unimproved road right of way and the airport is scheduled to be vacated. It requires a thirty-day notice for the public hearing. That will be scheduled for August 13th, 2019. The closing could occur sooner, but we felt it was cleaner to allow the sale, if approved, to close after the vacation of the right of way in order for the city to receive both sides of the right of way and to have that land transferred into ownership for the airport property. The driveway would be on the south side of the property with a gate on non-right of way property. The Planning Commission did consider this item in accordance with Minnesota Statutes for the sale of city-owned property, consistent with the comprehensive plan, and they are recommending in favor of that conformity with the plan, to the City Council. We are recommending Council's approval of this purchase agreement and the sale of the industrial land to Enbridge Energy.

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Stone, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2019-138 A Resolution by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Park Rapids, Minnesota, Approving the Sale of City-Owned Real Property in Park Rapids, Minnesota.

9.6. Resolution Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the License Agreement to Use Public Right of Way for Private Driveway Improvements Adjacent to Commerce Avenue by and between Enbridge Energy and the City of Park Rapids:

Mack stated this is a request for a license agreement for a private driveway within the road right of way. There is existing pavement on Industry Drive. This is an unimproved road right of way, as part of the Industrial Park Second Addition, that's adjacent to the fence that goes around the airport. The city has no plans for the improvement of this road right of way, with the exception of the future master plan for the airport for a future gate for excess to airport hangar space that could be constructed at some time in the long distant future. The purchaser of the land has requested that they provide private driveway improvements in the public right of way. The way to accommodate that is a license agreement. This has been extensively reviewed. It was developed by the city attorney and myself and was presented to Enbridge. We had some back and forth on the language through the attorneys. We now have the agreement ready for approval. I would recommend approval of it as requirement of the purchase agreement.

Conway stated its public right of way, but they are requesting a license agreement to be able to do private improvements in the right of way? Mack stated correct. Conway questioned when they are finished making the improvements, is it still public, or does it become private. Mack stated it's still a public right of way. The improvements are private. If the city at some point in the future determines there's a need for the construction of a public roadway through there, we have a provision in the license agreement for notice, six months in advance. At that point they would be required to remove the improvements, unless the city chooses to keep all of the class five in place, which we would need for a road anyway. There are no plans for a road for the foreseeable future. This seemed to be the most common-sense approach to get this done.

Wills questioned do we need to maintain and plow it? Mack stated we have zero maintenance responsibility. It is 100% private as part of the agreement. Conway questioned how about public use of it, will public use be restricted? Mack answered yes. This is exclusive use by the city and the private property owner. There will be a gate to the site on the right of way. McKinney stated basically we are allowing them to use our land to build a driveway, but we have a right to use it also, but not the public in general. If we ever want to make it a street, we have the right to cancel their license. Mack stated we have numerous other examples of these private driveways in public rights of way with no agreements. Now, we have to do everything legally. That's what we have done through this agreement. It also provides provisions to include insurance for anyone working in this right of way, the contractor and sub-contractors, and the same is true for the landowner.

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2019-139 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the License Agreement to Use Public Right of Way for Private Driveway Improvements Adjacent to Commerce Avenue by and between Enbridge Energy and the City of Park Rapids.

Discussion: Leckner questioned how many jobs will be created on this site? Mack stated five new permanent good paying jobs for the community. Leckner stated this is some property that wasn't really sellable and they were willing to make it work. It's a good thing

for the city. We've received some money that we can invest in our industrial park and create some new jobs. It's a good thing to get this done.

10. GENERAL BUSINESS:

10.1. Resolution Appointing Ryan Mathisrud as the Full Time City Administrator for the City of Park Rapids: Conway stated the Personnel Committee has gone through the required selection process as per our policies. It is the recommendation of the committee that the Council appoint Ryan Mathisrud as the city administrator. Mr. Mathisrud's employment will commence on August 19th; however, John McKinney will remain as the city administrator until August 30th, at which time Mathisrud will step in. We have asked Mathisrud to attend the meeting this evening to give a brief summation of his background, and he'll be available for questions.

Ryan Mathisrud stated I'd like to thank the Personnel Committee for making the recommendation to select me as the new administrator for the City of Park Rapids. There were many well qualified candidates that applied for this position and it's an honor to be selected. For nearly four years I worked as the planning director for this city. I know a lot about this community, the various departments and how they operate. I established many positive relationships with many of the folks in the community as well as across the state. I'm fully aware of many of the opportunities and challenges that face this community, and also its strengths and limitations. I look forward to doing my best to learn more and to engage with the public and to work with the City Council to strategically lead the community into the future. With the full Council's approval tonight, I look forward to coming home in August.

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Stone, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2019-140 Appointing Ryan Mathisrud as the Full Time City Administrator for the City of Park Rapids.

10.2. Resolution Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the Amendment to the Wastewater Treatment Facility Operation and Maintenance Agreement by and between Lamb-Weston/RDO Frozen and the City of Park Rapids: McKinney stated we have had an arrangement for this waste treatment facility at RDO that the city actually owns. It is operated, maintained, and improved by them. Originally, the document provided payment for the facility as well as provided the city with a \$20,000.00 administrative fee. They have asked us to consider an extension of that agreement.

The RDO representative stated they are looking for longevity to make sure everything runs smoothly over the next number of years. McKinney stated there is a letter in your packets that explains what they are doing out there. Because they are doing some continued extensive improvements to the facility, they want to make sure that we are going to agree to let them continue using our facility, and they will continue to pay the fee. We have gone through engineering, public works, and administration, and we concur that it will be favorable to the city to approve the agreement.

Leckner stated this is a good deal for the city and since they are investing a lot of money in it, it gives them some assurance that they can continue using it.

Conway stated I need to abstain from the discussion and the vote regarding this issue.

A motion was made by Wills, seconded by Stone, to approve Resolution #2019-141 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the Amendment to the Wastewater Treatment Facility Operation and Maintenance Agreement by and between Lamb-Weston/RDO Frozen and the City of Park Rapids.

The vote was called.

The following Councilmembers voted in favor: Leckner, Stone, Wills.

The following Councilmembers voted nay: None.

The following Councilmember abstained: Conway.

The motion carried.

10.3. Full Time School Resource Officer: Chief Jeff Appel stated in the spring of this year School Superintendent Lance Bagstad approached me to request a full-time school resource officer (SRO). In early April I presented a memo to Administrator McKinney detailing a program and what it would take, which in turn lead to your Council Action Request that is before you tonight. It involves two separate resolutions. Both went through the various city committees, one being the joint powers agreement with School District 309 with the Finance Committee, and the other being the approval of an eleventh full time police officer through the Personnel Committee. Both gained support of the committees to move forward with the school district.

Appel stated currently we have a contract with the school district. We offer services to the school district with our on-duty day shift patrol officer. In the morning they go to the different schools and spend as much time as they can in the schools, and also respond to calls through the school as they are generated. There are days when our day shift officer is the only officer on so it limits time in the school, which lead to their request for a full-time officer.

Appel stated in your packet you have the agreement with the school. After we worked through the committees with the advisement of the Finance Committee, McKinney, and myself met with Superintendent Bagstad, school staff and presented the agreement that the Finance Committee recommended. On June 3rd the school board approved the joint powers agreement. On June 17th we got a whole new agreement from the city attorney. After that, last night, the school board approved the new agreement. There are three corrections, 2D, item 12. and item 5, reads 50% and it should be 60%. On the signature page it should say school district #309. The document lays out all of the duties for the SRO.

Appel stated current staffing levels cannot accommodate the position, therefore it would require an eleventh officer. If approved we would have an internal competitive posting with our internal roster of officers, and requiring two years of service to fill that position. We want an experienced officer to be a part of that program. Our goal is to have that officer to be a juvenal expert, not just limited to the school, but outside of school hours, to utilize that person as someone who as an expert on all juvenal matters that pertain to law enforcement. Once we select that person, the eleventh full-time officer, to be approved, would fill their position in a patrol role and that would allow that officer to move into the school, during the school year.

Appel stated I'm requesting that Officer Kelli LaClarie would move from part time to full time status to fill that eleventh position. I feel the city is lucky that we have her. We held a hiring process in January and she is number one on the hiring list. We were so impressed with her that we immediately offered her a part time position, which she has been field training since April on a part time basis. It's been advantageous to us that she's been training since April, which would make the transition a great benefit to the department.

Appel stated the duties of the SRO officer are in the agreement. There are major goals that I have for this position, that are supported with the school. We want this officer to be able to meet and interact with students on a non-confrontational setting. Often with our current system when we get called to the school it's for a reason. We don't have that general face to face contact with the students which is key. We want that non-confrontational interaction. It teaches them the value of the legal system, provides students with easier access to that system. The officer will serve as a role model, a resource, and a mentor to students who have questions or needs the officer can assist with. We want that first name basis within the district. We have approximately 1,650 students and 230 staff members at the school, which is pretty much its own little city in itself. It's a key part of our public safety that we focus on as a department. We want this officer to act as a deterrent to crime in school buildings, campus, and the community. Not only through a uniformed presence but by developing positive relationships with students, facility, staff, and community members.

Appel stated as an example, when I worked in Savage as a road cop, in the summer, we were tangled with some juveniles on a case who were not happy to be talking with law enforcement and were not cooperating with us one bit. It was on the verge of a use of force situation. The school resource officer rolled in and the situation turned a complete 180. The juveniles had an immediate attitude adjustment. That's what we're going for, not just limited to the schools. The SRO knew these kids on a personnel level and he eliminated that problem that we were headed towards. That is one of our major goals.

Appel stated we want to promote respect for all people and property and to work closely with Hubbard County Social Services on juvenal related matters. A lot of the calls during the year are for social service calls regarding juvenal matters. During the school year and over the summer we want the SRO to work hand in hand with social services, and hopefully have an intimate knowledge of these kids when social services needs our help. We want the SRO to take a personnel interest with the students and their activities, provide classroom instruction and other information to students, facility, and staff concerning the law, personnel rights and responsibility and other law enforcement related topics.

Appel stated throughout the school year we get asked to do numerous presentations to the kids. We accommodate that now. This will allow us to make that process a lot easier. We would have somebody at the schools. Provide for the safety and security of the school's students, facility, staff, and visitors which is at the top of our list. This is all about public safety. Having an officer at the schools is extremely important to this, and also to provide fast response to incidents requiring police involvement such as emergencies, criminal investigations, and if necessary, arrests. If they are present at the school it reduces our response time drastically. The SRO would act as a liaison between

the police department and the school district. The communication right now is great. This will only improve that. Assist school administrators and facility with emergency procedures and management plans. That is an ongoing thing every day. We are always looking for ways to make our school safer.

Appel stated those are just some of the goals that I outlined. The benefits to public safety and the city are when school ends this SRO officer will be put into our ranks on assignment as I would see fit. That could be in a patrol role. It could be in investigations. We can move that person around and have extra manpower. We all know that the City of Park Rapids has a different feel in the summer. There are many more residents. If you look over the summer months regarding calls there is a spike for services. This officer would be invaluable to us as a resource to promote better public safety throughout the community.

Appel stated the Finance Committee recommended for the school district in the agreement that they approved, is 60% of a two-year officer's annual salary, with a 4% cost of living increase built into the yearly schedule. That 60% equals to 90% of the officer's salary during the school year.

Conway stated I think it's a wonderful idea. I'm in full support of an SRO. I do think it takes a specific personality to be able to pull this off. If we have the wrong person in the role even though they might be a perfectly fine officer on a general basis. If they can't get along with those students its going to move the needle in the wrong direction. Are you comfortable with the selection process with your bid system to be able to get the right person in that role? Appel stated I am. In this officer agreement, if it should take a bad turn where things aren't going right, we have the authority to pull that person out and get the right person in there. This will be a constant open communication with the school district to make sure that all of these goals are being achieved and that we have the right person in there where we can achieve these goals. If that's not happening, I'll have the authority to make sure we get the right person in the position. I'm confident that we will pick the right person to put in there and they will flourish.

Brumbaugh stated we would need to hire another officer. We based everything on the 2018 wages. We don't have our 2020 numbers done at this point. A new officer that's hired at the starting wage would cost the city \$73,000.00. Since the resource officer has to have two years of experience, that cost is \$81,400.00. Because we are in an agreement with the school, they are paying us approximately \$28,000.00 every year. With the new agreement they will be paying 60% of a full time SRO, which is \$48,840.00. We'll get an additional \$20,840.00. Because we are hiring a new officer, the cost to the police budget will go up approximately \$52,160.00. Those numbers are based on 2080 hours per year. It doesn't include overtime. It does include benefits any new officer would get, which is health insurance, PERA, and Medicare. The Finance Committee recommended moving forward with this at the time they talked to the school about it.

A. Resolution Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the School Resource Officer Agreement by and between Independent School District No. 309 and the City of Park Rapids: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2019-142 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the School Resource Officer Agreement by and between Independent School District No. 309 and the City of Park Rapids.

B. Resolution Approving the Full Time Employment Status and Acknowledging the Declaration of Police Officer Kelli LeClaire for the City of Park Rapids: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Stone, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2019-143 Approving the Full Time Employment Status and Acknowledging the Declaration of Police Officer Kelli LeClaire for the City of Park Rapids.

10.4. Resolution Awarding Bid for the Huntsinger Water Tower Reconditioning Project in the City of Park Rapids: Jon Olson, from Apex Engineering Group, stated I'm here to review the bids that we received on the reconditioning of the Huntsinger Water Tower. We received bids on June 27th, 2019, at 10:00 a.m. There was a lot of interest in the project. We did receive five bids. There's a bid recommendation and tabulation in the packet. The engineer's estimate for the project was \$135,000.00. That was for the base bid for the interior spot repair and an optional alternate overcoat on the exterior. Central Florida Tankees was the low bidder. Their bid total was \$93,200.00. Their base bid was \$48,200.00 and the alternate bid was \$45,000.00, for a total bid price of \$93,200.00. This total bid was \$41,800.00 less than the engineer's estimate. We got very good numbers on this project.

Olson stated Central Florida Tankees is a newer company. They were founded within the last year. They were formed by a group of individuals that have been in the coating business for several years. Given the discrepancy in the cost of their bid versus what we were anticipating we wanted to verify that they didn't miss something in their bid, and that they bid the scope of work that we intended. We did verify that with them, and we verified that they intended to use the products and materials that we specified. We verified that was the case. They appear to have bid this project as we saw it. Why is their number so low? These coating companies are really competitive. Their response was twofold. The timing worked out perfectly for them. They have a large project coming up here in a few weeks. They have a little gap in their schedule. They really wanted this project so they can continue to build their reputation under their new name. We contacted the references they supplied. There were no red flags identified when we did that research. They are a newer company, but seem to be reputable. We have no concerns at this point with the company themselves, their experiences or their abilities.

Olson stated the base bid is for the interior spot work on the interior wet and dry. That work, according to the KLM inspection report is necessary at this time. There is corrosion at various locations. With the total project cost if you were to award just the base bid, the \$48,200.00 plus the engineering and inspection fees, we'd be looking at a total project price of around \$100,000.00. The goal with the exterior overcoat is to buy some additional life. A full rehab on a water tower is very expensive. The existing life span on the coating that we have in place with no improvements is estimated at six to eight years according to the KLM report.

Olson stated there is no right answer on how to handle this situation. There is a little risk moving forward with an overcoat, but there's also a potential for a large gain. It's our opinion that eight to ten years, buying a couple of additional years is likely on the conservative side. The coating materials have come a long way in recent years. The coating manufacturer has indicated that an overcoat can be a good longer-term solution. They have several that have exceeded that ten-year mark by quite a bit. Given the

performance of the existing system, it's current condition, there is some reason to consider awarding that alternate, especially based on the price that we received. If you were to award the alternate the total estimated project cost would be \$165,000.00. If you look at the total price of a new tower, to rehab an entire tower, you're in that \$600,000.00 to \$700,000.00 range for a twenty-five to thirty-year lifespan. We're looking at about \$20,000.00 to \$25,000.00 a year. If we can gain an additional forty years out of an overcoat it will have paid for itself. It would be in the neighborhood of \$16,000.00 per year. There's no guarantee as to how much we're going to improve that. It's a decision for the Council to make whether or not they feel there is adequate justification for making that. My opinion is, there is reason to consider it based on the performance.

Olson stated I've talked with Burlingame at length about this. Given the low bids that we did receive he and I both feel that moving forward with the base bid and the alternate is in the city's best interest. It was a surprise to see that low bid number. Typically, these companies are very competitive. They know where people are bidding at. Leckner questioned is there someone who will be able to inspect the work, especially on the inside of the tower to make sure they are doing it properly? Olson stated that's outside of our area of expertise. That's why we hired KLM Engineering as a sub-consultant to us. We do recommend that they inspect the project. There is so many things that go into the long-term performance of these coating systems. We are recommending that the work be inspected full time. Stone questioned is that included in your price? Olson stated they are included. That's why the numbers are higher than the bid amounts. That includes my fees and the subcontractor's fees.

Leckner stated we did talk about the if the city had the funds for this at the Finance Committee meeting. It's in our water fund. We have money for maintenance. This is a maintenance issue and we should probably take care of it. McKinney stated there is no question about the base bid. The question is whether or not you want to do the alternate. Conway stated I have to go with the people we have making the recommendation.

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Stone, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2019-144 Awarding Bid for the Huntsinger Water Tower Reconditioning Project in the City of Park Rapids, to include the base bid and the alternate bid, for a total bid price of \$93,200.00.

11. CITY ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS: McKinney stated I congratulate Ryan Mathisrud. I concur with the comments about the great activities on the Fourth.

12. DEPARTMENT HEAD UPDATES: Appel stated I would like to add public works for the thanks over the Fourth. They came in and helped moved barricades for the parade. We appreciated that. I want to thank Superintendent Bagstad for his hard work on that SRO agreement and the school board for their support. The program is going to greatly benefit the school district and the city.

13. MINUTES/REPORTS/INFORMATION: There were no comments.

14. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL: Stone stated I'm excited for our city. We had a great Fourth of July holiday. I'm also excited for the school district to have a full-time officer on staff.

Leckner stated thanks for all the hard work that was put in for the fireworks. Second Street Stage is going really good. Welcome to Mathisrud to the city. We have a lot of good things going for the city right now.

15. ADJOURNMENT: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

[seal]

Mayor Ryan Leckner

ATTEST:

Margie M. Vik
City Clerk